

**STATE LEVEL PROJECT SUMMARY
FFY 2015**

1. Project Title: Local Health Department Support (EARS).

Budget: \$400,000

a. Related State Objectives: This project supports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the State Level Objectives.

b. Audience:

Gender: Males and Females

Ethnicity: White, African American, Latino/Hispanic populations, and all other racial/ethnic groups

Languages: English and Spanish

Ages: Adults, Teenagers, and Children

c. Food and Activity Environments: N/A

d. Project Description and Educational Strategies:

The Local Health Department Support, Evaluation consists of four projects.

Project 1: Process Evaluation Reporting System for California SNAP-Ed State Implementing Agencies (SIAs)

In FFY 2014, NEOPB Research and Evaluation Section (RES) and the State of California Information Technology Services Division (ITSD) staff successfully developed and implemented the online Activity Tracking Form (ATF) capable of collecting all data required for the USDA Education and Administrative Reporting System (EARS). In FFY 2015, RES staff will coordinate the diffusion of the online ATF system across all SIAs and their contractors. The system for SIAs will be modified to “hide” the NEOPB-specific ATF fields since these are not relevant to the SIAs and their contractors.

Project 2: Communities of Excellence for Nutrition, Physical Activity and Obesity Prevention (CX³).

CX³ is a program planning framework that involves taking an in-depth look at community food environments to identify areas in need of improvement. Because the community itself has a critical role to play in preventing obesity, CX³ examines communities in relation to a variety of obesity prevention benchmarks referred to as community indicators and assets. These CX³ indicators and assets set standards of “excellence.” They define what a community itself should look like in order to help prevent the devastating chronic diseases related to overweight and obesity for its residents. The local data compiled in evaluating the indicators and assets is what makes CX³ such a powerful tool for local groups. It shows how the community currently “measures up” and where it needs to improve to become a community of excellence for its residents.

STATE LEVEL PROJECT SUMMARY FFY 2015

LHDs use online mapping tools to assess the community and then they complete on-the-ground surveys to take a deeper look at how individual stores and fast food establishments score in regards to access to healthy foods, walkability and food and beverage marketing practices.

As of FFY 14, a total of 41 LHDs are participating in CX³. Four very small rural counties are expected to begin the CX³ process in FFY 2015.

Additionally, with the recent completion of the first full five year cycle, NEOPB staff will be reviewing the program process, tools, trainings and outcomes to inform program modifications.

Project 3: Impact Outcome Evaluation (IOE) of NEOPB-Funded Nutrition Education Interventions

LHDs receiving over \$350,000 (n=35) will continue in FFY 2015 to conduct IOEs to measure pre- and post-intervention changes in fruit and vegetable consumption, sugar-sweetened beverage consumption, physical activity, and factors that influence these behaviors. Interventions must have 100 or more matched pairs of participants of at least five education sessions or contacts.

Standardized instruments are used for IOEs and vary based on the target age group. LHDs working with children in grades 3 through 8 use a questionnaire based on the Baylor University School Physical Activity and Nutrition Project instrument. A similar instrument but more age-appropriate is used for high school students. Interventions aimed at adults use the Food Behavior Checklist (FBC) or Fruit and Vegetable Checklist (a subset of the FBC).

RES staff will conduct one-on-one and group trainings (in-person, by webinars or teleconferences) and technical assistance to assist LHDs in administering the survey instruments in the least biased manner, as well as adhering to other standardized practices.

LHD staff will continue enter questionnaire responses with RES-created data entry templates which are programed to automatically analyze the data and flag post scores that significantly differ from pre scores. These findings are submitted to NEOPB staff; LHD, RES, and Community Development staff subsequently work together to interpret the findings with a focus on program improvement.

Each year continuing projects are expected to conduct an evaluation that is more rigorous than the previous year. Rigor may be enhanced in any number of ways, for example by measuring a greater number of indicators, increasing sample size, or adding an income-eligible comparison group.

Project 4: Evaluation of Policy, System, and Environment (PSE) Changes

STATE LEVEL PROJECT SUMMARY FFY 2015

This project will assess LHDs' progress towards implementing PSEs that support their nutrition education and social marketing/promotion efforts.

The project focuses on providing technical assistance to LHDs in the following areas:

- Applying the RE-AIM (Reach, Effectiveness, Adoption, Implementation and Maintenance) program planning and evaluation framework to answer whether PSE strategies *reach* the priority population, are *effective* in achieving intended outcomes, are *adopted* by providers and settings, and are *implemented* with fidelity and in a manner that will be *maintained* overtime;
- Identifying and reporting core indicators for PSE changes that correspond with the USDA Western Region *Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Obesity Prevention Outcomes Evaluation Framework*;
- Assisting local projects to tailor the suite of indicators to their specific PSE intervention and determine how best to collect the desired information;
- Identifying and promoting reliable and consistent assessment tools that have been used for measuring PSE change and strengthening program delivery.

This project also focuses on further refining the evaluation system for data collection, analysis, and summary by:

- Refining RE-AIM evaluation indicators when necessary to respond to changes in the USDA evaluation framework;
- Adapting and refining the PSE annual reporting system that was developed in FFY2014 for local projects to report against their RE-AIM indicators;
- Compiling and presenting the PSE change information reported by local projects at the end of FFY2014 to USDA, the local projects, and other stakeholders.

e. Developing New Materials: N/A

f. Evidence Base:

Project 4:

Thirteen PSE strategies were derived after review of the following sources: *SNAP-Ed Strategies and Interventions: An Obesity Prevention Toolkit for States*; interventions and strategies reviewed by the Center for Training and Research Translation (Center TRT); The Institute of Medicine's *Accelerating Progress in Obesity Prevention: Solving the Weight of the Nation*; the CDC's *Community Guides for Nutrition and Physical Activity*, the CDC's *Communities Putting Prevention to Work Guidelines*; and the CDC's *Common Community Measures for Obesity Prevention*.

The RE-AIM framework has been widely applied to evaluation of health promotion and disease management. Purposes of the RE-AIM framework include: to broaden the criteria used to evaluate programs to include elements of external validity; to evaluate issues relevant to program adoption, implementation, and sustainability; and to help close the gap between research studies and practices. There are over 100 publications using RE-AIM in diverse health-related fields. (www.RE-AIM.org). The RE-AIM

STATE LEVEL PROJECT SUMMARY FFY 2015

framework is featured in *SNAP-Ed Strategies and Interventions: An Obesity Prevention Toolkit for States* SNAP-Ed and used by the Center TRT in reviewing evidence of public health impact in population-level interventions.

- g. Environmental Supports:** N/A
- h. Use of Existing Educational Materials:** N/A
- i. Development of New Educational Materials:** N/A
- j. Key Performance Measures/Indicators:** See 4g

2. Evaluation Plans N/A

- a. Name**
- b. Type**
- c. Questions**
- d. Evaluation**

3. Coordination Efforts:

Project 1: By the end of FFY 2014, RES staff will have (1) conducted webinar trainings for SIAs and their contract staff; (2) facilitated an initial follow-up meeting with SIA staff; (3) recorded and posted a webinar training for reference and future trainings; and (4) processed user account requests. The successful continued diffusion of the online ATF system to all SIAs will require a clear delineation of responsibilities between NEOPB and SIA staff, which we outline below.

For FFY 2015, SIA staff will take on all responsibilities related to trainings, technical assistance, establishing user accounts, and working directly with ITSD staff.

Specifically, their responsibilities will be:

1. Identify staff persons as liaison between their contract staff and NEOP staff.
2. Identify staff persons to learn the system with sufficient knowledge to provide TA to their contractors, run data queries/reports, produce annual EARS reports.
3. Obtain and forward user account requests to NEOPB staff.
4. Refer new contract staff to recorded webinar; addressing follow-up training questions.
5. Identify a process with ITSD for maintenance and updating user accounts, and adding/deleting sites.

Project 2: Partner and community/resident engagement processes are built into various stages of the CX³ project, including training residents (adult and youth) to do data collection, sharing data results at community forums and stakeholder meetings, listening to community priorities, and the identification of community-led solutions. One of the major components of the food store survey is identification of the presence of a set of WIC foods in the store. Within NEOPB staff coordinates cross-sectionally with the

STATE LEVEL PROJECT SUMMARY FFY 2015

Prevention First Initiative. With the initiation of California Tobacco Program's Healthy Retailer program, there has been strong state and local level coordination to share survey data and intervention information.

4. Evaluation Activity

a. Related project(s) or Interventions:

Project 1: This project is related to all California SNAP-Ed interventions.

Project 2: LHD-led retail and restaurant-related PSE interventions

Project 3: Nutrition education interventions at LHDs receiving at least \$350,000.

Project 4: PSE interventions.

b. Formative, process, outcome or impact evaluation:

Project 1: Process

Project 2: Process

Project 3: Outcome and occasionally Impact.

Project 4: Process

c. Question(s) to be addressed by the evaluation:

Project 1:

RQ1: What are the frequency and duration of direct education SNAP-Ed activities?

RQ2: How many unduplicated people received SNAP-Ed direct education services?

RQ3: What are the socio-demographic characteristics of recipients of SNAP-Ed direct education services?

RQ4: How many duplicated direct education contacts were made?

RQ5: In what sites were those services received?

RQ6: In which sites did PSE activities occur by site type?

RQ7: How many indirect education contacts were made?

RQ8: How many staff trainings were provided and how many staff participated?

RQ9: How many activities included partners and what were their roles?

Project 2:

RQ1: How does the neighborhood score against Top Pick indicators of a "community of excellence"?

RQ2: How do individual site scores or neighborhood conditions improve after the intervention is implemented?

Project 3:

Are significant changes observed, post versus pre scores for:

RQ 1: Fruit and vegetable consumption?

RQ 2: Consumption of other healthy foods?

RQ 3: Consumption of low nutrient and/or sugar-sweetened beverages?

RQ 4: Levels of physical activity?

STATE LEVEL PROJECT SUMMARY FFY 2015

Project 4:

RQ 1: What is the public health impact of multi-component PSE change efforts in SNAP-Ed eligible settings as measured by reach, effectiveness, adoption, implementation, and maintenance?

RQ 2: How many people in the target population were reached?

RQ 3: What changes are documented at the environmental level?

RQ 4: How many SNAP-Ed eligible settings and partners adopted new or improved PSEs?

RQ 5: Were key components of the multi-component PSE interventions implemented as intended?

RQ 6: Was PSE change maintained with a sustainability plan and institutional/community support?

RQ 7: What are the most common barriers to implementation and how were they addressed?

d. Approach to conducting the evaluation, including scope, design, measures, and data collection: See 1d.

e. Plans for using the results:

Project 1: The results will be compiled and sent to the CDSS for entry into FPRS for the California EARS report. In addition, reports will be generated at the State, SIA, LHD, and other sub-levels, and used to provide recommendations for and potentially improving the effectiveness of future interventions, other SIA programs, and coordinated California SNAP-Ed efforts. These data are vital to our estimates of levels of exposure to SNAP-Ed interventions at the census tract level for Project 4 under the State-level Evaluation.

Project 2: LHDs select qualifying low-income neighborhoods to assess and follow an outlined five-year CX³ process, including GIS mapping of the neighborhood, local community food environment data collection, sharing data findings, identifying community priorities, and implementing PSE solutions to improve findings. Standardized CX³ community food environment survey tools and neighborhood condition measures have been created. Assessment data is collected (and compared) in the first and last year of the five year project. Data is shared with public health partners, community partners, and community residents to increase awareness about the community food environment findings and to create community-driven solutions.

Project 3: IOE reports are submitted by LHDs to the NEOPB in July along with a plan for the upcoming year's intervention and evaluation activities. RES staff will collate quantitative as well as qualitative findings for a comprehensive FFY 2015 evaluation report.

Project 4: The data on core indicators will be aggregated at the state level and incorporated into the annual reporting to USDA. The results will also be used to

**STATE LEVEL PROJECT SUMMARY
FFY 2015**

describe for various stakeholders the public health impact of the PSE strategies implemented by LHDs in SNAP-Ed eligible settings.

- f. Whether or not the project has been evaluated previously, along with the most recent year in which the evaluation was done:

All four projects are evaluated annually. Project 4 began in FFY 2013 and was refined in FFY 2014.

- g. Framework indicators to be assessed:

Project 1:

ST4

Percent of settings with an identified need for improving access or creating appeal for nutrition and physical activity supports within the following categories of venues.

ST8

Percent of communities with partnerships including at least 10 diverse partners across sectors (all serving primarily low-income persons) addressing nutrition or physical activity practices or standards in their services

- a. Types and number of organization or individuals per sector represented
- b. Documented level of integration of the partnership (as documented by partners)
- c. Level of influence of SNAP-Ed (as documented by partners)

Project 2:

ENVIRONMENTAL	SECTORS OF INFLUENCE
<p><u>Organizational or Individual Support</u> ST5 Local Champions ST6 Partnerships*</p> <p><u>Adoption and Reach</u> MT4 Nutrition Supports Adopted* MT5 Physical Activity Supports Adopted*</p> <p><u>Implementation and Effectiveness</u> LT9 Nutrition Supports Implementation LT10 Physical Activity Program Implementation LT11 Program Recognition</p> <p><u>Maintenance</u></p>	<p><u>Community Capacity</u> ST8 Community Partnerships</p> <p><u>Community Changes</u> MT7 Food Industry MT9 Agriculture* MT11 Community Design and Safety</p> <p><u>Community Benefits</u> LT13 Food Industry Healthy Outlets LT15 Agriculture Sales</p> <p><u>Sustainability</u> I7 Regional Food Hubs</p>

**STATE LEVEL PROJECT SUMMARY
FFY 2015**

I3 Resources I4 Sustainability Plan I5 Barriers Mitigated	
---	--

Project 3:

IOEs have the potential to address a number of Framework indicators. Below we have listed indicators by whether all or some of the projects collect relevant data. The tables also note which related measures are optional.

IOEs Involving Adults

Indicator	Description	Projects
MT1 c, d,	Fruits, vegetables	All
LT2 a, b	Fruits, vegetables	All
MT1 f, g	Sugary beverages, milk	Some
MT2	Read Nutrition Facts	Some
LT5 b	Sugary beverages	Some
LT6 a	Running out of food in last month	Some
ST2 a, b	Shop with a list, Read Nutrition Facts	Optional
MT1 e, f, g	Water, Sugary drinks, Low-fat milk	Optional
MT2 a, f, g	Read Nutrition Facts, Shop sales/use coupons, Shop with a list	Optional
MT3 a, b	Minutes of physical activity, Days of physical activity, sedentary (no letter)	Optional
LT4 a	Low-fat milk	Optional
LT5 a, b, c	Water, SSB, Juice	Optional
LT6 a, b	Food security last year, food security last month	Optional
LT7 a	150 minutes physical activity/week	Optional

IOEs Involving Youth/Teens

Indicator	Description	Projects
MT1 e, f	Water, sugary beverages	All
MT3 b	Days of physical activity	All
LT2 a, b	Fruits, vegetables	All
LT3 a, b, d	Cooked whole grains, ready-to-eat whole grains	All
LT4 a, d	Low-fat or non-fat milk, any dairy	All
LT5 a, b	Water, sugary beverages	All
LT8	Screen time	All
ST1	Knowledge – topic up to LHD	Optional
MT3 a, b	Minutes of physical activity, days of physical activity, sedentary (no number)	Optional
LT7	One hour of MVPA per day	Optional

Project 4:

**STATE LEVEL PROJECT SUMMARY
FFY 2015**

Depending on the specific PSE approaches taken by LHDs and their subcontractors, the following indicators will be assessed:

ENVIRONMENTAL	SECTORS OF INFLUENCE
<u>Organizational or Individual Support</u> ST5 Local Champions ST6 Partnerships* <u>Adoption and Reach</u> MT4 Nutrition Supports Adopted* MT5 Physical Activity Supports Adopted* <u>Implementation and Effectiveness</u> LT9 Nutrition Supports Implementation LT10 Physical Activity Program Implementation LT11 Program Recognition <u>Maintenance</u> I3 Resources I4 Sustainability Plan I5 Barriers Mitigated	<u>Community Changes</u> MT7 Food Industry MT8 Local Government* MT9 Agriculture* MT10 Education MT11 Community Design and Safety <u>Community Benefits</u> LT13 Food Industry Healthy Outlets LT14 Local Government Healthy Food Sales LT15 Agriculture Sales <u>Sustainability</u> I6 Let's Move Recognition

h. Cost

Project 1: Total costs for the on-line AFT for FFY 2015 is \$400,000. System hosting costs were divided evenly among the SIAs. Enhancements charges only applied to CDPH. Maintenance costs were allocated on estimates for system support and number of users. The following table lists the FFY 2015 costs per SIA.

California Department of Public Health	\$206,026
California Department of Social Services	\$77,175
U C Davis, CalFresh	\$56,775
California Department of Aging	\$30,012
Catholic Charities	\$30,012
TOTAL	\$400,000