

STATE LEVEL PROJECT SUMMARY FFY 2015

1. Project Title: State-Level Evaluation.

Budget \$5,126,225

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 State-level Evaluation consists of five projects.

Project 1: Inner-Agency Agreement with UC Berkeley, Atkins Center for Weight and Health (CWH), for 13 staff positions within the NEOPB Research and Evaluation Section (RES).

Under the direction of the Chief of the RES, the 13 staff will design, conduct, and report on research and evaluation activities for the NEOPB; and use findings from these studies, as well as external sources, to support LHDs in their required deliverables; address the State Level Objectives; and meet the needs of the NEOPB's reporting requirements to USDA. RES staff will also be available to provide training and technical assistance to State Implementing Agencies (SIAs) and their contractors on topics related to evaluation design, instrument selection, recruitment, and other basic evaluation topics, as well as the specifics of the evaluation of Policy, Systems, and Environmental (PSE) interventions using the RE-AIM (Reach, Effectiveness, Adoption, Implementation and Maintenance) framework.

The Scope of Work with UCB identifies six related activities:

1. Assist LHDs and their subcontractors in completing the required deliverables to the NEOPB (training and technical assistance on EARS, IOEs, CX3, and PSEs using RE-AIM; see Local Health Department Support, Evaluation section).
2. Assist in the planning and oversight of NEOPB's quantitative and qualitative surveys: Benchmark Survey (Project 2); Qualitative Evaluation of Nutrition Education and Obesity Prevention Branch (NEOPB) Model (Project 3); and (3) Comprehensive Evaluation of SNAP-Ed and Behavioral Surveillance of SNAP Populations (Project 4). The CWH will release the funding announcement and establish a contract with a vendor for the Benchmark Survey.

STATE LEVEL PROJECT SUMMARY FFY 2015

3. Provide training and technical assistance to contractors across all SIAs-, within the NEOPB, and for LHDs. RES staff have already begun to train key SIA staff on the requirements and functions of online EARS in preparation to implement the system and related training and technical assistance across all SIAs and their contractors (see Local Health Department Support, Evaluation, Project 1). In FFY 2015, RES staff will extend this assistance to SIAs and their contractors on basic process and outcome evaluation activities.
4. Assist in the development and completion of reporting requirements to USDA (EARS and Annual Reports).
5. Use internal and external research and evaluation findings to educate and inform NEOPB and CDPH staff, lay and professional audiences; and develop professional abstracts, briefs, technical and project reports, and manuscripts for publication.
6. Conduct sampling, data cleaning and syntax programming and documentation, coding of qualitative data, and descriptive and inferential statistical analyses.

Project 2: *Benchmark Survey (funded via CWH).*

The Benchmark Survey will be the mechanism for evaluating associations between levels of exposure to NEOPB Champion for Change Media, Advertising and Public Relations Campaign messages and self-reported behavioral outcomes. RES staff will revise the current questionnaire to include unaided recall questions related to television, radio, and billboard exposure specific to the images and messages of the 2015 Campaign. The 2015 survey instrument will also be revised to assess applicable outcomes from the *Western Region SNAP-Ed Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Obesity Prevention Outcomes Evaluation Framework* document.

NEOPB staff will identify SNAP households with adult women and conduct a statewide random sample stratified by race/ethnicity. A survey vendor (TBD through a competitive process facilitated by the CWH) will administer by telephone the survey instrument to roughly 333 White, 333 African American, and 333 Latino/Hispanic women in March 2015. Three months after the initiation of the 2015 Campaign, these mothers will be re-contacted and asked to participate in a follow-up interview. Open-ended unaided recall responses will be coded into levels of possible exposure by at least two RES staff. Analyses will be conducted to verify acceptable levels of reliability. Revisions to the coding instructions and procedures will be performed if necessary. Levels of ad exposure will be examined in relationship to within-person changes in outcomes (see Section 4g).

Project 3: *Qualitative Evaluation of Nutrition Education and Obesity Prevention Branch (NEOPB) Model.*

CDPH will establish an inner-agency agreement with Helen Wu, PhD, from the Institute for Population Health Improvement, UC Davis, to conduct the semi-structured interviews with key staff from 58 LHDs in FFY 2015. The survey instrument will collect qualitative

STATE LEVEL PROJECT SUMMARY FFY 2015

information on the benefits and challenges to the new funding model; coordination activities with SIAs and the County Nutrition Action Plan (CNAP); approaches to PSE interventions; perceived ability to change behavior among the SNAP population; adequacy and flexibility of funding; adequacy and types of services directed at African American and Latino populations; status of implementation of the new funding model in terms of hiring for administrative and direct service positions and establishing subcontracts; establishing partnerships; and assistance of the Training Resource Centers (TRCs).

Project 4: Comprehensive Evaluation of SNAP-Ed and Behavioral Surveillance of SNAP Populations.

FFY 2015 will represent Year 3 of the four-year comprehensive evaluation study. The Year 3 survey will be one-year follow-up telephone interviews with 2014 survey participants who agreed to be re-contacted (Cohort 2) and mothers, teenagers, and children from a new sample (Cohort 3). The core component of the survey instrument is the Automated Self-administered 24-hour Recall (ASA24). A supplemental questionnaire developed by RES staff will be used again to assess levels of physical activity, consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages, access to healthier foods, and height and weight. The telephone interviews will be conducted in English and Spanish.

Beginning in FFY 2015, the NEOPB plans to incorporate its ongoing behavioral surveillance surveys into the comprehensive evaluation study by expanding the telephone interviews outside of the selected 17 LHDs. These efforts will replace the current California Dietary Practices Survey (CDPS) and the California Children's Healthy Eating and Exercise Practices Survey (CalCHEEPS). Children will be oversampled in 2015, the next scheduled year for CalCHEEPS. Overall, telephone interviews will be completed with 13,250 adults, teenagers, and children. In summary, Project 4 will address three objectives:

1. Assess outcomes among adults, teenagers, and children within the selected 17 LHDs for the comprehensive SNAP-Ed evaluation.
2. Provide statewide behavioral surveillance data for adults.
3. Provide statewide behavioral surveillance data for children.

We will employ the current recruitment strategies for the 2015 survey. Thus, in addition to obtaining behavioral prevalence rates with greater accuracy at less cost, our recruitment rates will increase over those for past CDPS and CalCHEEPS. The recruitment methods will consist of (1) a letter of (re)introduction to the survey mailed to sampled households; (2) telephone contact with adults to confirm eligibility, willingness to participate, and current mailing address; and (3) mailing of a survey packet with a tape measure along with instructions for measuring the respondents' height, food demonstration booklet and measuring cups and spoons as required for administration of the ASA24. Moreover, attempts will be made to locate adults with letters of (re)introduction returned as non-deliverable through the use of reverse directories and/or public or commercial tracing services.

**STATE LEVEL PROJECT SUMMARY
FFY 2015**

The current contract with Westat is through PHI which expires on September 30, 2014. Ann Invitation For Bids procurement will be released to contract for the 2015 survey work with the State of California.

Project 5: *Behavior Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS)*.

The BRFSS supplements the NEOPB's primary adult statewide surveillance surveys (Project 4) to monitor trends and, where possible, compare changes among SNAP-Ed-eligible population segments of adults. Because this external survey includes the general population, it allows the NEOPB to compare the low-income target with higher income segments of the population. We are requesting funding for seven questions.

- e. Developing New Materials:** N/A
 - f. Evidence Base:** N/A
 - 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:** N/A
- 4. Evaluation Activity**
- a. Related project(s) or Interventions:**

Project 2: NEOPB Champion for Change Media, Advertising and Public Relations Campaign

Project 3: All individual and environmental interventions implemented through the LHDs.

Project 4: All individual and environmental interventions implemented, as well as impressions for media campaign exposure, within the 17 selected LHDs, as recorded through EARS, IOEs, and RE-AIM for PSE interventions.

Project 5: NEOPB Champion for Change Media, Advertising and Public Relations Campaign and all individual and environmental interventions implemented through the LHDs.

**STATE LEVEL PROJECT SUMMARY
FFY 2015**

b. Formative, process, outcome or impact evaluation:

Project 2: Outcome
Project 3: Process
Project 4: Outcome
Project 5: Outcome

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

Project 2:

RQ1: What is the proportion of SNAP women who recall a 2015 Campaign television, radio, or billboard ad?

RQ2: What is the relationship between ad exposure and recall of and adherence to My Plate guidelines; overall increases in fruit and vegetable consumption and levels of physical activities; and decreases in sedentary behaviors?

RQ3: Are there differences in recall rates and associations between exposure and outcomes across Whites, African Americans, and Latinos/Hispanics?

Project 3:

RQ1: What is the status of implementation of the new funding model in terms of filling staff positions, establishing subcontracts, and providing services?

RQ2: What are the successes, barriers, and lessons learned from the new funding model within and across LHDs?

Project 4:

RQ 1: Is there evidence of positive changes over time among adults, teenagers, and children in the areas of (a) consumption of healthier foods, (b) access to healthier foods, (c) consumption of water, (d) levels of physical activity, (e) consumption of unhealthy foods, and (f) consumption of unhealthy beverages?

RQ 2: Is there evidence of positive changes over time within certain racial/ethnic groups among adults, teenagers, and children in a through f?

RQ 3: Is there evidence of levels of behavior change among adults, teenagers, and children in relation to types and levels of programs and interventions in a through f?

RQ 4: What is the cost-effectiveness of programs and interventions?

RQ 5: What are the prevalence rates for fruit and vegetable consumption and other behaviors among adults from SNAP households throughout California?

RQ 6: What are the prevalence rates for fruit and vegetable consumption and other behaviors among children from SNAP households throughout California?

Project 5:

RQ1: What are California adults' dietary and physical activity practices on a typical day?

RQ2: What is the frequency of California adults eating fruits and vegetables?

RQ3: What is the frequency of California adults drinking sugar-sweetened beverages?

RQ4: What is the frequency of California adults eating fast food?

RQ5: What is the average number of minutes that California adults engage in physical activity per week?

STATE LEVEL PROJECT SUMMARY FFY 2015

RQ6: What is the prevalence of food insecurity among California adults?

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

e. Plans for using the results:

Project 2: The results will be communicated in an annual report and used to provide recommendations for and potentially improve the effectiveness of future campaigns.

Project 3: Semi-structured interview findings will be presented in a report, and used to make improvements to programs.

Project 4: 2014 and 2015 survey responses will be linked for Cohort 2 mothers, teenagers, and children. During the first six months of 2016 we anticipate completing the analyses to examine changes over time in outcomes among the three age cohorts as related to RQ 1 and RQ 2. In the latter half of 2016 we will conduct the analyses related to RQ 3 and RQ 4.

Analyses for calculating statewide prevalence rates and confidence intervals for RQ 5 and RQ 6 will be completed in early 2016. The value of the calculated point prevalences in comparison to prior years to assess trends will be limited. However, the wealth of dietary behavior information available through the ASA24 will allow for addressing all long-term Individual Level outcomes from the *WRO Evaluation Framework*, specifically LT2 through LT5.

Project 5: Survey findings will be used to inform NEOPB programs and campaigns to assist in program planning and refinement. Survey data will help guide the development and enhancement of the NEOPB and its targeted statewide social marketing campaigns. Results inform the needs assessment component of the annual Plan, are compiled into data tables for public use, and are presented in fact sheets and reports.

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

Project 2: The Benchmark Survey was changed from a cross-sectional to a longitudinal survey in 2014. Households statewide with incomes < 185% FPL were randomly sampled and stratified by race/ethnicity (White, African American, and Latino/Hispanic). Wave 1 interviews with 1,000 women occurred at the end of the media campaign; follow-up (Wave 2) interviews occurred three months later. For 2015, we will replicate this methodology but schedule and complete Wave 1 interviews just prior to the start media campaign (March 2015) and Wave 2 three months later. The revised design will assess changes in self-reported outcomes post versus pre campaign implementation.

Project 3: Key staff from all funded local health departments will be asked to participate in semi-structured interviews. These data will allow us to continue to document the evolution and successes and barriers of the new funding model, as well as provide

STATE LEVEL PROJECT SUMMARY FFY 2015

qualitative data that will be beneficial in our interpretation of the quantitative survey findings.

Project 4: Based on the recommendations of the UC Berkeley, CWH, Expert Review Team, the current Year 2 survey for the Comprehensive California SNAP-Ed Evaluation includes assessing dietary behaviors through the administration of the ASA24. This represents a major improvement over the 2013 methodology, which assessed food and beverage intake by using the BRFSS food frequency questions. The current and proposed 2015 survey will recruit and re-interview approximately 1,500 mothers, 500 teens, and 700 children, as well as newly-sampled mothers (n=5,300), teens (n=1,700), and children (n=2,500) from randomly-selected SNAP households.

For 2015 we proposed to expand the survey to include males, and adults and children from counties outside of the selected 17 local health departments. This will allow for improved statewide behavioral surveillance for dietary behaviors and prevalence rates with smaller confidence intervals due to the increased sample sizes, and reduce the costs over the current CDPS and CalCHEEPS. (For 2016, we would oversample teens as a substitute to the biennial California Teen Eating, Exercise and Nutrition Survey, or CalTEENS.)

g. Framework indicators to be assessed:

Project 2:

ST1

e. Percent of participants who know MyPlate, as demonstrated by recall of: Make half your plate fruits and vegetables

ST3

Percent of participants who set a goal with intention to reduce their time spent watching television

MT1

Percent of participants who increased their use of MyPlate when planning their meals during the period assessed.

c. Ate more than one kind of fruit throughout the day

d. Ate more than one kind of vegetable daily throughout the day

LT2

Percent of participants who ate

a. Fruits two or more times per day (or, average number of cups consumed daily)

b. Vegetables three or more times per day (or, average number of cups consumed daily)

MT3

a. Percent of participants who report increases exercise, physical activities or leisure-sport appropriate for the population of interest, and types of activities: average number of minutes per session

MT6

a. Percent of SNAP-Ed eligibles who can recall SNAP-Ed nutrition, physical activity, and obesity prevention messaging

**STATE LEVEL PROJECT SUMMARY
FFY 2015**

Project 4:

MT3

Percent of participants who report increases exercise, physical activities or leisure-sport appropriate for the population of interest, and types of activities:

a. Average number of minutes per session

LT2

Percent of participants who ate:

a. Fruits two or more times per day (or, average number of cups consumed daily)

b. Vegetables three or more times per day (or, average number of cups consumed daily)

LT3

Percent of participants who ate 100% whole grain/whole wheat versions of:

a. Cooked grains

b. Ready-to-eat grains

c. Average servings of whole grains consumed daily

d. Refined food grains

LT4

Percent of participants who drank/ate low-fat (1%) or fat-free versions of:

a. Milk

b. Yogurt or cheese

c. Switched from whole or 2% milk to fat-free or low-fat milk

d. Consumed any dairy product three or more times daily

LT5

a. Percent of participants who increased the number of cups of plain water consumed daily.

b. Percent of participants who reduced their consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages daily.

c. Percent of participants who switched from fruit-flavored drinks to 100% fruit juice.

LT7

Percent of adults who achieve:

a. At least 150 minutes per week of moderate-intensity aerobic physical activity.

I1

Percent of participants at a healthy weight

a. Adults with BMI between 18.5 and 24.9

b. Children and teens less than the 85th percentile.

Project 5:

MT3

Percent of participants who report increases exercise, physical activities or leisure-sport appropriate for the population of interest, and types of activities:

a. Average number of minutes per session

LT2

Percent of participants who ate:

a. Fruits two or more times per day (or, average number of cups consumed daily)

**STATE LEVEL PROJECT SUMMARY
FFY 2015**

b. Vegetables three or more times per day (or, average number of cups consumed daily)

LT5

a. Percent of participants who increased the number of cups of plain water consumed daily.

b. Percent of participants who reduced their consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages daily.

c. Percent of participants who switched from fruit-flavored drinks to 100% fruit juice.

LT6

a. Percent of participants who did not run out of food in the past 30 days.

b. Percent of participants who were food secure in the past 12 months.

LT7

Percent of adults who achieve:

a. At least 150 minutes per week of moderate-intensity aerobic physical activity.

h. Cost

Project 1 and 2: \$2,870,028 UCB (includes \$450K Benchmark Survey)

Project 3: \$201,197 – UCD

Project 4: \$1,950,000 – CHC IFB

Project 5: \$105,000 - BRFS

Total: \$5,126,225

**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
<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>	<u>Community Capacity</u> ST8 Community Partnerships <u>Community Changes</u> MT7 Food Industry MT9 Agriculture* MT11 Community Design and Safety <u>Community Benefits</u> LT13 Food Industry Healthy Outlets LT15 Agriculture Sales <u>Sustainability</u> I7 Regional Food Hubs

**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

Budget Coversheet

Contractor Name: Atkins Center for Weight and Health at the University of CA, Berkeley
 Contract Number: 14-10309

Budget Categories	FFY 14 Total	FFY 15 Total	Difference	% Difference
1 Salaries		\$1,115,694.25	\$1,115,694.25	\$0.00
2 Benefits		\$446,301.23	\$446,301.23	\$0.00
3 Operating		\$88,692.00	\$88,692.00	\$0.00
4 Equipment		\$7,000.01	\$7,000.01	\$0.00
5 Travel & Per Diem		\$22,094.82	\$22,094.82	\$0.00
6 Subcontractors		\$450,000.00	\$450,000.00	\$0.00
7 Other Costs		\$10,904.25	\$10,904.25	\$0.00
8 Indirect Costs		\$446,079.44	\$446,079.44	\$0.00
Totals:	\$0.00	\$2,586,766.00	\$2,586,766.00	\$0.00

Budget Categories	Reason for difference greater than 5%
1 Salaries	New Contract
2 Benefits	New Contract
3 Operating	New Contract
4 Equipment	New Contract
5 Travel & Per Diem	New Contract
6 Subcontractors	New Contract
7 Other Costs	New Contract
8 Indirect Costs	New Contract

Prime Staffing

Contractor Name:
Contract Number:

Atkins Center for Weight and Health at the University of CA, Berkeley
14-10309

Budget Adjustment		Position Title	Position Names*	Description of Job Duties		FTEs charged to SNAP-Ed	Total Annual Salary	Total SNAP-Ed Salary	Benefit Rate	Benefits *Total SNAP-Ed Salary X Benefit Rate	SNAP-Ed Salary, Benefits and Wages, Federal Dollars only	Budget Adjustment Justification
Action	Last Amt Approved			% of SNAP-Ed Time spent on Mgmt/Admin Duties	% of SNAP-Ed Time spent on Direct SNAP-Ed Delivery							
1		Specialist EARS	TBN		100.00%	1	\$83,183.00	\$83,183.00	37.475%	\$31,172.83	\$114,355.83	
2		Associate Specialist EARS	TBN		100.00%	1	\$76,268.00	\$76,268.00	37.475%	\$28,581.43	\$104,849.43	
3		Proj Mgr - LHD Comprehensive Eval (Team Lead Sac)	TBN		100.00%	1	\$106,000.00	\$106,000.00	37.475%	\$39,723.50	\$145,723.50	
4		Specialist - IOE/LHD Evaluation	TBN		100.00%	1.7	\$83,183.00	\$141,411.10	37.475%	\$52,993.81	\$194,404.91	
7		Specialist PSE/Re-AIM	TBN		100.00%	1	\$83,183.00	\$83,183.00	37.475%	\$31,172.83	\$114,355.83	
8		Specialist CX3	TBN		100.00%	1	\$83,183.00	\$83,183.00	37.475%	\$31,172.83	\$114,355.83	
9		Specialist Behavioral Surveillance- Adults / Benchmark	TBN		100.00%	1	\$83,183.00	\$83,183.00	37.475%	\$31,172.83	\$114,355.83	
10		Technical Knowledge Expert - USDA reports	TBN		100.00%	0.1	\$107,069.00	\$10,706.90	37.475%	\$4,012.41	\$14,719.31	
11		Technical Knowledge Expert - Lit & Report review	TBN		100.00%	0.5	\$107,069.00	\$53,534.50	37.475%	\$20,062.05	\$73,596.55	
12		Team Director / Proj Mgr	TBN		100.00%	1	\$112,785.00	\$115,200.00	37.475%	\$43,171.20	\$158,371.20	
13		Project Assistant - Technical Knowledge	TBN		100.00%	0.54264	\$36,983.00	\$20,068.46	77.914%	\$15,636.14	\$35,704.60	
14		Statistician	TBN		100.00%	1	\$88,358.00	\$88,358.00	45.350%	\$40,070.35	\$128,428.35	
15		Statistician	TBN		100.00%	1	\$88,258.00	\$88,258.00	45.350%	\$40,025.00	\$128,283.00	
16		Human Resources	TBN	100.00%		0.125	\$51,293.33	\$6,411.67	45.350%	\$2,907.69	\$9,319.36	

Prime Staffing

17			Budget/Payroll	TBN	100.00%		0.125	\$52,960.00	\$6,620.00	45.350%	\$3,002.17	\$9,622.17	
18			Financial Analyst	TBN	100.00%		0.125	\$70,525.00	\$8,815.63	45.350%	\$3,997.89	\$12,813.52	
19			Operations	TBN	100.00%		0.125	\$81,660.00	\$10,207.50	45.350%	\$4,629.10	\$14,836.60	
20			Development Strategy	TBN	100.00%		0.05	\$95,951.00	\$4,797.55	37.475%	\$1,797.88	\$6,595.43	
21			Publications & Product	TBN	100.00%		0.55	\$76,268.00	\$41,947.40	45.350%	\$19,023.15	\$60,970.55	
22			Admin Assistant	TBN	100.00%		0.065	\$67,039.00	\$4,357.54	45.350%	\$1,976.14	\$6,333.68	
Totals:					700.00%	1300.00%	13.00764	\$1,634,401.33	\$1,115,694.25		\$446,301.23	\$1,561,995.48	

* Staff will be hired upon execution of contract.

Definition and basis for calculations of benefit rate(s):

[University of California, Berkeley, published benefits rates](#)

Prime Budget Justification

Contractor Name: Atkins Center for Weight and Health at the University of CA, Berkeley
 Contract Number: 14-10309

Budget Adjustment		Operating Expenses							
Action	Last Amt Approved	Budget Item	Description/Justification	Unit Cost	Quantity	Months	Total	Budget Adjustment Justification	
		General Office Expense	Includes charges such as photocopying, printer cartridges, utilities, maintenance, software, monthly phone and internet cost and miscellaneous office supplies for project staff.	\$1,950.00	1.00	12.00	\$23,400.00		
		Off Campus Rent	rent and janitorial	\$5,441.00	1.00	12.00	\$65,292.00		
Total Operating Expenses:							\$88,692.00		

Budget Adjustment		Equipment Expenses							
Action	Last Amt Approved	Budget Item	Description/Justification	Unit Cost	Quantity	FTE	Total	Budget Adjustment Justification	
		Furniture set up	Furniture needed to set up the office which includes 8 workstations, conference room, reception area and kitchen (to purchase desks, chairs, file cabinets, storage cabinet and other related equipment). \$7,001.01 for 4.69 FTE which is \$1492.54 per FTE. This is for the Specialist - Behavioral Surveillance Adults/Benchmark; Team Director/Project Manager; Statistician; Publications and Productions; both Technical Knowledge experts and the Project Assistant – Technical Knowledge.	\$1,492.54	4.69	1.00	\$7,000.01		
Total Equipment Expenses:							\$7,000.01		

Budget Adjustment		Travel and Per Diem													
Action	Last Amt Approved	Travel/Position Title	Location	Trips	FTE	Days	Nights	Per Diem	Lodging	Air	Miles	Reg. Fee	Other	Total	Budget Adjustment Justification
		Team Director; Project Manager - LHD Comp Eval; Tech knowledge expert - USDA reports; Tech knowledge expert - Lit and report reviews; Statisticians - to travel from Berkeley to Sacramento for project meetings	Sacramento	48	1	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	158.58710	\$0.00	\$20.00	\$5,222.82	

Sub Staffing A

Contractor Name: Atkins Center for Weight and Health at the University of CA, Berkeley
Contract Number: 14-10309
Sub Contractor A Name: TBN

Budget Adjustment		Position Title <small>* Job Descriptions for each position can be found on the Job Descriptions tab.</small>	Position Names	Description of Job Duties		FTEs charged to SNAP-Ed	Total Annual Salary	Total SNAP-Ed Salary	Benefit Rate	Benefits <small>*Total SNAP-Ed Salary X Benefit Rate</small>	SNAP-Ed Salary, Benefits and Wages, Federal Dollars only	Budget Adjustment Justification
Action	Last Amt Approved			% of SNAP-Ed Time spent on Mgmt/Admin Duties	% of SNAP-Ed Time spent on Direct SNAP-Ed Delivery							
1		Project Director	TBN		100.00%	0.25	\$125,000.00	\$31,250.00	35.000%	\$10,937.50	\$42,187.50	
2		Recruitment Coordinator	TBN		100.00%	0.4	\$80,000.00	\$32,000.00	35.000%	\$11,200.00	\$43,200.00	
3		Recruitment Asst	TBN		100.00%	0.25	\$65,000.00	\$16,250.00	35.000%	\$5,687.50	\$21,937.50	
4		Data Collection Coordinator	TBN		100.00%	0.4	\$70,000.00	\$28,000.00	35.000%	\$9,800.00	\$37,800.00	
5		Data Collection Asst	TBN		100.00%	0.22	\$65,000.00	\$14,300.00	35.000%	\$5,005.00	\$19,305.00	
6		Survey Workers	TBN		100.00%	1.56249	\$50,000.00	\$78,124.50	35.000%	\$27,343.58	\$105,468.08	
7		Data Manager	TBN		100.00%	0.4	\$87,000.00	\$34,800.00	35.000%	\$12,180.00	\$46,980.00	
Totals:				0.00%	700.00%	3.48249	\$542,000.00	\$234,724.50		\$82,153.58	\$316,878.08	

Definition and basis for calculations of benefit rate(s): _____

Sub Budget Justification A

Contractor Name: Atkins Center for Weight and Health at the University of CA, Berkeley
Contract Number: 14-10309
Sub Contractor A Name: TBN

Budget Adjustment		Operating Expenses							
Action	Last Amt Approved	Budget Item	Description/Justification	Unit Cost	Quantity	FTE	Total	Budget Adjustment Justification	
		Communications	Phone, Fax, Internet, CATI software and licensing	\$1,060.00	12.00	1.00	\$12,720.00		
		Rent	Rent	\$500.00	12.00	1.00	\$6,000.00		
		General office expense	Office supplies	\$92.60	12.00	1.00	\$1,111.20		
Total Operating Expenses:							\$19,831.20		

Budget Adjustment		Travel and Per Diem													
Action	Last Amt Approved	Travel/Position Title	Location	Trips	FTE	Days	Nights	Per Diem	Lodging	Air	Miles	Reg. Fee	Other	Total	Budget Adjustment Justification
		Project Director and Recruitment coordinator travel Sacramento-Berkeley		4	1	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	157.83	\$0.00	\$20.00	\$433.54	
Total Travel and Per Diem:														\$433.54	

Budget Adjustment		Sub Contractor(s)					
Action	Last Amt Approved	Name	Description/Justification	Total	Budget Adjustment Justification		
		A N/A					
Total Sub Grant(s):				\$0.00			

Budget Adjustment		Other Costs						
Action	Last Amt Approved	Budget Item	Description/Justification	Unit Cost	Quantity	Misc.	Total	Budget Adjustment Justification
			Reimbursement for personal costs such as childcare, meals, lodging, and transportation for recipients of SNAP-Ed to participate in focus groups.	\$10.00	1000.00	2.00	\$20,000.00	
Total Other Costs:							\$20,000.00	

Budget Adjustment		Indirect Costs				
Action	Last Amt Approved	Calculation Method	%	\$ of Method	Total	Budget Adjustment Justification
		\$357,143 Total Direct x .26 Indirect = \$92,857	26.0000%	\$357,143.00	\$92,857.18	
Total Indirect Costs:					\$92,857.18	

Total Budget:					\$450,000.00	
----------------------	--	--	--	--	---------------------	--

Budget Coversheet

Contractor Name: The Regents of the University of California, Davis
 Contract Number: 14-10323

Budget Categories	FFY 14 Total	FFY 15 Total	Difference	% Difference
1 Salaries	\$0.00	\$103,914.02	\$103,914.02	0.00%
2 Benefits	\$0.00	\$44,835.10	\$44,835.10	0.00%
3 Operating	\$0.00	\$9,000.00	\$9,000.00	0.00%
4 Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%
5 Travel & Per Diem	\$0.00	\$5,259.70	\$5,259.70	0.00%
6 Subcontractors	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%
7 Other Costs	\$0.00	\$1,001.00	\$1,001.00	0.00%
8 Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$37,187.18	\$37,187.18	0.00%
Totals:	\$0.00	\$201,197.00	\$201,197.00	0.00%

Budget Categories	Reason for difference greater than 5%
1 Salaries	New Interagency Agreement
2 Benefits	New Interagency Agreement
3 Operating	New Interagency Agreement
4 Equipment	New Interagency Agreement
5 Travel & Per Diem	New Interagency Agreement
6 Subcontractors	New Interagency Agreement
7 Other Costs	New Interagency Agreement
8 Indirect Costs	New Interagency Agreement

Budget Coversheet

Contractor Name: The Regents of the University of California, Davis
 Contract Number: 14-10323

Budget Adjustment		Position Title	Position Names	Description of Job Duties		FTEs charged to SNAP-Ed	Total Annual Salary	Total SNAP-Ed Salary	Benefit Rate	Benefits *Total SNAP-Ed Salary X Benefit Rate	SNAP-Ed Salary, Benefits and Wages, Federal Dollars only	Budget Adjustment Justification
Action	Last Amt Approved			% of SNAP-Ed Time spent on Mgmt/Admin Duties	% of SNAP-Ed Time spent on Direct SNAP-Ed Delivery							
1		IPHI Director/Principal Investigator	Kizer, Kenneth W.	100.00%		0.05	\$181,500.00	\$9,075.00	21.100%	\$1,914.83	\$10,989.83	
2		Co-Principal Investigator	Wu, Helen	100.00%		0.25	\$100,750.00	\$25,187.50	51.150%	\$12,883.41	\$38,070.91	
3		IPHI Assistant Director	Hughes, Michael	100.00%		0.05	\$178,327.50	\$8,916.38	38.775%	\$3,457.33	\$12,373.71	
4		Graduate Research Assistant	Student TBD	100.00%		0.2	\$45,000.00	\$9,000.00	1.300%	\$117.00	\$9,117.00	
5		Research Assistant (Analyst IV)	Analyst TBD	100.00%		0.5	\$75,562.50	\$37,781.25	51.150%	\$19,325.11	\$57,106.36	
6		Admin Assistant	Schmit, Michelle	100.00%		0.05	\$65,487.50	\$3,274.38	51.150%	\$1,674.85	\$4,949.23	
7		Human Resources Admin Assistant	Levallois, Valerie	100.00%		0.05	\$65,487.50	\$3,274.38	51.150%	\$1,674.85	\$4,949.23	
8		Events & Communications Analyst IV	Analyst TBD	100.00%		0.05	\$75,562.50	\$3,778.13	51.150%	\$1,932.51	\$5,710.64	
9		Financial Analyst III	Hunt, Jason	100.00%		0.05	\$72,540.00	\$3,627.00	51.150%	\$1,855.21	\$5,482.21	
Totals:				900.00%	0.00%	1.25	\$860,217.50	\$103,914.02		\$44,835.10	\$148,749.12	

Weighted average calculation of guidance for SFY 14-15 & 15-16 based on months in each. Benefit rate includes medical, dental, and vision insurance; disability, life, unemployment, and workers' comp insurance; retirement plan; employee support programs; employer matching for Medicare and OASDI. Additional detail about UCD's composite benefit rate calculation is available at:

Definition and basis for calculations of benefit rate(s): http://accounting.ucdavis.edu/doc_help/labor/composite_benefit_rate/index.cfm?opt=2

Budget Coversheet

Contractor Name: The Regents of the University of California, Davis
 Contract Number: 14-10323

Budget Adjustment		Operating Expenses							
Action	Last Amt Approved	Budget Item	Description/Justification	Unit Cost	Quantity	Months	Total	Budget Adjustment Justification	
		General Operating Expenses	General office supplies and other operating expenses (insurance, etc.) (approximately \$334/month x 12 months)	\$4,000.00	1.00	1.00	\$4,000.00		
		Telephone Charges	Phone set-up & monthly line charge, long distance calls, ReadyTalk audio conferencing & recording. (approximately \$417/month x 12 months)	\$5,000.00	1.00	1.00	\$5,000.00		
Total Operating Expenses:							\$9,000.00		

Budget Adjustment		Equipment Expenses							
Action	Last Amt Approved	Budget Item	Description/Justification	Unit Cost	Quantity	FTE	Total	Budget Adjustment Justification	
		N/A				1.00	\$0.00		
Total Equipment Expenses:							\$0.00		

Budget Adjustment		Travel and Per Diem													
Action	Last Amt Approved	Travel/Position Title	Location	Trips	FTE	Days	Nights	Per Diem	Lodging	Air	Miles	Reg. Fee	Other**	Total	Budget Adjustment Justification
		2 day trips (Co-PI, RA)	Shasta,	2	2	1	0				250.00		\$50.00	\$480.00	
		1 day trip (Co-PI, RA)	San Diego	1	2	1	0			\$300.00	40.00		\$200.00	\$1,022.40	
		1 overnight trip (Co-PI, RA)	Tulare County	1	2	2	1	\$46.00	\$102.00	\$0.00	600.00		\$100.00	\$924.00	
		1 overnight trip (Co-PI, RA)	Los Angeles	1	2	2	1	\$46.00	\$135.00	\$300.00	40.00		\$200.00	\$1,476.40	
		Childhood Obesity Conf (Co-PI, RA)	San Diego	1	0.75	4	3	\$46.00	\$140.00	\$300.00	40.00	\$600.00	\$200.00	\$1,300.40	
		Local Travel (multiple trips)	Davis	1							100.90			\$56.50	
Total Travel and Per Diem:														\$5,259.70	

* Lodging costs include taxes. Reimbursement at CalHR rates. **Other includes rental cars, parking, toll fees, shuttle service, etc.

Budget Adjustment		Sub Contractor(s)							
Action	Approved	Name	Description/Justification				Total	Budget Adjustment Justification	
		A N/A							
Total Sub Grant(s):							\$0.00		

Budget Adjustment		Other Costs							
Action	Last Amt Approved	Budget Item	Description/Justification	Unit Cost	Quantity	Misc.	Total	Budget Adjustment Justification	
		Software	Atlas.ti (1 student license - 1 semester)	\$51.00	1.00	1.00	\$51.00		
		Software	Atlas.ti - professional license (1 educational institution rate license)	\$670.00	1.00	1.00	\$670.00		
		Audio recorder/memory card	Digital audio recorder and flash memory card to be used when Co-PI and RA meet with the Local Health Departments to record and store meetings.	\$80.00	1.00	1.00	\$80.00		

Budget Coversheet

		Books	Reports, books, journal articles, and other content that are identified during the literature review for goal 1 which are not available free or under existing UCD library system subscriptions. Generally, this could include CDs containing compilations of conference presentations which describe relevant obesity initiatives, new books/guides on methods for conducting searching across disciplines or through social media or other non-traditionally academic information sources, and/or specific articles in journals for which UCD does not already pay for a subscription (article fees can range from \$10-30 per article). Specific content and titles cannot be determined until the goal 1 work is in progress, as it requires conducting the work and seeing which items are relevant and require payment.	\$200.00	1.00	1.00	\$200.00	
Total Other Costs:							\$1,001.00	

Budget Adjustment		Indirect Costs				
Action	Last Amt Approved	Calculation Method	%	\$ of Method	Total	Budget Adjustment Justification
		Modified Total Direct Costs (Personnel & Fringe Benefits Only, per State Guidance)	24.9999333%	\$148,749.12	\$37,187.18	
Total Indirect Costs:					\$37,187.18	
Total Budget:					\$201,197.00	

Budget Coversheet

Contractor Name: Champions for Healthy Change - TBD
 Contract Number: 14-10333

Budget Categories	FFY 14 Total	FFY 15 Total	Difference	% Difference
1 Salaries	\$0.00	\$1,055,370.00	\$1,055,370.00	0%
2 Benefits	\$0.00	\$369,379.50	\$369,379.50	0%
3 Operating	\$0.00	\$424,353.96	\$424,353.96	0%
4 Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0%
5 Travel & Per Diem	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0%
6 Subcontractors	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0%
7 Other Costs	\$0.00	\$23,155.60	\$23,155.60	0%
8 Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$77,740.94	\$77,740.94	0%
Totals:	\$0.00	\$1,950,000.00	\$1,950,000.00	0%

Budget Categories	Reason for difference greater than 5%
1 Salaries	N/A New Contract
2 Benefits	N/A New Contract
3 Operating	N/A New Contract
4 Equipment	N/A New Contract
5 Travel & Per Diem	N/A New Contract
6 Subcontractors	N/A New Contract
7 Other Costs	N/A New Contract
8 Indirect Costs	N/A New Contract

Budget Coversheet

Contractor Name: Champions for Healthy Change - TBD
 Contract Number: 14-10333

Budget Adjustment		Position Title	Position Names	Description of Job Duties		FTEs charged to SNAP-Ed	Total Annual Salary	Total SNAP-Ed Salary	Benefit Rate	Benefits *Total SNAP-Ed Salary X Benefit Rate	SNAP-Ed Salary, Benefits and Wages, Federal Dollars only	Budget Adjustment Justification
Action	Last Amt Approved			% of SNAP-Ed Time spent on Mgmt/Admin Duties	% of SNAP-Ed Time spent on Direct SNAP-Ed Delivery							
1		Project Director	TBD	40.00%	60.00%	1.00	\$120,000.00	\$120,000.00	35.000%	\$42,000.00	\$162,000.00	
2		Subject Matter Expert	TBD	15.00%	85.00%	0.75	\$75,000.00	\$56,250.00	35.000%	\$19,687.50	\$75,937.50	
3		Data Collection Manager	TBD	20.00%	80.00%	0.50	\$60,000.00	\$30,000.00	35.000%	\$10,500.00	\$40,500.00	
4		Data Steward	TBD	25.00%	75.00%	0.50	\$45,000.00	\$22,500.00	35.000%	\$7,875.00	\$30,375.00	
5		Junior Data Manager	TBD	15.00%	85.00%	0.50	\$38,000.00	\$19,000.00	35.000%	\$6,650.00	\$25,650.00	
6		CATI Coordinator	TBD	0.00%	100.00%	0.50	\$45,000.00	\$22,500.00	35.000%	\$7,875.00	\$30,375.00	
7		CATI Programmer / Tester	TBD	0.00%	100.00%	0.25	\$80,000.00	\$20,000.00	35.000%	\$7,000.00	\$27,000.00	
8		Technical Editor (translati	TBD	10.00%	90.00%	0.25	\$36,000.00	\$9,000.00	35.000%	\$3,150.00	\$12,150.00	
9		Graphics/Print Specialist	TBD	5.00%	95.00%	0.25	\$45,000.00	\$11,250.00	35.000%	\$3,937.50	\$15,187.50	
10		Project Support Staff	TBD	15.00%	85.00%	1.00	\$45,000.00	\$45,000.00	35.000%	\$15,750.00	\$60,750.00	
11		Survey Support Staff	TBD	65.00%	35.00%	0.50	\$77,740.00	\$38,870.00	35.000%	\$13,604.50	\$52,474.50	
12		Clerical	TBD	85.00%	15.00%	0.50	\$30,000.00	\$15,000.00	35.000%	\$5,250.00	\$20,250.00	
13		Telephone Team Leader	TBD	50.00%	50.00%	2.00	\$48,000.00	\$96,000.00	35.000%	\$33,600.00	\$129,600.00	
14		Telephone Interviewer	TBD	5.00%	95.00%	22.00	\$25,000.00	\$550,000.00	35.000%	\$192,500.00	\$742,500.00	
		Totals:		350.00%	1050.00%	30.5	\$769,740.00	\$1,055,370.00		\$369,379.50	\$1,424,749.50	

Definition and basis for calculations of benefit rate(s): Fringe benefits associated with direct labor, and those costs necessary to staff, manage, house, equip, and otherwise support operations' professional, technical, and administrative staff, and their salary costs not directly chargeable to a revenue-producing project.

Budget Coversheet

Contractor Name: Champions for Healthy Change - TBD
 Contract Number: 14-10333

Budget Adjustment		Operating Expenses						
Action	Last Amt Approved	Budget Item	Description/Justification	Unit Cost	Quantity	Months	Total	Budget Adjustment Justification
		Supplies	General Supplies - \$350 prorated per FTE per month	\$350.000	20.00	9.00	\$63,000.00	
		Telephone	per long distance hour	\$1.625	9828.1	9.00	\$143,735.96	
		Printing	30,000 pages and 15,000 envelopes	\$0.08	45000	1.00	\$3,600.00	
		Postage/Shipping	7,930 AMPM Packets & Letters and 7,867 Recontact Letters	\$4.00	15797	1.00	\$63,188.00	
		Respondent Incentives	\$20 per mother	\$20	3200	1.00	\$64,000.00	
		Respondent Incentives	\$10 per respondent	\$10	8683	1.00	\$86,830.00	
Total Operating Expenses:							\$424,353.96	

Budget Adjustment		Equipment Expenses						
Action	Last Amt Approved	Budget Item	Description/Justification	Unit Cost	Quantity	FTE	Total	Budget Adjustment Justification
		N/A				1.00	\$0.00	
Total Equipment Expenses:							\$0.00	

Budget Adjustment		Travel and Per Diem													
Action	Last Amt Approved	Travel/Position Title	Location	Trips	FTE	Days	Nights	Per Diem	Lodging	Air	Miles	Reg. Fee	Other	Total	Budget Adjustment Justification
		N/A												\$0.00	
Total Travel and Per Diem:														\$0.00	

* Lodging costs include taxes. Reimbursement at CalHR rates.

Budget Adjustment		Sub Contractor(s)						
Action	Approved	Name	Description/Justification				Total	Budget Adjustment Justification
		A N/A						
Total Sub Grant(s):							\$0.00	

Budget Adjustment		Other Costs						
Action	Last Amt Approved	Budget Item	Description/Justification	Unit Cost	Quantity	Misc.	Total	Budget Adjustment Justification
		Tape Measures	Tape Measures	\$0.81	7930	1.00	\$6,423.30	
		Measuring kits (24hr dietary)	Measuring Cups	\$2.11	7930	1.00	\$16,732.30	
Total Other Costs:							\$23,155.60	

Budget Adjustment Indirect Costs _____

Budget Coversheet

Action	Last Amt Approved	Calculation Method	%	\$ of Method	Total	Budget Adjustment Justification
		18.32% NICRA of Other Direct Costs, Excluding Respondent Incentives	18.319833%	\$424,353.96	\$77,740.94	
Total Indirect Costs:					\$77,740.94	
Total Budget:					\$1,950,000.00	

Budget Coversheet

Contractor Name: Behavioral Risk Factor Survey
 Contract Number: MOU CDSRB

Budget Categories	FFY 14 Total	FFY 15 Total	Difference	% Difference
1 Salaries		\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%
2 Benefits		\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%
3 Operating		\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%
4 Equipment		\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%
5 Travel & Per Diem		\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%
6 Subcontractors		\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%
7 Other Costs		\$105,000.00	\$105,000.00	0.00%
8 Indirect Costs		\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%
Totals:	\$0.00	\$105,000.00	\$105,000.00	0.00%

Budget Categories	Reason for difference greater than 5%
1 Salaries	
2 Benefits	
3 Operating	
4 Equipment	
5 Travel & Per Diem	
6 Subcontractors	
7 Other Costs	
8 Indirect Costs	

Budget Coversheet

Contractor Name: Behavioral Risk Factor Survey
 Contract Number: MOU CDSRB

Budget Adjustment		Position Title	Position Names	Description of Job Duties		FTEs charged to SNAP-Ed	Total Annual Salary	Total SNAP-Ed Salary	Benefit Rate	Benefits *Total SNAP-Ed Salary X Benefit Rate	SNAP-Ed Salary, Benefits and Wages, Federal Dollars only	Budget Adjustment Justification
Action	Last Amt Approved			% of SNAP-Ed Time spent on Mgmt/Admin Duties	% of SNAP-Ed Time spent on Direct SNAP-Ed Delivery							
		N/A						\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00	
		Totals:		0.00%	0.00%	0	\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00	

Definition and basis for calculations of benefit rate(s): _____

Budget Coversheet

Contractor Name: Behavioral Risk Factor Survey
 Contract Number: MOU CDSRB

Budget Adjustment		Operating Expenses										Budget Adjustment Justification		
Action	Last Amt Approved	Budget Item	Description/Justification							Unit Cost	Quantity	Months	Total	
		N/A										1.00	\$0.00	
Total Operating Expenses:											\$0.00			

Budget Adjustment		Equipment Expenses										Budget Adjustment Justification		
Action	Last Amt Approved	Budget Item	Description/Justification							Unit Cost	Quantity	FTE	Total	
		N/A										1.00	\$0.00	
Total Equipment Expenses:											\$0.00			

Budget Adjustment		Travel and Per Diem												Budget Adjustment Justification	
Action	Last Amt Approved	Travel/Position Title	Location	Trips	FTE	Days	Nights	Per Diem	Lodging	Air	Miles	Reg. Fee	Other	Total	
		N/A												\$0.00	
Total Travel and Per Diem:													\$0.00		

* Lodging costs include taxes. Reimbursement at CalHR rates.

Budget Adjustment		Sub Contractor(s)										Budget Adjustment Justification
Action	Approved	Name	Description/Justification							Total		
		A N/A										
Total Sub Grant(s):										\$0.00		

Budget Adjustment		Other Costs										Budget Adjustment Justification		
Action	Last Amt Approved	Budget Item	Description/Justification							Unit Cost	Quantity	Misc.	Total	

Budget Coversheet

		<p>Risk Factor Surveys</p> <p>To conduct 7 risk factor surveys to include the following: Percent of participants who report increases exercise, physical activities or leisure-sport appropriate for the population of interest, and types of activities: a. Average number of minutes per session Percent of participants who ate: a. Fruits two or more times per day (or, average number of cups consumed daily) b. Vegetables three or more times per day (or, average number of cups consumed daily) a. Percent of participants who increased the number of cups of plain water consumed daily. b. Percent of participants who reduced their consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages daily. c. Percent of participants who switched from fruit-flavored drinks to 100% fruit juice. a. Percent of participants who did not run out of food in the past 30 days. b. Percent of participants who were food secure in the past 12 months. Percent of adults who achieve: a. At least 150 minutes per week of moderate-intensity aerobic physical</p>					
			\$15,000.00	7.00	1.00	\$105,000.00	
Total Other Costs:						\$105,000.00	

Budget Adjustment		Indirect Costs					
Action	Last Amt Approved	Calculation Method	%	\$ of Method	Total	Budget Adjustment Justification	
		N/A			\$0.00		
Total Indirect Costs:					\$0.00		
Total Budget:					\$105,000.00		