**School Health Coordinators’ Committee Discussions**

**Discussion Topic: What is your sense of the purpose and perspective of the CIM on Student Achievement and Comprehensive School Health?**

**Source: Susan Hornby** August 11 2013:

**Question:** What is your sense of the purpose and perspective of the CIM on Student Achievement and Comprehensive School Health?

I have been having conversations with a couple of members of our Advisory Committee on this issue, given feedback on the table outlining individual and environmental factors that is shown on the latest Themes document from the research team (Deliverable 7).

**Responses:**

 **(1)** **British Columbia:**

My understanding of this project is that it is intended to assess the impact of the CSH approach on student achievement (correct?), given a) we already have data on how the CSH approach impacts health behaviours and outcomes, and b) we want to have something to present to education decision makers, to encourage them to support further implementation of CSH. For those reasons, I wouldn’t want to include physical activity or diet/nutrition in the indicators, as that wouldn’t match the scope/purpose of the project. Having said that, I have struggled with the addition of the environmental factors, as I felt that they are also beyond the scope of what I would have defined as student achievement….they seem more like indicators of a healthy school community rather than indicators of student achievement (while of course they would influence student achievement). On the one hand, I am interested in seeing how a CSH approach does influence those environmental factors, especially if we don't really have existing data for those areas. Where it gets a little murky for me is the distinction between those "environmental" variables that could be impacted by a CSH approach (e.g. how effective is the CSH approach on enhancing teacher/parent/administrator knowledge), those that may or may not be part of a particular CSH initiative's design (ie. process indicators, such as if a specific CSH initiative deliberately included staff training and professional development into their CSH initiative or not), and those that are mediating factors (e.g. I could see easily see some of the behavioural indicators being part of the mediating factors section)

**(2) Prince Edward Island:**

There is a possibility that we all see the purpose of this CIM a little differently - depending on our current position, situation, and needs. For me, I would like to see how it can 'prove' that CSH framework, used to address health behaviours of students, impacts student academic achievement and student success (however you define that) - base on the literature review, key informant interviews etc.... That way - it's not just me saying it to the decisions makers- it is a collective voice from researchers and experts across the country.

 **(3) Alberta:**

I think there are two items here. One we need to determine CIM for student success (not just academic achievement) and then we need to determine the correlation between the CSH approach and the CIMs. When the CIM are determined (by Freeman's work) then we can look at how CSH enhances the CIMs for student success. For example, if school connectedness is a CIM for student success, then how might CSH enhance school connectedness so that more students achieve success?