

California Department of Public Health
Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion
Nutrition Education and Obesity Prevention Branch

Questions and Responses

Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program – Education
Stakeholders’ Meeting
January 5, 2015

This document addresses questions received during the January 5, 2015, Nutrition Education and Obesity Prevention Branch (NEOPB) Stakeholders’ Meeting, whether in person or through the webinar “chat” option. Questions have been grouped by theme and may be paraphrased to consolidate questions that address the same issue.

General Questions

1. Can these Stakeholder Meetings be a venue to look at/address/inform all SNAP-Ed State Implementation Agency partners (i.e. California Department of Social Services, California Department of Aging, and University of California, CalFresh)?

Response: *The Stakeholders’ Meetings focus on the operations of the California Department of Public Health (CDPH), Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program-Education (SNAP-Ed), as the Budget Trailer Bill language for Fiscal Year 2014-15 was specific to CDPH. CDPH does not have purview over the other State Implementing Agencies (SIAs) or the responsible state agency, which is the California Department of Social Services (CDSS). CDPH will pass along this suggestion to CDSS.*

2. Because of the Healthy Hungry-Free Kids Act (HHFKA), and the difference between base and approved funds, how will this impact the California SNAP-Ed Program? Please explain why California did not initially apply for the full amount for the current Federal Fiscal Year (FFY).

Response: *CDSS is the lead California state agency and coordinates the plan submission to USDA WRO for several State Implementing Agencies (CDPH, UC-Cal Fresh, CDA and Catholic Charities). CDSS also has final funding decision authority for the state implementing agencies. CDSS is working with the state implementing agencies via an amendment process to request California's full allocation for federal fiscal year (FFY) 2015.*

3. Please speak more about the decrease in funding to the California Department of Public Health, Nutrition Education and Obesity Prevention Branch for SNAP-Ed activities? How does NEOPB anticipate decreased funding will affect NEOPB SNAP-Ed programs? What are the plans to sustain SNAP-Ed programs?

Response: *The funding reduction is mandated in the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 (HHFKA) and outlined in detail by federal fiscal year (FFY 2013 –FFY 2018) in the USDA Guidance (pages 49-50). California expects a SNAP-Ed funding decrease of approximately 32%-40% from FFY 2015 through FFY 2018. This is approximately an 8-10% decrease in funding per federal fiscal year. CDPH currently utilizes the Local Health Department (LHD) model and expects the funding for the local county health departments to stabilize by FFY 2018. CDPH currently funds 59 of the 61 health departments and believes the SNAP-Ed program will be sustainable through the county health departments. CDPH accounted for some of the funding reduction by decreasing the number of staff that it requested in its Budget Change Proposal (BCP) of 2014 to 40 funded positions (plus thirteen positions with UC Berkeley to conduct research and evaluation activities), down from the 70 positions in the Public Health Institute (PHI) Master Contract.*

Staffing

4. What is the current NEOPB state staff expertise in youth work such as youth programming and engagement?

Response: *NEOPB recognizes the importance of youth programming and engagement and is working to build its capacity to support LHD efforts. To this end:*

- *CDPH, under the direction of its Lead Agency, the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), plans to include youth*

engagement as topics at its upcoming statewide Forum for all State and Local SNAP-Ed implementing agencies in March 2015;

- *Training and Resource Centers (TRCs) are positioned to provide regional training and technical assistance to LHDs—and by extension to other Local Implementing Agencies (LIAs)—throughout FFY 2015; and,*
- *PHI, at the direction of CDPH, will host training and technical assistance to assist in building LHD capacity; however, the primary purpose of this contract is internal training.*

5. With the BCP and subsequent cost savings from CDPH - NEOPB staffing, how will the noted \$7 million dollars be distributed to local communities for direct services to the SNAP-Ed population?

Response: *As listed in slide 14, a majority of the initial savings has been redistributed to the county health departments. Some of the savings was also utilized to fund state operating expenses in support of all SIAs and to support required evaluation activities.*

Transitional Contracts

Training and Resource Centers (TRCs)

6. How is the effectiveness of the Training and Resource Centers (TRCs) being evaluated? What will CDPH NEOPB do with the TRC evaluation results?

Response: *In January, CDPH NEOPB surveyed the LHDs to assess their participation in and satisfaction with services currently provided by the TRCs in their Service Area and to assess their training and support needs. This information along with the fiscal outlook for the remaining of the FFY, helps inform program planning for services for LHDs. As of 2/6/14, NEOPB has decided to move forward with requesting approval from CDSS and WRO for a mid-year amendment to its FFY 15 plan to extend TRC services until the end of FFY 15 (September 30, 2015). This decision was made after analyzing data collected from LHDs on the above described survey, discussions with the TRC project directors, and input from the SNAP-Ed Advisory task force.*

CDPH NEOPB project officers evaluate progress and quality of TRC Scope of Work (SOW) activities through mid-year and end-of-year progress report submissions. Also, TRCs work with the NEOPB Research and Evaluation Unit to develop and implement evaluation methods such as key informant interviews and/or focus groups to assess and identify barriers and challenges in the implementation of tasks of all SOW objectives.

7. What is the plan for the TRC contracts following May 2015?

Response: *CDPH plans to extend the TRCs to September 30, 2015. CDPH has also had discussions with CDSS about continuing the services provided by the TRCs through another competitive solicitation that may be managed by CDSS.*

8. Please describe how the TRCs across the state work together and share information on trainings, activities, and resources to support cross-county collaborations. How will these collaborations be fostered beyond TRCs?

Response: *In November 2014, NEOPB convened the TRC directors to a meeting the day prior to the Project Directors' Meeting to network and share information on trainings, activities and resources. Additionally, upcoming trainings and available resources are posted on the NEOPB public website and updated regularly. To help foster collaborations in FFY 2016 and beyond, CDPH NEOPB is also currently working with LHDs to determine how to carry on multi-county coalitions.*

Trainings

9. What is the capacity and mechanism for CDPH-NEOPB to provide statewide and regional in-person trainings?

Response: *The CDPH NEOPB Training Development and Support Section is comprised of veteran and new staff with a mix of expertise which works across sections in NEOPB to coordinate and consistently develop trainings. NEOPB has an expertise and a conference support contract to provide logistics support for in-person statewide and regional training. In addition, webinar services have been procured to make trainings available on a statewide basis and through its public CDPH website. The Training Development and Support Section is also in the process of developing a training plan to support future*

LHD training needs, including the offering of statewide and regional in-person trainings.

Research and Evaluation Contract – University of California, Berkeley

10. Please clarify - Is the University of California, Berkeley (UCB) a transitional contract?

Response: *A: The UCB agreement is not a short-term contract. CDPH currently has a three-year agreement with UCB to assist CDPH with long-term evaluation and research efforts.*

Program Evaluation

11. Please describe how schools are incorporated into evaluation efforts.

Response: *Schools will be incorporated into evaluation efforts by providing data through the Education and Administrative Reporting System (EARS), the Activity Tracking Form (ATF) and the Impact/Outcome Evaluations (IOEs). The purpose of EARS is to report and describe intervention activities at a State level to the USDA. The ATF is used to complete the EARS report. EARS reports the number of individuals reached and the number of contacts those individuals had (at the aggregated State level), the types of education given, and the number of and type of intervention sites, for example. EARS also report the Media campaign impressions and funding, the funding for NEOPB intervention activities, indirect activities like newsletters or posters. LHDs all over California participate in the Impact/Outcome Evaluation project. The objective of this project is to identify successful interventions and potential best practices, and to provide LHDs direction for program improvement, refinement, and redirection of effort.*

12. How are the State Implementing Agencies (SIAs) collaboration efforts being captured through current evaluation efforts?

Response: *Online EARS will be implemented across SIAs. In addition, a four year evaluation of 17 Counties will assess the collective impact of all SIA activities.*

13. Please describe what surveys are continuing to be used by NEOPB; which ones are being discontinued. How will NEOPB do comparability and trend analysis?

Response: *CalCHEEPS, CalTEENS, and CDPS are being discontinued. Champions for Healthy Change and the Media Evaluation Survey will continue. Past surveys did not provide the sensitivity or statistical power of the Champions for Healthy Change and the Media Evaluation Survey. The improvements to methodology far outweigh the loss of any comparable data. We can collect a larger sample size which ends up costing less, has more sensitive questions and higher recruitment.*

14. Please describe the current timeline for evaluation activities. Will this timeline for evaluation be reexamined?

Response: *Timelines for evaluation activities need to adhere to the FFY, specifically annual reporting requirements to the USDA. It is not conducive for effectiveness that we have a separate evaluation deadline that does not coordinate with the FFY.*

15. Please describe how NEOPB is working towards making the ATF more user friendly, in order to extract relevant data to demonstrate program effectiveness at the local level.

Response: *We are open to suggestions on how to make the ATF more user-friendly. ATF data are for process evaluation purposes; these data cannot be used to demonstrate program effectiveness.*

16. Are there program reach numbers LHDs need to meet to achieve SNAP-Ed goals? If so, please specify. What is the reach of direct education activities from school-based efforts?

Response: *SNAP-Ed does not have reach-related goals and these are not required by USDA.*

17. Please describe evaluation efforts on sugar-sweetened beverages.

Response: *Questions related to sugar-sweetened beverage consumption are included in our Champions for Healthy Change survey and our Impact/Outcome Evaluations (IOEs) of structured nutrition education interventions.*

18. Please describe how policy, systems, and environmental change strategies are being evaluated.

Response: *CDPH will utilize the reach, effectiveness, adoption, implementation, and maintenance (RE-AIM) framework which has been nationally recognized as a method to assess interventions that address policy, systems, and environmental change.*

19. Please describe the statewide media campaign evaluation efforts. How are these efforts capturing statewide media efforts working with the other SIAs?

Response: *A longitudinal survey of randomly-selected mothers assesses through unaided recall questions potential exposure to campaign messages and related outcomes.*

20. How does NEOPB capture data on physical activity? What is the data source and why are existing data sources, specifically FitnessGram not used?

Response: *Physical activity questions are included in our Champions for Healthy Change survey. The California Department of Education is revising the procedures to request FitnessGram data and we plan to obtain these data as soon as they are available*

Obesity Prevention Strategies

21. How will LHDs incorporate campaigns, evidence-based and policy, systems and environmental change strategies (PSEs) into their work plans?

Response: *In the Integrated Work Plans for FFY 16, the instructions state that all intervention strategies used in SNAP-Ed must meet evidence-based standards for research-tested, practice-tested, or emerging programs as defined in the SNAP-Ed Interventions: A Toolkit for States. These can include comprehensive, multi-level interventions at multiple complementary*

organizational and institutional levels of the Social Ecological Model (SEM). Intervention strategies used must be proven to change behavior. The LHD's are asked to use the SNAP-Ed Interventions: A Toolkit for States: <http://snap.nal.usda.gov/snap/SNAP-EdInterventionsToolkit.pdf> and other resources provided by State SNAP-Ed Implementing Agencies to identify intervention strategies included in this one-year work plan.

22. What kind of capacity building and support will NEOPB provide to the LHDs for their PSE work and evidence-based strategies?

Response: *CDPH NEOPB will provide training and technical assistance to support PSE and evidenced-based strategies which comprise a core part of the LHD/LIA integrated work plans. Trainings will include the continuation of webinars on PSEs introduced last year. Additionally, feedback from LHD Survey and Assessment helps inform training and technical assistance needs.*

Collaboration and Partnerships

23. Is there a mechanism for organizations that have experience in developing and implementing PSEs to provide guidance and support to the LHDs?

Response: *In the integrated work plans the LIA's describe how they work through their County Nutrition Action Plans (CNAP), or a comparable or similar entity (council, coalition, consortium, collaborative) to coordinate. They indicate how these partnerships will be used to coordinate healthy eating and physical activity strategies in their jurisdiction. In addition, they will describe their long-term community change goals around obesity prevention in their jurisdiction. These are broad goals that support future efforts and should include a description of how SNAP-Ed activities can be leveraged or be supported. They will provide a description of the efforts in their jurisdiction which demonstrate how unmet need is being addressed by multiple funding sources, including SNAP-Ed. This will include PSE strategies used, integrated local objectives identified to support long-term goals and how these objectives are tied to the needs assessment. Currently, the TRCs are providing trainings and technical assistance on PSE activity*

24. Please describe the NEOPB Partnership Plan, including the goals and implementation strategies at the local level.

Response: *The purpose of the Plan is to address the multi-faceted aspects of the obesity epidemic through innovative actions, a shared vision and a collaborative approach to resolve the obesity epidemic. The plan lays out how to engage strategic partnerships across multiple sectors (e.g., government, agriculture, retail, healthcare, schools, faith-based). We are planning a summit for fall 2015 that will bring together those strategic partners with the focus on how to address the obesity epidemic in a coherent, collaborative, supportive and innovative way. The NEOPB Partnership Plan will be posted on the NEOPB website in late February 2015 and available for public view <http://www.cdph.ca.gov/programs/cpns/Pages/Partnerships.aspx>*

25. How are local SNAP-Ed program activities aligned with greater community change strategies and coordinated across funding and departments?

Response: *The Integrated Work Plan (IWP) is the mechanism through which community change strategies are planned and implemented by each county. The IWP at the local level includes jurisdictional descriptions of other nutrition related programs; community assessment; and community change goals and partnership and collaborative efforts. The narrative summary in the IWP also includes the local jurisdiction's description of how they intend to increase community engagement across different SNAP-Ed target audiences and various organizations. Presence of other funding sources received by CDPH and distributed to local jurisdictions are also communicated to LHDs through their Project Officers (POs) so that they may connect with these projects, ascertain how efforts can be leveraged and/or supported, and determine partnership opportunities.*

26. How is NEOPB addressing health equity issues in California?

Response: *As with all CDPH programs, NEOPB operates programs that include strong health equity components and works with the CDPH Office of Health Equity. LHDs address health equity as part of the county IWPs described above and, based on the assessed needs, may partner and/or subcontract with community entities as needed to work with specific community of need.*

27. What is the status of the Food Access Nutrition Education and Outreach (FANOut) Meetings?

Response: *Responsibility for these meetings transferred to the Department of Social Services at the outset of FFY 2014; therefore, CDSS is the appropriate entity to contact regarding the status of FANOut.*

28. Are there plans for formal collaboration between CDPH-NEOPB and the California Department of Education (CDE)?

Response: *There are no plans at present for an Interagency Agreement (IAA) with SNAP-Ed funds; however, CDPH/NEOPB has an IAA in place for school health collaboration under a five-year grant with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Collaboration exists currently on several fronts with CDE: NEOPB staff sits on CDE-sponsored committees, support the Smarter Lunchroom campaign, promote a CDE-sponsored pilot program for preschool settings, SHINE, in the USDA SNAP-Ed Tool Kit and in multiple other ways. Staff in NEOPB and the Nutrition Services and After-School Divisions of CDE supports each other's efforts.*

Strategic Planning

29. Please describe the NEOPB Strategic Planning Process, including the goals and implementation strategies. What type of agencies and organizations is part of the external Strategic Planning Workgroup?

Response: *The goal of the strategic planning process is to lay out NEOPB's strategic priorities for FFYs 2017-2020, given the projected 30 percent loss of funds to SNAP-Ed. Implementation strategies will be defined when the Plan is completed, which is projected for fall of 2015 following meetings with a Work Group of partners.*

The priorities laid out in the Strategic Plan will form the platform on which to base the LHD component of the FFY 2016 SNAP-Ed State Plan (if approved, this plan will be a two or three-year plan), future CDC grants and any applications for new funds NEOPB undertakes.

Members of the NEOPB Strategic Planning Work Group are well-recognized leaders in California, with expertise in developing strategies and interventions for obesity prevention, including state-level foundations, private-non-profit organizations, local health executives and advocates.