

PHYSICAL ACTIVITY

The Nature and Incorporation of CSPAP Learning Experiences in Physical Education Teacher Education: Accounts of Faculty From “Highly Effective” Programs

*Collin A. Webster, Laura Russ, Liana Webster,
Sergio Molina, Heesu Lee, Jason Cribbs*

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine faculty accounts of the nature and incorporation of Comprehensive School Physical Activity Program (CSPAP) learning experiences for preservice physical education teachers (PPETs) in undergraduate physical education teacher education (PETE). Nine individuals employed as faculty members in different PETE programs were purposively selected to participate, based on a previous study in which the individuals had reported that their programs were “highly effective” in preparing PPETs for multiple CSPAP roles. A semi-structured interview was conducted with each participant to examine the nature of their pro-

Collin A. Webster is an associate professor in the Department of Physical Education and Athletic Training at the University of South Carolina. Laura Russ is a doctoral student in the Department of Physical Education and Athletic Training at the University of South Carolina. Liana Webster is an assistant professor in the Department of Kinesiology at Texas A&M University - Corpus Christi. Sergio Molina is a doctoral student in the Department of Physical Education and Athletic Training at the University of South Carolina. Heesu Lee is a doctoral student in the Department of Physical Education and Athletic Training at the University of South Carolina. Jason Cribbs is a doctoral student in the Department of Physical Education and Athletic Training at the University of South Carolina. Please send author correspondence to websterc@mailbox.sc.edu

grams' CSPAP learning experiences for PPETs and the adjustments, catalysts, challenges, and goals that characterized the program change process to incorporate these experiences. Constant comparison analysis revealed that many of the CSPAP learning experiences were field-based. The adjustments programs made to incorporate CSPAP learning experiences included embedding such experiences into existing coursework or combining/removing existing courses to make room for CSPAP learning experiences. A wide range of catalysts, challenges, and goals pertaining to the program change process were evidenced in data. This study provides a glimpse of how PETE programs have responded to shifts in conceptions about the professional roles and responsibilities of physical education teachers in line with public health concerns.

Until the last decade of the 20th century, contemporary conceptualizations of the physical education teacher's professional role and responsibilities ranged mostly within the relatively narrow sphere of school gymnasias, playing fields, and other instructional settings where physical education lessons are usually taught. In the United States, such conceptualizations are reflected in the national standards for initial teacher certification in physical education (National Association for Sport and Physical Education [NASPE], 2008b), which largely circumscribe the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of an effective physical education teacher to the physical education "classroom." But in the last 25 years, proposals about physical education's role in public health, based on the increased prevalence of obesity concurrent with dropping rates of physical activity (PA), have challenged dominant views in the field and drawn broader boundaries to define the workspace of physical education teachers (Webster et al., 2014). Recent public health-aligned perspectives cast physical education professionals as leaders of Comprehensive School Physical Activity Programs (CSPAP; Carson, Castelli, Beighle, & Erwin, 2014), which encompass multiple programs and contexts in and around a school to maximize the promotion of PA to all members of the school community. The implications of such perspectives ultimately extend to physical education teacher education (PETE), where faculty must critically examine professional standards and consider current program offerings in light of changing societal needs and emerging schools of thought about the purpose and scope

of a physical education teacher's craft (Goc Karp, Scruggs, Brown, & Kelder, 2014).

The present study was undertaken as an extension of a previous investigation in which we asked faculty from PETE programs around the country to rate the effectiveness of their undergraduate programs in preparing preservice teachers for CSPAP roles (Webster et al., 2016). In that study, perceived effectiveness was uniformly high for roles traditionally outlined for physical education, but varied considerably for more novel roles tied to other CSPAP components. What caught our attention was that a small number of respondents rated their programs relatively high in preparation effectiveness across most or all CSPAP roles. We wondered what these programs were doing to prepare preservice teachers for CSPAP roles beyond physical education, how faculty had approached the integration of learning experiences related to these roles into their programs, what lessons were learned throughout the integration process, and what futures faculty envisioned for CSPAP preparation in their programs. We felt that the accounts of faculty who had embarked on the journey to align the preparation of future teachers with public health goals would provide valuable perspective to the cadre of teacher educators in our field, who are caught amid the vicissitudes of an evolving profession.

The CSPAP Model: A Conceptual Framework for Teacher Preparation

The CSPAP model originated as a position statement from NASPE (2008a). It expands and refines the focus on PA promotion through schools that stems from coordinated school health models tracing back to the 1930s (Erwin, Beighle, Carson, & Castelli, 2013). In recent years, major public health organizations, including the Institute of Medicine (IOM, 2013) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC, 2013), aligned their recommendations for school-based PA promotion with the CSPAP framework. CSPAPs are conceptualized as multi-component approaches to PA promotion that work through schools, using evidence-based strategies, to maximize engagement in PA by all members of the school community, including students, school professionals, and parents (Erwin et al., 2013).

A CSPAP consists of five components: (a) quality physical education, (b) PA during the school day, (c) before and after school PA, (d) staff involvement, and (e) family and community engagement. *Quality physical education* is the cornerstone of a CSPAP, and is viewed as uniquely designed to provide instruction in the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to lead a physically active lifestyle, while also offering opportunities for students to engage in moderate-to-vigorous PA. All other CSPAP components are considered behavioral, as opposed to instructional, in focus (IOM, 2013). That is, unlike physical education, their purpose does not encompass teaching skills, knowledge, or dispositions for PA. Instead, their sole function is to increase the amount of daily PA participation among students, school professionals, and parents. *PA during the school day* focuses on increasing students' PA in school programs (e.g., recess) and contexts (e.g., general education classrooms) outside of physical education but during regular school hours. *Before and after school PA* focuses on creating or enhancing programs before school (e.g., walk-to-school programs) and after school (e.g., intramurals) to increase students' PA. *Staff involvement* focuses on strategies school professionals aside from physical education teachers can use to implement to increase students' PA (e.g., classroom teachers integrating PA into academic lessons), as well as on strategies to enhance staff wellness (e.g., providing PA programs for teachers). *Family and community engagement* focuses on providing or enhancing PA opportunities for students and their families within both the home environment and the local community.

A number of scholars and public health authorities envision physical education teachers as central protagonists in CSPAP implementation (Beighle, Erwin, Castelli, & Ernst, 2009; Beighle & Moore, 2012; Carson, 2012; Carson et al., 2014; Castelli & Beighle, 2007; Castelli & Ward, 2012; CDC, 2013; Cipriani, Richardson, & Roberts, 2012; Heidorn & Centeio, 2012; IOM, 2013). Recommendations detail expanded roles for physical education teachers in leading implementation efforts. For example, Castelli and Beighle (2007) recommend that physical education teachers form or join a school wellness committee; develop a PA subcommittee; teach moderately-to-vigorously active physical education lessons; sponsor inservice training for other PE teachers; initiate or enhance school-based PA opportu-

nities beyond physical education (e.g., active recess, classroom PA); and connect with community organizations to increase opportunities for PA. Heidorn and Centeio (2012) emphasize the importance of physical education teachers motivating other school staff to serve as role models by being physically active and supporting program implementation. In all, the recommendations for physical education teachers to lead CSPAP implementation specify professional roles that span all five components of the model.

In tandem with the recommended roles for physical education teachers in CSPAP implementation, a growing literature base offers perspectives on the related knowledge and skills that PETE programs should aim to develop in preservice teachers (Webster et al., 2014). A number of authors recommend adding/modifying course content and field experiences for preservice physical education teachers (PPETs) to increase the focus on various aspects of CSPAP leadership, such as school wide and community-based PA programming, PA advocacy, PA measurement, and program evaluation. For example, McKenzie (2007) recommends modifying course content to integrate ecologic models and environmental engineering principles, broadening the focus of field experiences to incorporate expanded pre-professional training in line with CSPAP roles, and providing opportunities for teacher candidates to engage in PA advocacy, such as lobbying for school-based PA programming. Given these recommendations for PETE and limited research on the preparation of physical education teachers for CSPAP roles, the purpose of this study was to examine the accounts of PETE faculty who had incorporated multiple CSPAP learning experiences into their undergraduate programs. Specifically, the following research questions were asked:

1. What do faculty describe as the nature of their program's CSPAP learning experiences beyond those focused on quality physical education?
2. What adjustments, catalysts, challenges, and goals do faculty identify related to incorporating these CSPAP learning experiences into their programs?

Method

Participants

Participants were nine PETE faculty members, each from a different institution, who were purposively selected from a national sample of 175 survey respondents from a previous study (Webster et al., 2016). As part of the survey, respondents were asked to rate the effectiveness of their undergraduate PETE programs in preparing PPETs for CSPAP roles across all five components of the model. Eighteen faculty members, whose effectiveness ratings placed them in the top 10% of all respondents, were invited to participate in the present study. Nine of these faculty members agreed to participate.

Three of the participants were male and six were female. Based on their survey responses, the mean reported age of the participants was 50.78 ($SD = 7.0$). Further descriptive information about the participants and their programs is presented in Table 1. Some of these participants consented to be identified while others did not. The decision was made to use number codes in place of the names and institutional affiliations of all participants in this paper. Readers can, however, contact the corresponding author to obtain identifying information for consenting participants.

Instrumentation

An interview guide was developed for the study. Questions were written and organized to align with four components of the CSPAP model, including PA during the school day, PA before and after school, staff involvement, and family and community engagement (CDC, 2013; NASPE, 2008). The interview guide was divided into two sections. Questions in the first section asked participants to describe the learning experiences their program provided for pre-service physical education teachers (e.g., “Please describe the learning experiences your program provides to prepare preservice physical education majors to promote PA in before- and/or after-school programs”). The second section of the interview guide focused on changes the participants’ programs made, and planned to make, to incorporate CSPAP learning experiences. Questions asked participants to describe any program adjustments (e.g., learning experiences that were added/taken away), as well as challenges faced in

Table 1
Descriptive Information About Participants and Their Programs

Participant	Years of experience in PETE	Academic rank	Academic status	Program responsibilities	Number of full-time program faculty	Number of part-time/adjunct program faculty	Number of graduate teaching assistants
1	26	Professor	Tenured	A, B, D, F, G, H	2	2	1
2	8	Assistant Professor	Tenure Track	A, C, D, F, G	3	2	0
3	7	Associate Professor	Tenured	A, G, J	7	5	0
4	23	Professor	Tenured	A, C, G, H, J	4	1	0
5	25	Associate Professor	Tenured	A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I	5	3	0
6	21	Assistant Professor	Tenure Track	A, B, C, D, F, I	1	0	0
7	13	Associate Professor	Tenured	A, C, G, I	7	12	0
8	30	Professor	Tenured	A, B, C, D, F, I	5	3	0
9	8	Associate Professor	Tenured	B, D, J	4	0	0

Note. A = Direct undergraduate PETE program; B = teach elementary methods class; C = teach secondary methods course; D = teach curriculum course; E = teach kinesiology course; F = teach content/skills course; G = supervise student teachers; H = direct student teaching; I = teach classroom teachers course; J = other.

making these adjustments, factors leading to the decision to make program changes, and any foreseeable changes for the future to improve the program's effectiveness in preparing preservice teachers for CSPAP roles.

Prompts, based on key recommendations for CSPAP (e.g., Carson, 2012; Castelli & Ward, 2012; Cipriani et al., 2012; Hall et al., 2011; Heidorn & Centeio, 2012), followed each question to more deeply probe participants' accounts of how their programs were preparing preservice teachers for specific CSPAP roles. For example, in the first section of the interview guide, prompts for the family and community engagement component asked participants to elaborate on learning experiences designed to prepare PPETs for the following roles: (a) organize PA events for students' families, (b) educate parents about strategies to promote their children's PA outside of school, (c) collaborate with community organizations to increase students' use of community facilities to be physically active outside of school, (d) increase family/community use of school facilities to be physically active, (e) increase the availability of transportation from school to community facilities where students can be physically active, and (f) use politicking skills with district/government officials to advocate for policies to increase students' PA at school.

Procedure

Approval to conduct this study was obtained from the lead author's university ethics committee prior to data collection. As a measure of trustworthiness and quality of rigor, the interview guide was reviewed by three noted CSPAP scholars, all of whom have published research and/or recommendations related to CSPAP. Their feedback suggested no changes were necessary so the initial version was then pilot tested with two PETE faculty members for clarity, readability, and feasibility of implementation. The results of the pilot study indicated the instrument was feasible to implement and would be effective in securing the desired information from study participants. Therefore, no changes were made.

Participants were recruited using an email invitation to participate in a telephone interview. Interviews were scheduled and conducted during June and July 2013. At the start of the interview, participants were read a preamble that reiterated why they were selected for the interview, the purpose of the interview, and the focus

of the questions. Participants were instructed to recommend another person in their program for us to contact for any questions they felt someone else would be better suited to answer. However, none of the participants indicated they were unable to answer any of the questions or recommended that we follow up with another person in their programs. A semi-structured format was followed to conduct the interviews (Patton, 2002). This format involved asking the participants all questions on the interview guide, but allowing for flexibility in the order each question was asked and the extent to which prompts were used, based on participants' responses. The interviews usually took on a conversational tone, which seemed to facilitate participants' comfort and candidness. All interviews were audio recorded and ranged from approximately 30 to 60 min.

Data Analysis and Trustworthiness

The audiotapes of the interviews were transcribed verbatim by five of the researchers, resulting in 78 pages of transcription. Each participant was sent a copy of his/her transcript and asked to verify its accuracy, as well as to request any changes or add detail. This member-checking procedure both refined and expanded the data and helped to ensure the participants had ample opportunity to express their views in response to each interview question (Patton, 2002). The transcripts were then analyzed using constant comparative techniques (Charmaz, 2006; Corbin & Strauss, 1990; Fram, 2013), while remaining sensitive to the CSPAP model and recommendations framing this study. Four of the researchers, all trained in qualitative analysis, used open, axial, and selective coding to draw out themes and distinctions in the types of CSPAP learning experiences programs offered and the program change processes related to the integration of these experiences. First, transcripts were read several times to construct "meaning units," which were excerpts the researchers (a) identified as containing useful information in relation to the research questions and (b) subsequently labelled and summarized. Next, the meaning units were categorized according to the sub-foci of each research question (i.e., types of learning experiences by CSPAP component and program change processes with respect to adjustments, catalysts, challenges, or goals). The units in each category were then placed into subcategories consistent with the focus of the interview probes. For example, in the category for

family and community engagement, meaning units for learning experiences related to educating parents about strategies to promote their children's PA outside of school were grouped together as a subcategory. Finally, the units in all subcategories were compared within and between each category, first for each transcript separately, and then across all transcripts, to identify both common and unique aspects of CSPAP integration in the nine programs.

At the start of data analysis, the researchers analyzed one of the interview transcripts together to ensure each researcher would follow the same analysis procedures. The researchers then independently analysed subsets of the transcripts. During this stage of the analysis, the researchers crosschecked each other's analyses, identified any differences in interpretation/perspective, and reached consensus through discussion. The findings were sent to each participant as an additional form of member checking (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 2002). Each participant was asked to confirm whether the meaning units accurately represented his/her perspectives. None of the participants indicated any changes were needed.

Findings

Overall, three themes were identified through data analysis. One theme was uncovered for the nature of the CSPAP learning experiences programs offered. This theme was labelled "Field Experiences." The other two themes were for program adjustments that were described as part of the change process for incorporating CSPAP learning experiences. These themes were labelled "Embedding CSPAP Learning Experiences" and "Making Room for CSPAP Learning Experiences."

The Nature of the CSPAP Learning Experiences

Field-based learning experiences. The one common thread in the nature of the CSPAP learning experiences participants described was that the experiences were usually based in field settings (i.e., beyond the university classroom). Field experiences often consisted of special CSPAP events for students, staff, and/or families. For example, some of the learning experiences for family and community engagement included assisting at a family fun night at school; attending parent meetings; organizing a district-wide pedometer challenge for school staff; and calling state legislators to try to prevent the passage

of a bill that would allow some students to qualify for a waiver for taking middle school physical education. In other cases, field placements were structured as part of an ongoing learning experience. For instance, as part of a course on community and environmental health, one of the programs required PPETs to do a 15-hr placement outside of the school system (e.g., at a local senior center) to develop exercise programs for adults.

Many of the field experiences for CSPAP focused on staff involvement. These experiences often served a dual purpose in line with CSPAP recommendations. Specifically, these experiences helped PPETs learn about promoting staff wellness, as well as about increasing staff involvement in PA promotion. For instance, some of the participants discussed organizing incentive programs not only as a strategy to increase the PA of school employees, but also as a strategy to motivate these staff to be active role models for their students. Field experiences targeting staff involvement typically focused on increasing the involvement of classroom teachers in school-based PA promotion. Some examples included having PPETs present workshops to inservice classroom teachers and having PPETs present brain breaks and cross-curricular activities to help classroom teachers learn to increase PA in their classrooms. One participant described a field-based experience in which PPETs worked with classroom teachers using a treadmill program:

One thing we've done with elementary—and our kids actually do this in our teaching exceptional children class—we have a treadmill program we do at the elementary schools where we have, I think, three treadmills at both elementary schools and our kids basically take the students identified by the district as maybe needing some focus time and we get them on the treadmill program. The kids are only on the treadmill anywhere from 8–15 minutes doing different walking and hand-eye coordination things. And then they go back to the classroom, and the classroom teachers are amazed at how much more focused these kids are, how much more relaxed. (Participant 7)

The same participant stressed the importance of learning experiences focused on increasing staff involvement in the following way:

It's a good eye-opener for [our majors]. They always think that everybody knows what they know, and then they're talking to staff and they're like, 'They don't really know what's good for them,' and we're like, 'No, you're the expert, you're training to be the expert and they need your leadership.' (Participant 7)

Adjustments, Catalysts, Challenges, and Goals Related to CSPAP Preparation

Adjustments: Embedding CSPAP learning experiences. Across the nine programs, CSPAP learning experiences beyond quality physical education were often embedded in courses and other learning experiences that were already part of the program of study. For example, programs incorporated learning experiences for promoting PA before and after school in a range of courses with a focus on methods of teaching; adapted physical education; organization and administration; sports, camps, intramurals, and coaching; community and environmental health; and lifetime physical activities. PPETs also learned about promoting staff involvement in their existing coursework. Courses that were mentioned included those focusing on human wellness and lifetime fitness; community and environmental health; legal aspects and general safety; and measurement and evaluation. Several of the programs embedded learning experiences related to staff involvement within student teaching by assessing PPETs on communication with administrators during student teaching, having PPETs create newsletters for administrators, having PPETs serve on school wellness committees, and conducting mock advocacy experiences with PPETs.

Other examples of embedded learning experiences were evident in preparing PPETs for roles related to family and community engagement. As part of existing courses in the program, PPETs created active homework assignments, wrote and sent newsletters to parents, and included a "take away" component in physical education lesson plans to help students bring PA to their homes. Newsletters were the most common strategies described by the participants. Below is an example of how one program integrated newsletters into coursework for PPETs:

The students take a course in education technology and [help] the physical education teachers, who are required to send home newsletters...to put in tips for getting their children more active after school, games they can play that are outside of video games and watching television. (Participant 3)

Making room for CSPAP learning experiences. Integrating CSPAP learning experiences into existing coursework was not always possible or sufficient for programs to provide PPETs with desired knowledge and skills for PA promotion. Therefore, a common type of adjustment was to either combine or remove existing courses to make room for new CSPAP learning experiences. Combinations usually occurred with skills/content courses. For example, one of the participants stated, “We went from a bunch of one credit courses, whether it be basketball, volleyball, to a team sports block” (Participant 7), while another participant stated, “We have two courses now that are called ‘Individual and Dual Sports’ and ‘Team Sports.’ It used to be that we had multiple courses like ‘Handball’ and ‘Racquet Ball’ and ‘Table Tennis’ and ‘Shuffleboard’ and things of that nature. So we sort of collapsed those into two courses so we could concentrate on making the PA a school wide initiative” (Participant 3). Some programs removed courses in the sciences and general education to make more room for CSPAP learning experiences, as illustrated in the following quote:

We went from having two anatomy and physiology courses to one, so we eliminated a science lab. We eliminated some of the stuff from general education curriculum that they were having to do, and now they can spend more time in their major. (Participant 8)

Examples of other program adjustments included adding courses and moving to dual licensure (physical education and health). One of the participants described adding the “Healthy Active Lifestyle Core,” which resulted in seven credits of new coursework relevant to CSPAPs.

Catalysts, challenges, and goals. There was a wide range of catalysts, challenges, and goals related to preparing PPETs for CSPAP

roles, with no strong themes identified across programs. Examples of catalysts included a desire to foster interdisciplinary collaboration across university programs; increased awareness and concern related to local and state-level data on obesity and fitness; the introduction of a state mandate for comprehensive school PA; a growing interest of school administrators, or change in state policy, to hire physical education teachers with dual certification in physical education and health, or who can promote PA beyond physical education class; and, based on research showing a decline in school physical education programs, a heightened concern that physical education teachers cannot make a big enough impact on kids or public health by confining their work solely within the physical education classroom. As illustrated in the following quote, a couple of programs also identified changes in the curricular structure at the college or university level as a factor that allowed for more program flexibility and the decision to integrate more CSPAP learning experiences:

I'm on a core curriculum committee for the entire college, and we did refine it. We removed 12 hours from the core because we realized as an institution that we could do much more in depth than if we were trying to meet the breadth of learning that we were trying to meet. We have a religion requirement, which is four classes of religion, and then we have an English and literature requirement also that is an additional six classes. We refined those things, which aren't necessarily related to our majors. But just taking those hours out allowed some of the majors to develop more courses in their curriculums. (Participant 4)

Examples of challenges to integrating CSPAP learning experiences into PETE programs included a slow-moving and, sometimes, stagnant university bureaucracy; opposing views of CSPAP integration among department faculty; getting PPETs to expand their sense of professional responsibility to include school wide and community PA promotion; making program changes while simultaneously trying to keep pace with rapid program growth; balancing more than one program focus (i.e., physical education and health promotion); finding curriculum space and/or tying CSPAP content into existing content; getting secondary teachers in schools to “buy in” to CSPAP

ideas and initiatives; and coordinating off-campus field experiences related to CSPAP. The quote below describes one program's experience in trying to invoke change within the university system:

To change your curriculum at the university, it seems to be a very long and somewhat red-tape process. But we've gotten good at it—how many readings, what we have to have ready for committees—and we give them not only the course history but we give them statistics on schools, stats from the CDC on obesity... We have to be the change. (Participant 7)

In the following quote, some of the issues underpinning opposing views among department faculty are described:

I think the biggest challenge has been getting the approval and getting the commitment from the department to be enhancing healthy active lifestyles. I think just having everybody across the programs agree that this is the direction we're going because it permeates everything... so if our students go to exercise physiology they're getting more of that kind of perspective as opposed to just 'this is exercise physiology.' And, then, the other piece of it is, a lot of these activities are not really activities that are rewarded by the tenure and promotion system... I mean, they don't often lead to research. They're mostly outreach and engagement oriented things, and so, luckily everyone in our program's tenured, so, but I can imagine for somebody whose not tenured, um, this is a lot of work, and it's work that's usually not rewarded or respected. (Participant 1)

Examples of program goals included developing/using statewide or national PA programs designed specifically for secondary schools, doing more to strengthen and formalize school-university partnerships, incorporating a capstone project that focuses on promoting PA beyond physical education, increasing the focus on politics and advocacy for physical education/PA, extending CSPAP learning experiences to encompass the birth to 5-year-old population, and formalizing cohorts within the major at an earlier point in the program (depicted in the following quote):

We need to do a better job of getting students into a cohort as quickly as possible. When you have a big community school like we do, you have students taking classes at different times. They transfer in and they're like a junior, so they don't get an opportunity to go through the whole experience. So, I think that's something we need to better streamline, so that we have groups of students who are having the same experience at the same time. I think it makes a stronger bond for the types of experiences that we want students in these programs to have. (Participant 9)

Discussion

This study explored faculty accounts of the nature and incorporation of CSPAP learning experiences in their undergraduate PETE programs, given increased attention to whole of school approaches to PA promotion (CDC, 2013; IOM, 2013). The alignment of physical education with public health goals has implications for the preparation of physical education specialists (e.g., Bulger & Housner, 2009; McKenzie, 2007) and, more broadly, for the way the physical education field situates itself amid school communities (McKenzie & Lounsbery, 2013). The faculty who participated in this study may represent a group of pioneers in PETE, whose accounts of CSPAP learning experiences for PPETs can help other teacher educators foresee possible futures for their own programs and better understand some of the factors involved with the program change process.

The accounts of CSPAP learning experiences described for the nine programs in this study demonstrate that field experiences can be a predominant part of CSPAP preparation for PPETs. Field experiences are recommended for preservice preparation specific to school PA programming (Webster et al., 2015) and more generally in the teacher education literature (McIntyre, Byrd, & Fox, 1996; Zeichner, 2010). Existing partnerships with schools, school districts, and community organizations can be utilized in mutually beneficial ways through PA promotion initiatives beyond quality physical education. Based on the findings from this study, field experiences can be structured around special events or longer term engagements and can facilitate PPETs' education related to multiple CSPAP components.

The program change process can be difficult for PETE faculty. The findings give reason to expect that many traditional PETE courses (e.g., methods, organization and administration) can provide logical platforms for incorporating CSPAP learning experiences. Participants described embedding such experiences into existing coursework. We suspect that program faculty seeking to incorporate CSPAP learning experiences into PETE may view this strategy more favorably than combining or removing existing courses to accommodate CSPAP preparation, especially given the lack of focus on CSPAP preparation in the current standards for initial certification in physical education (NASPE, 2008b).

The results of this study indicate that factors at all levels of the university can thwart program changes related to incorporating CSPAP learning experiences. It is important for faculty seeking change to initialize the change process by presenting a strong rationale to department colleagues so that the department can then stand in unison to advance a proposal to committees at higher levels of the university. The rationale for CSPAP preparation may stem from numerous sources, including research (e.g., childhood obesity), policy (state legislation for CSPAPs), and professional practices (e.g., hiring trends of school administrators). Helping other faculty to identify and build connections between their existing courses and CSPAP may strengthen department unity. Those leading change efforts should be prepared for, and well versed in, university policies and procedures for making official program changes.

The findings further indicate that local schools might also hamper PETE change efforts aligned with CSPAP at the secondary level. Coaching responsibilities of middle and high school physical education teachers, and school policies that restrict facility use to athletics, may limit the number of collaborative opportunities, and amount of time and space available for CSPAP initiatives, especially within the PA before and after school component. While suggestions for gaining the support of secondary schools were not mentioned, a possible strategy might be to provide school stakeholders with educational opportunities about CSPAP. For example, PPETs could give a presentation about CSPAP at a school staff meeting or at an open house night for parents. Educating stakeholders about CSPAP might inspire some in the school community to champion additional PA promotion initiatives (Castelli, Centeio, & Nicksic, 2013).

The faculty members who participated in this study were astutely aware of contextual changes beyond their PETE programs and recognized that these changes necessitated extending and reframing PETE learning experiences using the CSPAP model. While different programs identified and responded to different catalysts for program change, and experienced diverse challenges initiating the change process, all programs embarked on a journey of adaptation and generated new opportunities for PPETs to develop the knowledge and skills necessary for CSPAP implementation. Further, all of the participants articulated clear and specific ideas for continued integration of CSPAP learning experiences into their PETE programs. It was evident that each program represented in this study embraced shifting tides of thought about the purpose and scope of a physical education teacher's work, and was committed to forging new paths between physical education and public health.

This study has two important limitations. First, details about the PETE programs in this study are limited to the subjective accounts of the faculty who were interviewed. Future research examining the integration of CSPAP learning experiences into PETE programs might consider triangulating interviews with multiple faculty representatives and PPETs from each program to investigate the accounts, perspectives, reflections, and insights of other important stakeholders. In addition, studies incorporating objective data (e.g., observations of classroom lessons and field experiences) and program-related documents (e.g., course syllabi and programs of study) are needed to build the descriptive research base in this line of inquiry. Second, it must be acknowledged that while the nine programs represented in this study apparently provided multiple opportunities for PPETs to learn CSPAP roles, there may be other PETE programs that provide similar or different CSPAP learning opportunities that also deserve attention. As mentioned earlier, the study sample was based on information provided by 175 faculty members who responded to a nationally disseminated survey in a previous study (Webster et al., 2016). Although each survey participant represented a different program, there were faculty from many more programs who did not respond.

Conclusion

Faculty from nine programs provided a glimpse of the nature of CSPAP learning experiences and the process of incorporating such experiences in PETE. While the results of this study are preliminary, encouragement can be found, and lessons learned, from those who may already be aligning PETE with CSPAP recommendations. The programs highlighted in this study were diverse in terms of the reported number of full- and part-time faculty for each program. One program only had one full-time member and one part-time member. To the authors, this suggests that incorporating CSPAP learning experiences into PETE is more an issue of program philosophy and vision than of program capacity.

The CSPAP model offered a useful conceptual framework for identifying key areas of focus for preservice preparation that are consistent with evolving notions of the knowledge and skills needed for a career in physical education. We recommend the application of the CSPAP model in future studies aimed at identifying and examining PETE programs that are responding to calls for physical education to play a key part in whole-of-school approaches to PA promotion. Such application can help to elucidate and organize the public health-aligned learning experiences programs incorporate, and ultimately inform the evidence base needed to best prepare future teachers for newly emerging professional roles and responsibilities.

References

- Beighle, A., Erwin, H., Castelli, D., & Ernst, M. (2009). Preparing physical educators for the role of physical activity director. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 80(4), 24–29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2009.10598307>
- Beighle, A., & Moore, M. (2012). Physical activity before and after school. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 83(6), 25–28. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2012.10598792>
- Bulger, S. M., & Housner, L. D. (2009). Relocating from easy street: Strategies for moving physical education forward. *Quest*, 61, 442–469. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2009.10483625>

- Carson, R. (2012). Certification and duties of a director of physical activity. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 83(6), 16–20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2012.10598790>
- Carson, R. L., Castelli, D. M., Beighle, A., & Erwin, H. (2014). School-based physical activity promotion: A conceptual framework for research and practice. *Childhood Obesity*, 10(2), 1–7. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1089/chi.2013.0134>
- Castelli, D. M., & Beighle, A. (2007). The physical education teacher as school activity director. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 78(5), 2–28. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2007.10598020>
- Castelli, D. M., Centeio, E. E., & Nicksic, H. M. (2013). Preparing educators to promote and provide physical activity in schools. *American Journal of Lifestyle Medicine*, 7, 324–332. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1559827613490488>
- Castelli, D. M., & Ward, K. (2012). Physical activity during the school day. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 83(6), 20–29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2012.10598791>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2013). *Comprehensive School Physical Activity Programs: A guide for schools*. Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cipriani, K., Richardson, C., & Roberts, G. (2012). Family and community involvement in the Comprehensive School Physical Activity Program. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 83(7), 20–26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2012.10598807>
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology*, 13(1), 3–21. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00988593>
- Erwin, H., Beighle, A., Carson, R. L., & Castelli, D. M. (2013). Comprehensive school-based physical activity promotion: A review. *Quest*, 65, 412–428. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2013.791872>

- Fram, S. M. (2013). The Constant Comparative Analysis Method outside of grounded theory. *The Qualitative Report*, 18, 1–25.
- Goc Karp, G., Scruggs, P. W., Brown, H., & Kelder, S. H. (2014). Chapter 10: Implications for Comprehensive School Physical Activity Program implementation. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 33, 611–623. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2014-0116>
- Hall, T. J., Little, S., & Heidorn, B. D. (2011). Preparing classroom teachers to meet students' physical activity needs. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 82(3), 40–52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2011.10598596>
- Heidorn, B., & Centeio, E. (2012). The director of physical activity and staff involvement. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 83(7), 13–21.
- Institute of Medicine. (2013). *Educating the student body: Taking physical activity and physical education to school*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Establishing trustworthiness. *Naturalistic Inquiry*, 289, 331.
- Lumpkin, A. (2007). *Introduction to physical education, exercise science, and sport studies* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- McIntyre, D. J., Byrd, D. M., & Fox, S. (1996). Field and laboratory experiences. In J. Sikula, T. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- McKenzie, T. L. (2007). The preparation of physical educators: A public health perspective. *Quest*, 59, 346–357. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2007.10483557>
- McKenzie, T. L., & Lounsbery, M. A. F. (2013). Physical education teacher effectiveness in a public health context. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 84, 419–430. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2013.844025>
- National Association for Sport and Physical Education. (2008a). Comprehensive School Physical Activity Programs [Position statement]. Retrieved from <http://www.wheresmype.org/downloads/Comprehensive-School-Physical-Activity-Programs2-2008.pdf>

- National Association for Sport and Physical Education. (2008b). *National standards for initial physical education teacher education*. Retrieved from <http://www.aahperd.org/naspe/grants/accreditation/upload/2008-National-Initial-Physical-Education-Teacher-Education-Standards-Edited-1-5-12.pdf>
- National Physical Activity Plan Alliance. (2012). National physical activity plan. Retrieved from <http://www.physicalactivityplan.org>
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Webster, C. A., Russ, L., Webster, L., Molina, S., Lee, H., & Cribbs, J. (2016). PETE faculty beliefs concerning the preparation of preservice teachers for CSPAP roles: An exploratory study. *The Physical Educator, 73*, 315–339. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18666/TPE-2016-V73-I2-6252>
- Webster, C. A., Webster, L., Russ, L., Molina, S., Lee, H., & Cribbs, J. (2015). A systematic review of public health-aligned recommendations for preparing physical education teacher candidates. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 86*(1), 30–39. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2014.980939>
- Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college- and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*, 89–99. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022487109347671>