

<b>III.</b>	<b>PROGRAM PLANNING AND RESOURCES SECTION</b>
<b>300</b>	<b>Scope of Work</b>

This Section includes:

- 301 Background
- 302 Informal Scope of Work Changes
- 303 Collaboration and Partnering Guidelines
- 304 Formative Research
- 305 Social Ecological Model
- 306 Social Marketing Tools

### 301 Background

The Scope of Work (SOW) is one of the most important documents in the *Network for a Healthy California (Network)* Local Incentive Award (LIA) and **Non-profit Incentive Award (NIA)** application and provides the starting point for contract negotiations. The SOW along with the State and Federal Share budgets become legally binding documents within the contract. The SOW document describes the target audience, as well as the goals, objectives, and specific activities the contractor will work towards over the contract period. The SOW provides the framework for programming and evaluation.

The SOW should focus on conducting interventions that reach large numbers of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Education (SNAP-Ed) eligible California families with activities that further the *Network* goals of improving the dietary habits of SNAP-Ed eligible Californians as well as promoting physical activity, federal nutrition assistance programs, and obesity prevention. Recognizing that SNAP-Ed eligible California families live in a dynamic physical, social, and cultural environment that in turn influences individual behavior, the *Network* has adopted the Social Ecological Model (SEM) as its theoretical framework (Section 305 below provides additional information). In order to sustain healthy dietary behaviors, the individual's environment must support those healthy behaviors. This means that not only must the individual know what constitutes a healthy diet and have the individual skills to make healthy dietary choices, but they must also have access to healthy food, have neighborhoods that are conducive to engaging in regular physical activity and policies that enable and empower individuals to shape their communities in ways that foster healthy eating and physical activity. As a result, when developing the SOW, factors at many levels, which influence and support healthy dietary changes, should be considered. In addition to providing nutrition education to individuals or groups, the SOW should utilize social marketing tools to influence multiple spheres of the SEM. These activities might include one or more of the following approaches:

- Empowering SNAP-Ed eligible individuals by providing them the tools, resources, messages, and inspiration to help themselves;
- Seeking change agents that will create more desirable ends for SNAP-Ed eligible families, the environment they live in and the organizations, institutions, and systems that support them;
- Encouraging SNAP-Ed eligible individuals to change social norms in their community through the development of partnerships, coalitions, and strategic alliances;
- Advertising, media advocacy, and public relations; and
- Indirectly influencing system, policy, or environmental changes that make fruits and vegetables and physical activity more accessible to SNAP-Ed eligible households.

(Implementing systems, policy, or environmental changes are not allowable *Network* activities and cannot be funded by Federal Share or leveraged for State Share.)

Copies (Word or Excel format) of the SOW Template are provided in the Appendix. Instructions for completing the SOW can be found on the *Network* website at [www.networkforahealthycalifornia.net](http://www.networkforahealthycalifornia.net).

### **302 Informal Scope of Work Changes**

Contractors are required to contact their assigned Program Manager prior to making changes to the SOW. Information about informal SOW changes is provided below, including how to make changes. Formal SOW changes can only be initiated through a formal contract amendment. Information about formal contract amendments is provided in the Fiscal Section of the LIA Guidelines Manual.

#### **Allowable Informal Changes Without an Amendment**

In administering an agreement, a Program and/or Contract Manager may make, initiate, or approve the following types of contractual changes to the SOW in writing without a formal contract amendment provided the agreement contains applicable agreement language that demonstrates:

- Minor SOW changes that do not alter the basic scope, goal, purpose, or agreement amount including non-substantial revisions to:
  - Detailed work activities including substitution of similar activities and tasks
  - Contract deliverables, including substitution of comparable deliverables
  - Performance time frames, including modification of completion/target dates
  - Locations or venue of SNAP-Ed activities

#### **Informal SOW Change Process**

In 1994, the California Department of Health Services (CDHS) obtained written approval from the Department of General Services (DGS), via an Administrative Relief proposal, to make certain contract modifications without having to process a formal contract amendment. In 2000, DGS requested CDHS to begin using bold/underline and strike out text when modifying contract provisions.

Instructions for an informal SOW change are as follows:

- Maintain all existing text in the SOW.
- **Bold and underline added/new text.**
- ~~Strike out~~ deleted text so that it still appears and is not removed.
- Informal SOW changes will be color-coded in the following order:
  - #1 – Black
  - #2 – Red
  - #3 – Green
  - #4 – Blue
  - #5 – Purple
  - #6 - Orange
- Enter the revision number and revision date in the SOW footer in the corresponding color (e.g. Revision #1, 7/11/2006).
- The same color-codes should be utilized for revisions to the Budget Justification.
- In general, informal changes are limited to no more than one (1) each contract year.

- Unless California Department of Public Health is initiating the SOW change process, the contractor must provide, in writing, the request and rationale for the change.
- Informal changes will also be approved by the Contract Manager to ensure that the above criteria are met and there is negligible effect on the budget.

For questions regarding SOW changes, contractors are encouraged to contact their Program Manager.

### **303 Collaboration and Partnering Guidelines**

#### **1. Collaboration and Partnering**

Effectiveness of nutrition education can be greatly enhanced through collaboration and partnership with others interested in promoting health and nutrition in SNAP-Ed eligible populations. Such collaboration and partnership can result in delivery of more uniform messages targeting key community nutrition issues and can facilitate use of multiple channels for communicating those messages to the public. Participation in a *Network* Regional Collaborative is another way to collaborate with other community partners.

#### **2. Policies Regarding Collaboration between Public Organizations for LIA/NIA Contracts**

The following policy statements must be adhered to if a public or non-profit organization chooses to formally collaborate or partner with another public or non-profit organization as part of an LIA/NIA contract. Adherence to these policies is especially important during the timeframe of development, review and approval of State Share and Federal Share Budgets and SOW for the LIA/NIA contract for the following fiscal year.

#### **3. Policy Statement 1**

The Project Coordinator of a lead organization responsible for the administration of a LIA/NIA contract with the *Network* must provide evidence of a proposed partnership or collaboration with other public or non-profit organizations in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or Letters of Agreements (LOA) between the respective parties. Such documents must be submitted as part of the initial Application package for review and approval by the *Network*. An MOU or LOA, at a minimum, should contain the following written elements:

- a. Names of the collaborating/partnering organizations.
- b. Specification of the total State Share dollar amount (if applicable) being proposed by the organization collaborating /partnering with the lead organization along with a statement that none of those funds are federal funds or funds being used to match other federal funds.
- c. Description of the major proposed activities.
- d. A statement that no portion of the proposed State Share funds is being counted more than once, or for another State agency, LIA/NIA contract, or for a University of California (UC) - Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) activity, during the term of the contract.
- e. A statement that the collaborating/partnering organization will provide State Share and Federal Share budget documentation as requested by the lead LIA/NIA organization and/or the *Network*.
- f. None of the activities funded through Federal or State SNAP-Ed budget shares supplant existing nutrition education efforts or funding.
- g. Additional coordination with *Network* regional Nutrition Education Consultants will be required for any school-based programming funded at the state or local levels.

- h. Signature(s), titles, and dates provided by authorized officials of the collaborating/partnering organization and the lead LIA/NIA organization.

#### 4. Policy Statement 2

The Project Coordinator of a lead organization for an LIA/NIA contract may not collaborate or partner with components or parts of other current or potential LIA/NIA project contractors as part of their LIA/NIA contract (including State Share budget funds and SOW activities), without the express written approval of the other organization. The approval document must be on the other organization's letterhead and signed and dated by an official with signature authority and addressed to the lead organization's administrator or LIA/NIA Project Coordinator. These documents must be submitted to the *Network* as part of the initial application and State Share budget. For example, a lead organization for an LIA/NIA contract must not propose the use of State Share dollars or a collaboration with individual schools or other school district programs within the parent school district unless the appropriate level official within the district approves the use of State Share funds following the procedure described above.

The Project Coordinator of the lead organization is also responsible for the program and fiscal integrity of the overall LIA/NIA contract, including partner organizations or components of partner organizations. The Project Coordinator also must guarantee access to the State Share documentation residing in the partner organizations to assure the *Network's* funding source (United States Department of Agriculture [USDA]) of actual expenditures of State Share funds that leverage *Network* USDA Federal Share funds.

#### 5. Policy Statement 3

USDA SNAP-Ed funds both the *Network* and UC-FSNEP. Both programs target SNAP-Ed eligible consumers for community-level interventions in the state. However, strategies by each agency are usually different, with the *Network* including a more synergistic approach including multiple channels to improving nutrition, physical activity and promotion of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and FSNEP focusing on individual level nutrition education. However, many *Network* agencies do both styles of interventions. Close communication between local FSNEP and *Network* contractors in a community is necessary to avoid duplication of services, potential double reporting and inaccurate documentation of State Share time and resources. This local communication can also result in synergies in the areas of resource allocation and community interventions.

Both the *Network* and UC-FSNEP target schools where over 50 percent of the students are enrolled in Free and Reduced Price Meal program, as well as other qualifying community sites. In developing budgets and planning locations for *Network* school interventions, the *Network* expects local collaboration between *Network* contractors and local FSNEP offices. Prior to submitting an application to the *Network*, it is recommended *Network* contractors contact local FSNEP offices to ascertain FSNEP intervention sites for the upcoming Federal Fiscal Year. A listing of local FSNEP offices can be found at <http://ucanr.org/ce.cfm>.

For questions regarding MOUs or LOAs, contractors should contact their assigned Contract Manager or Program Manager. An MOU Form template is provided in the Appendix.

### 304 Formative Research

As a social marketing program, *Network* contractors should actively engage the low-income audiences and stakeholders in the formulation and planning of nutrition education activities. For

this reason it is critical to accurately describe who will receive the nutrition education. Formative research helps with this by segmenting the audience.

Audience segmentation involves identifying subgroups of a population that share some characteristic, have similar attitudes or hold common beliefs about a given behavior. For example, reasons differ as to why some groups do or do not eat fruit and vegetables. The SNAP-Ed eligible audience shares the characteristic of having low household income, but the audience must be further segmented by other variables, including:

- Demographics: Geographic location, age, race/ethnicity, presence and age of children in the household, food stamp eligibility, number of food stamp recipients in a neighborhood, and participation, employment, income, and neighborhood characteristics (e.g., stores, gardens, parks).
- Attitude: Those who believe they get enough fruits and vegetables even though they do not eat the recommended amount on a daily basis, or those who do not believe they need to eat the recommended amounts of fruits and vegetables for good health.
- Knowledge: Skills to choose, prepare, and enjoy fruits and vegetables or physical activity with family and friends. Skills to achieve changes in their organizational or community environments.
- Current Behavior: Level of fruit and vegetable intake or daily physical activity.
- Readiness to Change: Those that have no plans to increase fruit and vegetable consumption, those that would like to increase fruit and vegetable consumption but do not have a specific plan or accessibility, those who have decided to eat more fruits and vegetables.
- Desired Benefits: Those that think eating the recommended amounts of fruits and vegetables a day or engaging in daily physical activity will help them or their families be healthier.
- Perceived Barriers or Costs: Real or perceived lack of access to fruits and vegetables at work, school or in the neighborhood, monetary cost of fresh fruits and vegetables or physical activity, lack of a safe place to walk or engage in leisure physical activity.

In addition to clearly segmenting the audience, it is important to identify their wants, needs, and desires. These are factors that influence fruit and vegetable consumption. There are a number of methods that can be used to ascertain which factors most influence fruit and vegetable consumption and the ones that are most relevant to the target audience. It is critical that these be correctly identified and matched with the nutrition education activities that can mediate them. These methods include:

- Reviewing the literature in journals and on the web.
- Reviewing existing data: The *Network* has a variety of surveys, case studies, and evaluation studies posted on the *Network* website. Contractors may contact their Program Manager to determine if there are other data available.
- Utilizing local data: Local public agencies may have already conducted assessments with different audience segments. These may include county surveys and other needs assessments.
- Conducting additional formative research to further discover specific population's needs, wants, and desires relating to healthy eating, physical activity, and federal nutrition assistance programs. These efforts may include participant observation, in-depth interviews, focus groups, and surveys, as well as key informant interviews with other service providers or local opinion leaders and gatekeepers.

The goal of formative research is to develop relevant, culturally appropriate, meaningful interventions that will empower the low-income audiences to desire and make voluntary behavior change. When reviewing existing data, give consideration to whether or not the data are relevant and applicable to the audience segment. When conducting additional formative research, recruit participants that are representative of the chosen audience segment. Accurately segmenting the target audience and identifying the important and changeable factors will help shape powerful and effective nutrition education strategies.

There are a number of resources available to assist contractors with the formative research process. Contractors are encouraged to contact their Program Manager for assistance with developing a formative research plan. The *Network* expects all new and continuing contractors to engage in formative research before developing new interventions.

### 305 Social Ecological Model (SEM)

The *Network* uses the SEM as its theoretical underpinning. Figure 5 provides a diagrammatic representation of the SEM. The nine tools of social marketing, which will be described in Section 306 below, should be applied over all five spheres of influence in the SEM.

Individual

Figure 5

#### A Social-Ecological Model for Nutrition Program Evaluation Spheres of Influence<sup>1</sup>



<sup>1</sup>McElroy KR, Bibeau D., Steckler A., Glanz K. "An ecological perspective on health promotion programs" *Health Education Quarterly* 15:351-377, 1988.

The SEM is similar to an onion, with one level wrapping around another. At the center of the model is the individual. At this level, the internal determinants of behavior are considered, such as knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, and skills. This is the foundational level, but the model recognizes that many external forces influence these individual determinants. In order to facilitate behavior change it is important to address these external forces as well.

#### Interpersonal

The next level of SEM considers the first of these external forces, interpersonal processes because the people close to the individual may affect his/her behavior. In this level, primary groups of social interaction are considered, such as family, friends, and social clubs or groups. This is the level where social norms operate, although they are also generated at the institutional and community levels. These primary interactions represent the associations that provide social identity and role definition. In many interpersonal relationships there are some

individuals in social roles who are seen as key decision makers. It should be noted that identifying these decision makers, or persons of influence, is important to facilitating individual behavior change. For instance, in an intervention targeting children, parents, teachers, and youth leaders would be important decision makers to involve in the intervention. Promotoras in the Latino community are another example of opinion leaders or gatekeepers. Family dynamics in the target audience should also be considered, such as families with only one parent or culture specific family roles.

### Institutional/Organizational

Institutions/organizations are composed of assemblies of primary interpersonal associations. These may include workplaces, churches, grocery stores, service organizations, or volunteer organizations to which individuals belong. All operate under a common set of customs, rules, and policies that guide organizational behavior. The institutional/organizational level of SEM considers these rules and policies. Interventions at this level can have tremendous influence over individuals. Workplace interventions, faith-based programs, and school-based programs are examples of programming at this level. While this level includes organizational policy, this is different from the social structure, public policy level of the model. A program at a school, workplace, or church may, with participant involvement, develop a food policy promoting good nutrition, by providing healthy snacks, including fruits and vegetables, and limiting the availability of junk food and soda at that site. This would be an example of an institutional/organizational intervention. An intervention at the social structure, public policy level might be a written food policy for an entire school district, city, county, or state.

Empowering the SNAP-Ed eligible audiences to develop and promote policies, such as those just discussed, would be an appropriate *Network* intervention to include in a SOW. Any work related to empowering the SNAP-Ed audiences to develop and promote policies must of course be chosen from allowable SNAP-Ed activities if they are to be supported by Federal or State Share funds.

### Community

The next level of SEM to consider is the community. This level includes all those individuals, businesses, institutions, and organizations which collectively comprise the larger societal fabric of a neighborhood, city, or immediate geographic area. These larger social constructs can be defined in many ways, such as by geographic location, membership in a particular group, or possession of certain beliefs that produce affiliations. There can be a community defined by a neighborhood, for example, the African American or Latino “community,” or the “community” of health professionals. It is at this level that many social norms and standards are generated. This is also an important level for setting the public agenda and developing partnerships. While individuals mediate work at this level, interventions targeting specific individual traits, or factors influencing behavior (described in the individual level), should not be confused with community level work. For example, a series of nutrition education classes, open to community members, would not be an example of a community level intervention. Such classes influence individual knowledge, attitudes, and behavior, usually not the larger social constructs encompassed by this level.

Examples of interventions at this level might include aggressive public relations and promotions aimed at setting the local media agenda, or the development of strong, functional partnerships with other organizations involved in increasing access to or promoting fruit and vegetable consumption and/or physical activity. For media related activities, SNAP-Ed funds may be used if at least 50 percent of the target audience meets the 185 percent Federal Poverty Level (FPL)

targeting requirement, but if this cannot be demonstrated, costs must be prorated to the percent of the audience that is at or below 130 percent FPL.

### Social Structure/Public Policy

The outermost sphere level of the SEM is the social structure/public policy level. Public policy is defined as an authoritative decision made by a local, state, or federal governing body. Some environmental and systems changes would be included in this level, if they are achieved formally through policy decisions. Environmental and systems changes often involve a tangible change in directive resources or philosophy of a community or organization, whereas, social structural changes involve more normative or conceptual changes. This is the broadest level of the model and can influence all the other levels. While interventions at this level can be seen as a daunting task, they are critical to create sustainable change in individual behaviors of large numbers of people.

As part of their SOW, contractors may contribute expertise and information to assist others in developing and promoting social structure/public policy level changes. For example, educating local elected officials about the importance of eating the recommended amounts of fruits and vegetables or daily physical activity would be an allowable activity. Any work related to assisting others in developing and promoting social structure/public policy level changes must of course be chosen from allowable SNAP-Ed activities if they are to be supported by Federal or State Share funds. Contractors should follow their agency or organization's guidelines for allowable policy activities.

### **306 Social Marketing Tools**

In order to assist LIA contractors in applying SEM to programming, the *Network* has developed a number of social marketing tools. The following paper, *The P's and T's of Social Marketing*, 2001, by Susan B. Foerster, M.P.H., R.D., Chief, [Network Policy, Planning, and Evaluation Section](#), examines these tools. When developing a *Network* SOW, how these social marketing tools may be used in SNAP-Ed (formerly FSNE) allowable activities should be considered. It is appropriate to apply different social marketing tools at the different levels of SEM. For specific questions relating to the application of the *Network's* social marketing tools, contractors are encouraged to contact their Program Manager.

### ***The "P's" and T's of Social Marketing through the California Nutrition Network and California 5 a Day Campaign***

**Introduction:** Social marketing is an evolving field, and how it is defined and executed in fact varies by topic, sponsoring organization, mandate, and resources. Social marketing is gaining popularity because it is inclusive, provides new strategies and tools to tackle tough social concerns, builds on proven marketing science, provides a bridge to working with the private sector, and has been used successfully in both the developing and the developed world.

The Cancer Prevention and Nutrition Section (CPNS) has selected the combination of tools it applies in its FSNE social marketing campaigns using past experience with the *California 5 a Day Campaign* and the National 5 A Day Program, tools described in social marketing textbooks and articles, and observations about what is applicable and can be transferred or adapted from other successful social change programs[1]. Social marketing is an approach, not a theory, so we have adopted the Social-Ecological Model as a means of systematically guiding how we set priorities for action, of building synergy and integrating interventions, of allocating resources, and of evaluating results achieved by a diverse array of partners[1].

This thinking has yielded what might be seen as an eclectic definition for social marketing that goes beyond most textbook descriptions. It is based on a subjective assessment of the combination of tools that is likely to be the most powerful in the hands of the *Network* partners for the purposes of improving fruit and vegetable consumption, increasing physical activity, and raising participation in federal nutrition assistance programs by FSNE families with children. As stated in our annual plan to USDA, we name the tools used by our social marketing campaign as being:

*... the traditional mix of **advertising, publicity, promotion and personal sales** used in commercial marketing delivered through **public/private partnerships** to which are added to the World Health Organization components of **community development, consumer empowerment, and policy, environmental and systems change, and—most recently—media advocacy.***

**Foundations of the California approach:** The 4 P's of commercial marketing routinely adapted to social marketing are defined as:

**Product**— In commercial marketing, the product is the idea, behavior, good or service that can be exchanged for a price. The product can be tangible or intangible[2]. In social marketing, the product is often the behavior or health idea that the campaign planners would like the targeted individuals to adopt. The product can be an action, a service, or a set of beliefs. [3, 4].

**Price**—Price is the cost to the target audience of making an exchange. In commercial marketing, price is almost always financial. [2]. With social change, price defines all the barriers that a person must overcome to accept the proposed social product. This includes opportunity cost, status loss, embarrassment, inconvenience, and infringement on basic values and time.[2-4].

**Place**—In commercial marketing, place is the outlet through which products are available. Place can also be conceptualized as characteristics of the outlet such as waiting time, staff behavior, temperature or other environmental conditions. In social marketing, place often is conceptualized as message delivery channels, or the system through which the products flow to users and the quality of service offered where the products are offered [2]. Place focuses largely on reducing structural obstacles and increasing access and developing a sales force of lay and professional service providers [3].

**Promotion**—Promotion includes *advertising, public relations, sales promotions, and personal sales* [2]. Promotion is the communication persuasion strategy and set of tactics that will make the “product” familiar, acceptable and desirable[5]. It is designed to cultivate positive attitudes and intentions that pave the way for behavior change[4]. It can be characterized as intermittent, seasonal, or thematic; it is designed to pique consumer interest; and it may target intermediaries as well as consumers. Promotion includes decisions on messages (what is to be said about the behavior and its benefits) and decisions on the channels (how that message gets to the right people at the right time)[3].

As applied in the California campaigns, the four tools of promotion are defined as:

- ***Paid or public service advertising*** for television, radio, outdoor, transit and a variety of targeted and “small” media, including newsletters, posters, and the Internet[2].

- **Public relations, publicity or “earned media”** is outreach activity designed to secure news attention in the print or electronic media. It may be done through TV or radio appearances, press conferences, desk-side briefings, and opinion editorial columns[5].
- **Special Promotions** are certain timeframes selected to advance specific messages or themes; they provide paid and voluntary support of special events, materials and incentives; and they work with multiple partners, especially at “point of sale” or “point of choice” to gain maximum media and consumer attention so as to stimulate interest, acceptance, trial or repeat “product purchase”[5]. Sales promotions may also include special educational activities for individuals in a direct audience (rather than a filtered audience such as media) and not directly news-related, such as festival and grocery store activities[2]. They can be defined as efforts taken to ensure that the target audience is aware of the campaign.
- **Personal sales** are traditional one-on-one or small group nutrition education[6]. In marketing terms, this is a paid form of personal presentation of products, services or ideas by an identified sponsor [5].

**Transforming the “4 P’s” of commercial marketing to the “6 P’s” of social marketing:**  
The traditional “4 P’s” of commercial marketing are combined with additional *P*’s recommended by some social marketing authors:

- **Partnerships**—Social networks that exist formally or informally among individuals, groups, and organizations. They may be assessed by the number, type, depth, and strength of relationship[1]. They can have significant impact when they cut across the public, non-profit and business sectors and operate at multiple levels of influence, namely local, regional, state and national.
- **Policy, Systems and Environmental Change**—local, state and national written policies that regulate or support organizational behavior, including protection of children and special populations[7]. For the *Network* and these include policy changes in the public, non-profit or business sectors. For organizational development and using modified stage theory, this includes problem definition, initiation of action, implementation of change, and institutionalization of change within an organization[1].

**Tools that complete our social marketing tool case:** To the “6 P’s” of social marketing, some social marketing authors advocate the addition of a few more “T’s” (tools). They argue, and we agree, that many social concerns are rooted in issues of social justice and require a shift in power to consumers[7]. In particular, residents in lower income areas may not have had the opportunity or known how to exercise their power in order to build healthy, vital communities that are rich in social capital and able to support healthy behaviors. These additional “Quarks/Qualities” are:

- **Consumer empowerment**—the process of gaining mastery and power over oneself and one’s environment to produce change[6]. Specifically, it refers to an individual’s ability to make decisions and have control over his or her personal life, immediate environment, or the larger community/societal environment. It combines personal efficacy and competence, a sense of mastery and control, and a process of participation to influence institutions and decisions[8, 9].

**Community development**—Community development is the process of gaining mastery and power over one’s community to produce change[6]. Individuals and organizations apply their

skills and resources in collective efforts to meet community needs, resulting in a community that has the ability to influence decisions and changes in the larger social system[8]. The goal of community development is for people in the community to identify and solve their own problems. It stresses consensus development, capacity building, and task orientation[6]. This can also be characterized as Asset-Based Planning or Community Development[10]. This approach will help develop cohesive, caring neighborhoods and communities; it may involve connecting communities with existing resources, know-how, and decision-makers in public, non-profit or business sectors; and it may include economic development and micro-enterprise.

**Media advocacy**—Media advocacy is when media is used to promote a policy agenda[11, 12]. It includes three basic steps: setting the agenda, shaping the debate, and advancing the policy. There is a clear outcome of social change resulting from the media advocacy work. Other tools to help bring social change using media include civic journalism and photo voice.

In *Network* campaigns, we aim to achieve efficiency much as a corporation would. We think at the State level in terms of large market segments defined by demographic, psychographic and media graphic characteristics. Based on these factors and our funding requirements, we set targets, define strategies, and think through the “6 P’s” for the statewide campaign. This is reasonable because the same motivations and barriers affect millions of people, and behavior is rooted in powerful social and marketplace forces that affect large segments, if not the entire population. Planning with stakeholders through the *Network* Steering Committee, formative research with consumers and intermediaries, and pilot testing with evaluation drive the State level processes. The State staff then assists its partners by providing those and other resources such as training, technical assistance, intervention, materials, leadership projects, and federal funding to enable local, regional and state organizations to work together and to tailor the promotional, educational, community development, partnership, and systems, policy and environmental interventions to their own circumstances.

To assure salience at the local level or within a channel, funded partners are encouraged to conduct their own needs assessment, identify assets that include those of the new partnership, and plan their interventions strategically using as many of the 9 social marketing tools as are appropriate. We encourage their emphasizing interventions that reach large numbers of consumers; result in systems, environment and policy improvements; and otherwise result in more long-lasting social change. A feedback loop with ongoing surveillance, reporting of activities and results, and critical analysis by the partners is created. Staff uses this information to prepare each year’s state plan that is submitted to the USDA Food Stamp Program.

The strength of the campaign comes from each partner using the “added value” provided by the central State resources in order to do better those things it already does well in its own spheres of influence. “Doing better” would include: joining forces with other partners to do more and larger interventions, synchronizing interventions that cumulatively result in execution of a complete social marketing campaign plan, critically interpreting the evaluation results, and the changing external environments so as to continually improve campaign operations.

**That said, because the environment is constantly changing, the partners also must remain alert, nimble, and ready to seize new opportunities that advance its aims while at the same time retaining focus and allegiance to the overarching strategies.**

## References:

1. Gregson, J., et al., *System, Environmental and Policy Changes: A Framework for Evaluating Nutrition Education and Social Marketing Programs with Limited Resource Audiences*. Journal of Nutrition Education, 2001.
2. Siegel, M. and L. Doner, *Marketing Public Health, Strategies to Promote Social Change*. 1998, Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen Publications.
3. Smith, W., *Social Marketing: An evolving definition*. American Journal of Health Behavior, 2000. **24**(1): p. 11-17.
4. Alcalay, R. and R. Bell, *Promoting Nutrition and Physical Activity through Social Marketing: Current Recommendations and Practices*. 2000, University of California, Davis Center for Advanced Studies in Nutrition and Social Marketing: Davis.
5. Kotler, P. and G. Zaltman, *Social Marketing: An Approach to Planned Social Change*. Social Marketing Quarterly, unk. **3**(Special Issue): p. 7-20.
6. Glanz, K. and R. BK, *Theory at a glance: a guide for health promotion practice*. 1995, National Institutes of Health: Bethesda, MD.
7. unknown,
8. Israel, B., et al., *Health education and community empowerment: conceptualizing and measuring perceptions of individual, organizational and community control*. Health Education Quarterly, 1994. **21**(2): p. 149-170.
9. Kieffer, C., *Citizen Empowerment: A developmental perspective*. Prev Hum Serv, 1984. **3**: p. 9-36.
10. Kretzmann, J. and J. McKnight, *Building communities from the inside out: A path toward finding and mobilizing community assets..* 1993, Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research: Evanston, IL.
11. Alcalay, R. and S. Taplin, *Community Health Campaigns: From theory to action,, in Public Communication Campaigns*, R. Rice and C. Atkin, Editors. 1989, Sage Publications: Newbury Park, CA. p. 105-130.
12. Atkin, C. and E. Arkin, *Issues and initiatives in Communicating health information, in Mass Communication and Public Health, Complexities and Conflicts*, C. Atkin and L. Wallack, Editors. 1990, Sage Publications: Newbury Park, CA. p. 7-14.