RNECE-West Survey Assessment

Western Territories

Guam
American Samoa
Micronesia
Northern Marianas

Western

North Central

Northeast

Southern

Southern Territories

Puerto Rico
Virgin Islands

SURVEY ASSESSMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Image: Map of NIFA Western Region States and Territories

The Regional Nutrition Education and Obesity Prevention Center of Excellence – West (RNECE-West), a joint effort of Colorado State and Washington State Universities' Extension, seeks to improve the health of low-income Americans, especially Hispanics, through strategies at the individual and environmental levels of the social-ecological model, including complementary nutrition education and public health approaches particularly for the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Education (SNAP-Ed).

The Western Region is the National Institute of Food and Agriculture's (NIFA) largest geographic region, covering from Colorado to Alaska to the Northern Marianas Islands. It includes 13 states, four US territories, eight different time zones and three US Department of Agriculture (USDA) Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) regions. This mix of urban, rural and island communities presents a broad mix of needs related to the use of direct education and Policy, Systems and Environment (PSE) activities as well as PSE programming efforts and training needs.

The RNECE-West conducted two broad assessments, including surveys of EFNEP and SNAP-Ed implementing agencies (IA) of the NIFA Western Region. A third assessment, related to *Best Practices*,[1] was completed by Colorado State staff of the RNECE-West. The *Best Practices* assessment is included here as its outcomes relate to RNECE objectives on training. SNAP- Ed IAs and administrative stakeholders across the nation were surveyed regarding their confidence in applying best practices and interest in related staff development.

The understanding of how PSE and direct education can work together is evolving. Taken collectively, this survey information indicates a need for collaborative training for both SNAP-Ed and EFNEP programs. Further review and content analysis of SNAP-Ed year-end report and EFNEP annual reports will help to identify training needs. Given the limited reported use of environmental assessment tools, training and more standardized tools for data comparison should help strengthen the program evaluation and recommendations. Common language and shared vocabulary detailing the appropriate and complementary efforts that can be made by each respective program will greatly enhance positive messaging on the community level.

The mission of the Region Nutrition Education and Obesity Prevention Center of Excellence - West (RNECE-W) is to improve the health of low-income Americans, especially Hispanics, through multiple strategies, including complementary nutrition education and public health approaches at the individual and environmental levels of the social ecological model of nutrition and physical activity behaviors (SEM).[2] The RNECE-W aimed to build the evidence-base for nutrition education and obesity prevention strategies and interventions that produce measurable improvements in health, obesity, nutrition (food behavior), and physical activity-related outcomes of interest to the USDA. The RNECE-W developed effective direct education evaluation through its research program and contributed to gaps in policy, systems, and environmental change evaluation. These activities were meant to prevent and reduce obesity prevalence in low-income families within the NIFA Western Region. Long-term follow-up of obesity prevalence data within five to ten years may validate the efforts of the RNECE-W through long-term evaluation of SNAP-Ed and EFNEP data that reflects changes in body weight, nutritional behaviors, and food security. A baseline of programming efforts was required to establish the current and future planned direct education and PSE coordinated activities within the RNECE-W states. The survey assessments investigate the different settings where direct education and PSE work take place, usage of evaluation tools for PSE actions, and training topics for SNAP-Ed or EFNEP.

The RNECE-W goals addressed in the survey assessment presented here included:
I.   Identify and create research collaborations and synergistic relationships among researchers and EFNEP and SNAP-Ed program directors, universities and other implementers, and state and federal agencies
II.   Pursue program implementation research to support *Best Practices in Nutrition Education for Low Income Audiences*[1] including professional development and management tools.
III.   Contribute to the development of a national SNAP-Ed evaluation and reporting system.
IV.   Address the individual and environmental levels of the Social-Ecological Model (SEM) through nutrition education and policy, systems and environmental change (PSE) by incorporating public health approaches.
V.   Coordinate RNECE-W research and programs with ongoing work of existing EFNEP and SNAP-Ed committees, multi-state projects and other regional and national teams/committees.
VI.   Direct the collection and consolidation of data related to target audiences, learning/behavior change objectives, evaluation tools, and outcomes from Western Region implementing agencies (IAs).

These research efforts are transferable to the EFNEP and SNAP-Ed programs across the country. The primary results of the RNECE-W signature research are detailed elsewhere. This report details the state of direct education and PSE change initiatives of NIFA Western Region states and territories in calendar year 2015. This data serves as a baseline for RNECE-W research projects initiated in FY14 to be completed by the close of the grant cycle in August 2017.

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Education (SNAP-Ed) Plan Guidance (*SNAP-Ed Guidance)* provides instructions for developing and submitting the State nutrition education and obesity prevention grant program. This document is updated and released on yearly basis; describing the expectations from FNS for the upcoming fiscal year and providing a road map for program directions. The evolution of SNAP-Ed from a program focused almost exclusively in nutrition education to a multi-level nutrition education and obesity prevention program is reflected in the progression of these document across the fiscal years.

FFY13 marked the year when the Social-Ecological Model (SEM) is introduced in the *SNAP-Ed Guidance*.[3] The SEM was presented as a tool to describe the roles that various segments of society can play in making healthy choices more widely accessible and desirable. With the introduction of this model, the guidance suggested that efforts to improve dietary intake and increase physical activity were more likely to be successful when using this type of coordinated system-wide approach.[3]

The following year, FFY14, the *SNAP-Ed Guidance* began to align with the Healthy, Hunger Free Kids Act (HHFKA)[4] and prominently reflected an obesity prevention approach. Multi-level, multi-strategy programs with appropriate community partners and interventions are encouraged, presumably to achieve the scope and intensity associated with obesity prevention outcomes. To support the expansion of SNAP-Ed into the larger spheres of the SEM, the *SNAP-Ed Guidance* for FY14 introduced the *SNAP-Ed Interventions: A Toolkit for States.*[5] This toolkit is a compilation of interventions that are proven to be effective and actionable community-based and public health approaches to nutrition education and obesity prevention.

The *SNAP-Ed Guidance* FFY15 focused on the need for evidence-based intervention along with clear expectations for SNAP-Ed multi-level programing.[6] "*FNS expects States to coordinate activities with partners using strategies from multiple spheres of the framework to further mutual efforts and maximize resources*."[6] This fiscal year also reflected an expansion of sites and interventions for PSE with the inclusion of retail and Smarter Lunchrooms interventions. In addition, the *SNAP-Ed Guidance* presented more concrete definitions and examples for Policy, Systems and Environmental change.[6]

Finally, in FFY16 the *SNAP-Ed Guidance* expanded and reinforced the need for multi –level interventions as three approaches or more "*Key to multi-level interventions is that they reach the target audience at more than one level of the SEM and that the interventions mutually reinforce each other. Multilevel interventions generally are thought of as having three or more levels of influence.*"[7] This pushes states to plan for different kind of programming with increased emphasis on the role of PSE along with direct nutrition education.[7]

The SNAP-Ed Strategies & Interventions: An Obesity Prevention Toolkit for States (*SNAP-Ed Toolkit*) was released as a single, standalone document in April 2016 with contributions from USDA collaborators that include: The Association of SNAP Nutrition Education Administrations, the Center for Training and Research Translation at the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, and the National Collaborative on Childhood Obesity Research.[8] An interactive, online *SNAP-Ed Toolkit* was released by the RNECE-South in November 2016.[9]

Policy, System and Environmental Change Efforts in the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program
The U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) administers the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP); land-grant universities conduct the program in all states, U.S. territories, and the District of Columbia. EFNEP focuses on reaching the poorest of the poor by working through families to address the health disparities associated with some of our most pervasive societal challenges—hunger, malnutrition, poverty, and obesity. EFNEP provides practical, hands-on nutrition education that changes behavior.[10]

EFNEP works with community partners and key decision makers and stakeholders to support an improved food and physical environment for low-income populations. In working with these community members, the primary focus for EFNEP remains on increasing programmatic reach and facilitating participants' ability to make healthy food and physical activity choices as individuals and as families.

As noted in Table 1: *State Budget Allocations for EFNEP and SNAP-Ed in NIFA Western Region State and Territories,* funding for SNAP-Ed is considerable higher than EFNEP. This funding contributes to differences in PSE work in the community.

The RNECE West conducted two broad assessments that are summarized here. The assessments include surveys of EFNEP and SNAP-Ed IAs of the NIFA Western Region asking about: 1) PSE Programming Efforts and 2) Use of direct education, PSE activities and evaluation efforts. In addition, outcomes of the *Best Practices* assessment are included. SNAP-Ed IA and administrative stakeholders across the nation were surveyed regarding their confidence in applying best practices and interest in related staff development.

Table 1: State Budget Allocations for EFNEP and SNAP-Ed in NIFA Western Region States and Territories								
	FFY13		FFY14		FFY15		FFY16	
State/Territory	EFNEP	SNAP-Ed	EFNEP	SNAP-Ed	EFNEP	SNAP-Ed	EFNEP	SNAP-Ed
Alaska	$256,298	$336,165	$263,078	$503,795	$263,080	$539,255	$262,925	$560,604
American Samoa	$100,581	-	$103,110	-	$103,110	-	$103,049	-
Arizona	$611,934	$10,491,479	$715,966	$14,240,323	$715,989	$13,864,856	$713,693	$13,233,284
California	$3,077,534	$104,701,291	$3,612,006	$136,029,753	$3,612,129	$126,849,658	$3,599,909	$116,529,713
Colorado	$601,234	$2,782,585	$663,703	$3,948,915	$663,717	$4,049,703	$662,348	$4,049,703
Guam	$100,612	$0	$103,831	$37,745	$103,831	$79,770	$ 103,757	$124,453
Hawaii	$334,066	$547,291	$347,341	$848,163	$347,344	$954,449	$ 347,038	$1,062,512
Idaho	$364,501	$683,210	$388,061	$1,061,631	$388,066	$1,164,532	$ 387,546	$1,229,485
Micronesia	$101,091	-	$106,401	-	$106,402	-	$ 106,277	-
Montana	$358,562	$589,534	$382,103	$854,549	$382,106	$892,796	$ 381,792	$892,796
Nevada	$255,551	$1,029,632	$293,525	$1,608,100	$293,533	$1,803,191	$ 292,712	$2,079,192
New Mexico	$559,813	$2,410,527	$596,281	$3,427,842	$596,289	$3,499,744	$ 595,454	$3,499,744
Northern Marianas Islands	$100,566	-	$102,751	-	$102,752	-	$ 102,698	-
Oregon	$543,808	$5,119,900	$600,465	$7,181,087	$600,477	$7,246,966	$ 599,222	$7,234,470
Utah	$377,477	$694,035	$410,541	$1,107,451	$410,548	$1,209,747	$ 409,822	$1,209,747
Washington	$713,516	$6,603,157	$794,970	$9,310,297	$794,988	$9,445,338	$793,168	$9,516,080
Wyoming	$270,216	$1,711,964	$275,850	$2,198,333	$275,851	$2,020,913	$ 275,720	$2,020,913

In November 2015, EFNEP and SNAP-Ed program leaders in the NIFA Western Region (including state agencies, departments of health, land-grant universities and colleges, and any other agency receiving SNAP-Ed funds) were invited to complete an electronic survey to assess PSE programming efforts. Policy, systems, and environmental change activities require sustainable community relationships. In many cases, a relationship that grows from a provision of direct nutrition education may provide a setting for PSE change approaches to occur. There is also considerable need for standardized language regarding the nature and types of PSE approaches from the USDA. This standardized PSE language will improve program leaders self-reporting efforts. Some programs that conduct PSE work do not report this work as PSE.

The first objective of this survey was to collect the site and location types where EFNEP and SNAP-Ed programming occurs, and how these location types relate to where PSE programming is ongoing or planned. The second objective of this survey was to measure PSE programming of survey respondents by whether they reported participating in PSE initiatives.

The survey was delivered electronically through Qualtrics over a two-month period. The response rate was 42%. Responses were received from 8 EFNEP, 7 SNAP-Ed and 3 coordinated EFNEP/SNAP Ed program leaders. Table 2 describes the representation of the survey respondents by program, role, and geographic location. States of the NIFA Western Region that were not represented due to non-response include: Alaska, Arizona, California, Hawai'i, Idaho, New Mexico, and Oregon.

Table 2: Representation By Program, State/ Territory, And Role (N=18)		
Response	Frequency	Percentage
Program Type		
EFNEP ONLY	8	44%
SNAP-Ed ONLY	7	39%
IA – Government Agency	2	
IA – Land Grant University/ College	4	
IA – Non-profit	1	
EFNEP and SNAP-Ed	3	17%
State or Territory		
Washington	4	22%
Federated States of Micronesia	2	11%
Utah	2	11%
Nevada	2	11%
Montana	2	11%
Colorado	2	11%
Palau	1	6%
Wyoming	1	6%
Not specified	2	11%
Role of Respondent		
State Coordinator/ Lead Manager	11	61%
SNAP-Ed Facilitator	1	1%
Principle Investigator	1	1%
Program Director	1	1%
Not specified	3	17%

Most EFNEP programming reported (n=8) is occurring in urban centers (62.5%). This is compared with SNAP-Ed respondents (n=7) who report that 43% of programming occurs in urban centers. Both EFNEP and SNAP-Ed programs reported a wide range of their programming working with the Hispanic population, from zero to 86%. While some programs do not serve Hispanics, in other programs the Hispanic population represents a large majority of those served by EFNEP and SNAP-Ed. The top three sites where EFNEP programming was reported include: schools, public housing, and Head Start locations. Similarly, the top three SNAP-Ed sites include: schools, public housing, and emergency food assistance sites. All SNAP-Ed respondents reported working in PSE, whereas only six out of eight (75%) EFNEP respondents confirmed working in PSE. The primary location for this PSE work in both programs was urban centers with populations of 50,000 or more. This points to gaps in PSE delivery for rural areas with populations less than 10,000 in the state being reported as a setting for PSE change work by either program.

PSE Locations

SNAP-Ed sites were counted as delivery sites within the SNAP-Ed Education and Administrative Reporting System (EARS). EFNEP sites were reported as program delivery sites within the Web-Based Nutrition Education Evaluation and Reporting System (WebNEERS). Given the relative sizes of both the EFNEP and SNAP-Ed programs, both are well-represented in a multitude of settings for program delivery. Schools were the setting of primary focus for both SNAP-Ed and EFNEP.

Table 3: Tools in Use by SNAP-Ed Implementers Conducting Environmental Assessments (n=10)		
Setting *Assessment Tool*	**# programs working in target area**	**# of those respondents using tool**
Grocery and Food Retail	2	
CX3 Tier 2 - Food Availability and Marketing - Store Survey[11]		2
Nutrition Environment Measures Survey - Store (NEMS-S)[12]		1
Nutrition Environment Measures Survey - Corner Store (NEMS-CS)[13]		1
Stock Healthy Shop Healthy Store Assessment Form[14]		1
Restaurants	1	
Nutrition Environment Measures Survey – Restaurant (NEMS-R)[15]		1
Emergency Food Assistance	2	
CX3-NF6 Food Bank Survey[16]		1
CX3-NF6 Emergency Food Outlet Survey[16]		1
Oregon Food Bank – Healthy Pantry 'Snapshot'[17]		1
Schools	2	
SPAN-ET (Oregon)[18]		1

Environmental Assessment Tools

EFNEP-only program respondents did not report the use any environmental assessment tools in the following settings: restaurants or fast-food, worksites, emergency food assistance, or schools (Table 3). In contrast, of the SNAP-Ed respondents used a variety of environmental tools. Worksites were not a place where either program used an environmental assessment tool to measure the healthfulness or change in the work setting, despite four respondents, two from each program, affirming that they have delivered or developed training and technical assistance (TA) for worksites. Each of the categories of environmental evaluation had at least one published, psychometrically tested assessment tool apart from emergency food assistance.

PSE and Training Opportunities
Similar to environmental assessments, there is large variation in the type and number of training opportunities offered by EFNEP and SNAP-Ed programs. The audiences of these trainings may include

internal staff or external stakeholders such as community members, school staff or grocery managers. Training and technical assistance may be offered by EFNEP supervisors or local SNAP-Ed staff in partnership with local agencies. Most community partnerships are not associated with the provision of training or technical assistance. This is an area where additional support may be focused to ensure successful implementation of PSE at the local level. Such support could come from an EFNEP state coordinator or local supervisor, lead implementing agency, or a larger training center, such as the RNECE Policy, Systems, and Environmental Change Center or the Center for Training and Research Translation (Center TRT) at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. Overall, SNAP-Ed is more engaged in the provision of technical assistance and training than EFNEP. Of the EFNEP respondents (n=8), two programs reported working within adult worksite and providing training or technical assistance to these worksites. These partnerships did not include usage of an environmental assessment tool. SNAP-Ed respondents did not report any partnership with worksites, a clear difference from EFNEP. SNAP-Ed respondents provided training or technical assistance to child care sites, food retail or grocery sites, and restaurant sites, whereas EFNEP program did not. Both programs reported being engaged with garden or gardening skills and emergency food assistance training and technical assistance.

EFNEP programs (n=6) held a wide range of partnerships with schools, from 5 to 51 school partners. Two of the EFNEP respondents reported not being partnered with schools. This work likely reflects direct education as only one of the eight EFNEP respondents reported working in PSE with schools. Most of the SNAP-Ed programs reported working with schools. SNAP-Ed held a great range of school partnerships from a minimum of 37 school partners to a maximum of 283 school partners. Survey respondents reported a variety of staff training topics planned for the program year of FY16.

This survey is limited by certain factors. The response rate is marginal for large population samples, given that 18 of the 42 individuals contacted responded (response rate 42.8%); however, the small sample size and nature of SNAP-Ed and EFNEP relationships within the NIFA Western Region should result in a higher response rate because leaders of SNAP-Ed IAs and EFNEP state coordinators would have been personally familiar with the individuals requesting a survey response, Karen Barale (RNECE-W Co-Director). The timing of the survey request was in November 2015, one month into FFY16 for SNAP-Ed, which may have lowered response rates through a conflict of respondents' time. Multiple requests for response were made directly to the organizational leaders identified by SNAP-Ed Connection's "State SNAP-Ed Contacts"[19] and EFNEP's "Coordinator Directory".[20] The results of the PSE survey within this report attempt to examine these programming efforts using existing metrics that were not designed to capture the allowable scope of SNAP-Ed and EFNEP activities. There is a growing need for validated and reliable metrics by which to measure changes in policy, systems related to health and food, and environmental change that results from SNAP-Ed or EFNEP programming efforts.

Summary

Overall, most EFNEP respondents reported delivering programing in urban centers with populations greater than 50,000 and 43% of SNAP-Ed respondents also reported urban centers as their primary settings. Rural areas with populations less than 10,000 were the least reported as places where either SNAP-Ed or EFNEP is delivered within this sample. This underscores a need to focus PSE efforts towards improving the health and food environments of less-densely populated areas, like those with less than 10,000 inhabitants. Neither SNAP-Ed or EFNEP respondents reported conducting PSE related work in low-income worksites. Such work sites might include career training centers, technical or trade schools that are not-for-profit, farming communities, and hospitality and food service workers. There is an opportunity to introduce worksite assessment tools to support PSE intervention measurement in worksites. Emergency food assistance sites are the third largest setting that SNAP-Ed delivers programming, both direct education and PSE. Evaluation is needed to corroborate the positive qualitative effects of SNAP-Ed partnerships within community food settings such as emergency food assistance sites.

In 2013, CSU researchers, along with a seven-member expert panel, reviewed SNAP-Ed State Plans and researched the literature to determine best practices in both direct delivery of nutrition education as well as indirect methods, such as social marketing. They identified 27 best practices in 5 areas: program design, program delivery, educator characteristics, educator training, and evaluation.[1]

As a follow-up to this work, CSU researchers conducted a survey with SNAP-Ed Implementing Agencies about staff development needs related to best practices. The survey was sent to all SNAP-Ed regional nutritionists for distribution to SNAP-Ed implementing agencies. Seventy responses were received from the survey conducted in 2013. Sixty responses were from implementing agencies; the other 10 responses were from State and Regional Personnel. A summary of the results for the 60 implementers is shown below. For 17 of the 27 Best Practices, 30% or more of the implementers were interested in staff development related to those Best Practices, particularly for the use of the Social Ecological Model in Program Design and Evaluation. In the Evaluation Domain, more than 30% of implementers were interested in staff development in 6 of 7 Best Practices. The most popular options for staff development were short webinars (or series of webinars) and self-paced trainings.

Table 4: Summary of survey responses from SNAP-Ed Implementing Agencies (n = 60)		
Best Practice Domain *(# Best Practices)*	*Confidence Level Range*	*Percent Interested in Staff Development for Most Requested Best Practices* *(>30% said yes definitely or yes probably)*
Program Design (8)	3.6 - 4.2	Social Ecological Model (42%); Theoretical Basis (38%)
Program Delivery (6)	3.6 - 3.9	Collaboration (35%); Learning Styles (32%); Fidelity (30%); Experiential Activities (30%)
Educator Characteristics (4)	3.3 - 3.6	Expertise in Teaching Methods (37%): Performance Expectations (32%)
Educator Training (3)	3.3 – 3.5	Ongoing Training (38%): Observation of Educators (33%): Initial Training (32%)
Evaluation (7)	3.0 – 3.6	Social Ecological Model (47%); Impact Assessment (43%); Sustained Behavior Change (40%); Process Evaluation (37%); Outcome Evaluation (33%); Formative Evaluation (32%)
1 = not comfortable with ability to apply this best practice; 2 = understand the concept but not comfortable applying it; 3 = fairly comfortable with best practice and my ability to apply it; 4 = confident in ability to apply the best practice; 5 = consider myself an expert		

A limitation of this survey was the small response from implementing agencies. The results suggest there is an interest in and a need for professional development around Best Practices, including PSE related topics.

---

[1] https://snaped.fns.usda.gov/snap/CSUBestPractices.pdf

USE OF DIRECT EDUCATION AND PSE ACTIVITES

In March 2015, RNECE-West researchers and a graduate nutrition class at Colorado State University conducted as survey of EFNEP and SNAP-Ed program leaders in the NIFA Western Region (including state agencies, departments of health, land-grant universities and colleges, and any other agency receiving SNAP-Ed funds). The goal of the survey was to assess direct education efforts, policy, systems, and environment programming in NIFA Western Region states and assess how SNAP-Ed and EFNEP evaluate their direct education and policy, systems, and the environment programming.

METHODS

A previous policy, systems and environment survey developed at RNECE-NE was modified to incorporate direct education and evaluation efforts. Questions were revised for clarity; question were added to address direct education and evaluation. Survey data was collection via Qualtrics, an electronic survey system. A Dropbox link was set up to collect any evaluation documents submitted.

Although the survey was sent out to all Western Region SNAP-Ed and EFNEP implementing agencies, and two reminders were sent within a three-week period, only 18 surveys were completed. This response rate was lower than expected.

Data were collected and frequencies were run using Qualtrics. Descriptive statistics were used to describe the data that was collected. Tables reflect frequencies; data were compiled into simple bar graphs. Due to the small sample size and open-ended questions, some qualitative analysis was done as well.

RESULTS

Respondents
Responses were received from 10 EFNEP, 15 SNAP-Ed and 4 "other" programs which represented 18 respondents, i.e., some coordinated multiple programs. Because of this, it was difficult to separate which responses reflected which program and to assign proper percentages.

Of the 18 respondents, 13 respondents indicated that they were a Land Grant University SNAP-Ed Implementing Agency, ten indicated that they were a Land Grant EFNEP agency, two respondents were another SNAP-Ed implementing agency, and two respondents indicated they were a nonprofit. Many of the agencies implemented EFNEP programs, SNAP-Ed programs, or both. Fifty-six percent of respondents were responsible for EFNEP, 83% were responsible for SNAP-Ed, and 22% were responsible for other programs, including Children's Health Living Program (a childhood obesity program), County programming, direct nutrition education not funded by SNAP-Ed, and the Hawaii Child Care Nutrition Program.

At least one response was received from the following: Colorado, Hawaii, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, and the Pacific territories. No responses were received from implementing agencies in Alaska, Arizona, California, or Idaho.

The two most common target audiences described were children ages 5-11 and parents and/or families. Sixteen IAs provided direct education and ten provided some form of PSE. Fewer used social media, social marketing, or web-based education strategies. Common settings for programming included: schools (15); community-based organizations (13); human service agencies (12); and 10 each at public housing, job training centers, neighborhood centers, and food banks/pantries. Twelve IAs employed paraprofessionals to deliver direct education, nine employed educators with a four-year degree, seven employed Registered Dietitians, and seven employed individuals with master's degrees.

Relative to evaluation of direct education, 16 IAs used pre/post assessment and two used a retrospective pre/post method. Only two IAs reported using comparison groups. The most common evaluation tools were questionnaires (14) and food recalls (9). Assessed behaviors included physical activity, food resource management, food security, food safety, and intake of fruits, vegetables, dairy, whole grains, and sugar sweetened beverages.

Thirteen respondents indicated they conduct some PSE activities, all within communities in which they are delivering direct education. Only seven IAs indicated they have evaluation in place for their PSE activities. The most common level of PSE change being targeted (5 each) were: multi-level, individual level, and/or organization levels. However, eight measured individual level outcomes (behaviors and knowledge) and only three assessed community level outcomes and two assessed organization level outcomes.

Given this is small sample, it is difficult to assess the full range of direct education and PSE efforts in the Western Region. Content analysis of the SNAP-Ed plans would provide a better assessment of current efforts. The responses suggest programing is diverse across the region (different sites, approaches and evaluation). As PSE efforts continue to grow, further assessment of programming efforts will help to provide direction for education and training as well as opportunities for collaboration.

OVERALL LIMITATIONS OF RNECE-W ASSESSMENT

This assessment of three surveys taken together examines different perspectives of the FFY16 program years of SNAP-Ed and EFNEP within the NIFA Western Region. These programs are unique and serve interrelated audiences of low-income Americans. SNAP-Ed may award program dollars to any agency that meets the criteria for an implementing agency as determined by the scope of each state's agency that administers the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). Therefore, there is a wide variety in the organizational cultures and sizes of SNAP-Ed IAs and their subcontractors working in local communities. In contrast, the EFNEP is only administered by land-grant university extension services. Thus, there are many land-grant universities that receive both SNAP-Ed and EFNEP funds to conduct beneficial community programming in coordination with other not-for-profits or governmental agencies that may apply SNAP-Ed funds to serve audiences such as older adults without children and military veterans without children in the home. One limitation of this assessment would be the low survey response rates. The varying organizational structures of SNAP-Ed IAs and EFNEP land-grant universities present distinctive challenges towards surveying the full impact of SNAP-Ed and EFNEP in PSE change and direct nutrition education. Internal staffing changes may result in out of date contact information or result in unanswered survey requests from the RNECE-W. Furthermore, it is difficult to ascertain all of

the subcontracting agencies delivering SNAP-Ed in local communities and contact them for a survey regarding FFY16 programming. States of the NIFA Western Region that were not represented in the PSE settings and evaluation/ assessments survey due to non-response include: Alaska, Arizona, California, Hawai'i, Idaho, New Mexico, and Oregon. No responses were received from implementing agencies in Alaska, Arizona, California, or Idaho for direct education and PSE survey. This indicates a zero-response rate means their programming efforts are not represented within the results of this assessment. Another limitation of this assessment is that it reflects self-reports of planned activities in direct education and PSE change within the upcoming program year, FFY16, at the time of the surveys.

These regional assessments are limited by time constraints for respondent recruitment and response; zero financial incentive because public, governmental employees cannot receive financial incentives for just doing their jobs; many of the program leaders of SNAP-Ed and EFNEP are over-loaded with work and if they are not required to complete a survey by their funders, then they aren't going to take the 20 plus minutes to complete this survey. There is little to no common, shared knowledge on vocabulary related to PSE and how PSE relates to direct education.

CONCLUSIONS

The understanding of how PSE and direct education can work together is evolving. Taken collectively, this survey information indicates a need for collaborative training for both SNAP-Ed and EFNEP programs. Further review and content analysis of SNAP-Ed year-end report and EFNEP annual reports will help to identify training needs. Given the limited reported use of environmental assessment tools, training and more standardized tools for data comparison should help strengthen the program evaluation and recommendations.

Common language and shared vocabulary detailing the appropriate and complementary efforts that can be made by each respective program will greatly enhance positive messaging on the community level.

REFERENCES

1. Baker, S., Auld, G., MacKinnon, C. Best practices in nutrition education for low-income audiences. *United States Food and Nutrition Service*. 2014. Accessed from < https://snaped.fns.usda.gov/snap/CSUBestPractices.pdf>
2. Story M, Kaphingst KM, Robinson-O'Brien R, Glanz K. Creating healthy food and eating environments: policy and environmental approaches. *Annual Review of Public Health.* 2008;29(1):253-272.
3. United States Food and Nutrition Service. The State Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Education (SNAP-Ed) Plan Guidance for Fiscal Year FFY13. *United States Department of Agriculture*. 2012.
4. Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010, Pub. L. No. 111-296. (2010).
5. SNAP-Ed Strategies & Interventions: An Obesity Prevention Toolkit for States April 2016 Update. *USDA Food and Nutrition Service.* Accessed from < https://snaped.fns.usda.gov/snap/SNAPEdStrategiesAndInterventionsToolkitForStates.pdf>
6. United States Food and Nutrition Service. The State Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Education (SNAP-Ed) Plan Guidance for Fiscal Year FFY15. *United States Department of Agriculture*. 2014.
7. United States Food and Nutrition Service. The State Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Education (SNAP-Ed) Plan Guidance for Fiscal Year FFY16. *United States Department of Agriculture*. 2015.
8. SNAP-Ed Strategies & Interventions: An Obesity Prevention Toolkit for States April 2016 Update. *USDA Food and Nutrition Service.* Accessed from < https://snaped.fns.usda.gov/snap/SNAPEdStrategiesAndInterventionsToolkitForStates.pdf>
9. "SNAP-Ed Toolkit: Obesity Prevention Interventions and Evaluation Framework." 2016.; https://snapedtoolkit.org/. Accessed December 6, 2016.
10. "The Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Policies." NIFA Program Leadership. Updated 2015. Accessed from <https://nifa.usda.gov/sites/default/files/program/EFNEP%20Policy%20Document%202015%20Update%20P1.pdf>
11. Ghirardelli, A., Quinn, V., Sugerman, S. Reliability of a retail food store survey and development of an accompanying retail scoring system to communicate survey findings and identify vendors for healthful food and marketing initiatives. *Journal of nutrition education and behavior.* 2011; 43 (4).
12. Glanz, K., Sallis, J., Saelens, B., Frank, L. Nutrition environment measures survey in stores (NEMS-S): development and evaluation. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine.* 2007; 32 (4): 282-289.
13. Cavanaugh, E., Mallya, G., Brensinger, C., Tierney, A., Glanz, K. Nutrition environments in corner stores in Philadelphia. *Preventive Medicine.* 2013;56(2):149-151.
14. "Stock Healthy, Shop Healthy." University of Missouri-Extension. 2016. Accessed from <http://extension.missouri.edu/stockhealthy/home.aspx.> Accessed on: May 13, 2014.
15. Saelens, B., Glanz, K., Sallis, J., Frank, L.. Nutrition environment measures study in restaurants (NEMS-R): Development and evaluation. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine.* 2007; 32 (4): 273-281.
16. "CX3 Tier 2 - Food Bank and Emergency Food Outlets." Califonia Department of Public Health. 2016. Accessed from

http://www.cdph.ca.gov/programs/cpns/Pages/CX3_T2_FoodBank_EmergFoodSurvey.aspx. Accessed on: May 13, 2014.

17. Turner, J., Shapiro-Shellaby, M., Weaver, E., Streit, K., Quinn, M. Healthy pantry initiative: strategies for encouraging healthy choices at the pantry. Oregon Food Bank. 2014. Accessed from <http://healthyfoodbankhub.feedingamerica.org/resource/healthy-pantry-initiative-toolkit/.> Accessed on: February 25, 2015, 2015.

18. John, D., Gunter, K., Jackson, J., Manore, M. Developing the school physical activity and nutrition environment tool to measure qualities of the obesogenic context. J*ournal of school health.* 2016; 86 (1): 39-47.

19. United States Food and Nutrition Service. State SNAP-Ed Contacts. 2016. Accessed from <https://snaped.fns.usda.gov/state-contacts.> Accessed on: October 20, 2015.

20. "Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) Coordinator Directory." National Institute of Food and Agriculture. Access from < https://nifa.usda.gov/sites/default/files/resource/EFNEP%20Coordinator%20Directory%20-%2011.2015.pdf>

APPENDICES

A.1. Direct Education and PSE Activity Survey

Welcome to the Western Region Nutrition Education Center of Excellence Survey of Current Direct Education and Policy, Systems and Environment (PSE) Targeting Adults

The survey is specifically for EFNEP and SNAP-Ed Implementing Agency leaders. The purpose is to understand the characteristics of your SNAP-Ed and EFNEP programs, in particular your direct education efforts with adults, including specific outcomes and evaluation tools being used. This survey will support a larger needs assessment and help direct Center activities.

The first section of the survey asks for general program information. The following sections ask specifics of direct nutrition education and complementary Policy, Systems, and Environment (PSE) activities. A future survey will gather more information specific to PSE.

We are requesting contact information in case we need to call you to better understand your programming.

This survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

Thank you for your time in helping with this effort.

PART ONE: Description of your current EFNEP and/or SNAP-Ed program

Identify Your State/Territory:

Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, American Samoa, the Federated States of Micronesia, Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands

Type of Agency/Organization: *Check all that apply.*

Land Grant University SNAP-Ed Implementing Agency
Land Grant University EFNEP
Other SNAP-Ed Implementing Agency
Non-profit
Public Health
Other (please specify*)* _____ .

Which programs are you responsible for? *Check all that apply.*

EFNEP
SNAP-Ed
Other (please specify): _____ .

Who is submitting the survey? *Please enter your name:*
Email address:
Telephone number (and extension if applicable):
Agency/Organization Name and Address:
Organization
Address
Organization
Address <> **State Zip code**
Line 1 Line 2 **City** Abbreviation 5-digit
Agency/Organization Name

Please provide information about the location of the program.
What types of areas does your program reach? *Check all that apply.*
Statewide
Major cities
Small cities
Suburban communities
Rural areas

What is the approximate number of participants reached per year?
Direct contacts: Indicate number below
Indirect contacts: Indicate number below

Which of the following audiences does your program target? *Check all that apply.*
Infants and/or children less than 5 years old
Children 5-11 years
Youth without children
Adults without children
Parents
Families (parents and children combined)
Seniors (65+ years of age)
Providers who serve the target population

Which two audiences does your program work with the most?

What types of intervention approaches are currently used by your program? *Check all that apply.*

Direct education of the target population

Direct education of providers who serve the target population

Web-based education of the target population

Web-based education of providers who serve the target population

Social media (use of Facebook, Twitter, etc.)

Social marketing (a disciplined, research-based intervention delivered through multiple channels, influencing large numbers of people in the target audience).

Policy, systems, and environmental change (written or unwritten decisions that result in new courses of action, activities and/or built environments that impact the target audience).

Other (please specify):

Which two are the most common approaches in your program?

Where are your interventions delivered? *Check all that apply.*

After school programs

Child care settings

Community-based organizations

Faith Based organizations

Food Banks/Pantries

Healthcare settings

Homes

Libraries

Neighborhoods/Neighborhood Centers

Public Housing Neighborhoods

Schools

Social/Human Service Settings

Workplaces that employ/serve low-income

Other (please specify):

Which two are the most common locations in which you deliver your program?

Who in your organization delivers the program directly? *Check all that apply.*

Certified health educators

Master in Public Health

Nutrition and/or Family and Consumer Science professionals

Nutrition paraprofessional educators

Registered Dietitians

Social workers

Other (please specify):

PART TWO: DIRECT EDUCATION

Do you currently engage in direct education efforts with adult populations?

Yes

No

Describe direct education efforts within adult populations

Intervention Reach: *Check all that apply*

In-person

Social media

None

Other

Number of sessions/lessons:

Number served:

What are your target sites for adult direct education? *Check all that apply*

Community

Job Training

Farmers Market

Workplaces

Homes

Human Service Agencies

Food Banks/Pantries

Public Health Departments

Other: *please specify*

What curricula do you use for your adult participants? *Check all that apply*

Eating Smart Being Active (Colorado State University/University of California Davis)

Eating Smart Moving More (North Carolina State University)

Eating Right is Basic – 4 (Michigan)

Other _____

What outcomes do your evaluate in your programs?

We do not collect outcome data

Direct Education only

PSE Efforts only

PSE & Direction Education

What type of individual behavior outcomes are included in your evaluation instruments for adults? *Check all that apply.*

Dietary Intake Fruit and Vegetable

Dairy

"Soda"

Whole grain

Food Safety behaviors

Physical activity

Food resource management behaviors

Other _____

What is your evaluation design for direct education programs? *Check all that apply*

Pre/Post Assessment

Retrospective Pre test

Non-randomized control group/Reference population

Other (please describe):

PART THREE: POLICY SYSTEMS AND THE ENVRIONMENT AND DIRECT EDUCATION INTEGRATION

Are you currently conducting PSE activities?

Yes

No

Describe your PSE activities*:*

Number of people reached through PSE efforts:

Please list other organizations/groups that are partnering with you in PSE efforts

Do you integrate PSE and Direct Education?
Yes
No

Please report on your most promising or successful integrated PSE & direct education effort(s).

Identify the name of the initiative:

In 1,000 characters or less, briefly identify the project goals and/or key objectives:

In 2,000 characters or less, briefly describe the activities undertaken in the integrated effort:

What level(s) of change does the intervention target? *Check all that apply.*
Individual level
Community level
Organization level
Multi-level

Does this initiative have an evaluation plan in place*.*
Yes
No

What is the design of the evaluation plan?
Randomized control
Non-randomized control group/Reference population
Pre/Post Assessment
Other (please describe):

What level of outcome do you measure? *Check all that apply.*
Individual level
Community level
Organization level
Multi-level

If Individual and/or Multi-level outcome data are being collected, what is being measured?
Check all that apply.
Individual knowledge
Individual attitudes
Individual behaviors
Other (please specify):

If Community, Organization and/or Multi-level outcome data are being collected, what is being measured?
Check all that apply.
Environmental change
Policy change
Systems change
Other (please specify):

PART FOUR: EVALUATION TOOLS
If you have an evaluation instrument to assess direct education and/or PSE efforts, would you be willing to provide a copy to us electronically?
Yes
No

You have indicated you would be willing to provide an electronic copy of your instrument.
Please upload your file here:
Browse…

If you have an evaluation or year-end report on direct education and/or PSE efforts, would you be willing to provide a copy to us electronically?
Yes
No

You have indicated you would be willing to provide an electronic copy of your evaluation report.
Please upload your file here:

A.2. PSE SURVEY

ET1 Thank you for taking this survey. The Western Region Nutrition Education and Obesity Prevention Center of Excellence (RNECE-W) is asking for your help in understanding the interventions underway in your state that support of policy, systems and environmental change (PSE) in federally supported nutrition education programs. By taking a few minute to provide information about your PSE interventions, you will be helping us catalog interventions, assess possible training needs and inform the research agenda for the Center.   You have been selected to complete this survey because of you represent one of these groups: the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) or the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) or the SNAP Education Program (SNAP-Ed) in the NIFA Western Region: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, American Samoa, the Federated States of Micronesia, Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands.

EQ1 Do you represent EFNEP in your State or Region?

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To We would like to inquire about the locations...If No Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Block

ET2 We would like to inquire about the locations where your EFNEP program is connected within the community. Please complete the following questions using your state 5-Year EFNEP Plan.

EQ2 Please enter the number of location sites and community partnerships included in your EFNEP 5-Year Plan (as reported in Delivery Sites/Locations and Community Partnerships in WebNEERS):

	# of Different Program Delivery Sites/Location (1)	# of Community Partnerships (2)
Adult Education & Training Sites (1)		
Adults Rehabilitation Centers (2)		
Faith Organizations/Churches (3)		
Community Centers (4)		
Emergency Food Assistance sites (5)		
Extension Offices (6)		
Farmers' Market (7)		
Food Stores (8)		
Head Start Sites (9)		
Health Care Sites (10)		
Libraries (11)		
Other youth education sites (12)		
Public Housing (13)		
Schools (14)		
Shelters (15)		
SNAP Offices (16)		
WIC Program Sites (17)		
Work sites (18)		
Other (please specify): (19)		
Other (please specify): (20)		

EQ3 Where does most of your state's EFNEP programming occur?

○ Rural areas (population less than 10,000) (1)
○ Towns or suburb areas (population between 10,000 and 50,000) (2)
○ Urban cities (population of more than 50,000) (3)

EQ4 What percentage of your EFNEP program participants identify as Hispanic?

ET3 Now we would like you to think about the different settings that EFNEP works with policy, systems, or environmental change.

EQ5 Does your EFNEP program work in policy, systems and/or environmental change?

○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To Where does most of your EFNEP program...If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Does your EFNEP program provide Master Gardener...

EQ6 Where does most of your EFNEP program's policy, systems, and environmental change efforts   occur?

○ Rural areas (population less than 10,000) (1)
○ Towns or suburb areas (population between 10,000-50,000) (2)
○ Urban cities (population of 50,000 or more) (3)

EQ7 Please rank how important the following activities are to your EFNEP program work on policy, systems, and environmental change efforts within local communities.

	Not important (1)	A little important (2)	Somewhat Important (3)	Very Important (4)
Conduct needs assessments (1)	○	○	○	○
Develop action plans (2)	○	○	○	○
Evaluate implementation (3)	○	○	○	○
Develop policies (4)	○	○	○	○
Implement action plans (5)	○	○	○	○
Change physical environments (6)	○	○	○	○
Make recommendations (7)	○	○	○	○
Provide information (8)	○	○	○	○
Support policy adoption (9)	○	○	○	○
Support activities (10)	○	○	○	○

EQ8 Please select all of the locations where your EFNEP program is engaged in policy, systems, and environmental change efforts. Select all that apply.

❑ Adult Education & Training Sites (1)
❑ Adult Rehabilitation Centers (2)
❑ Faith Organizations (3)
❑ Community Centers (4)
❑ Emergency Food Assistance Sites (5)
❑ Extension Offices (6)
❑ Farmers' Markets (7)
❑ Retail Food Stores (8)
❑ Head Start Sites (9)
❑ Health Care Sites (10)
❑ Libraries (11)
❑ Other Youth Education Sites (12)
❑ Public Housing (13)
❑ Schools (14)
❑ SNAP Offices (15)
❑ WIC Program Sites (16)
❑ Work sites (17)
❑ Other (18) _____

EQ11 Does your EFNEP program provide Master Gardener or gardening skills training?

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To How many gardening skills training do...If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Does your EFNEP program partner with FARMERS'...

EQ12 How many Master Gardener or gardening skills trainings do you provide each year?

❍ Please enter number of yearly trainings: (1) _____
❍ I don't know (2)

EQ13 Does your EFNEP program partner with FARMERS' MARKETS?

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To How many of your Farmers' Market partners...If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Does your agency work with any CHILD...

EQ14 How many of your EFNEP Farmers' Market partners accept SNAP benefits?

❍ Please enter the number of Farmers' Markets that accept EBT (1) _____
❍ I don't know (2)
❍ None (3)

EQ15 Of your EFNEP Farmers' Market partners, how many provide financial incentives for using SNAP/ EBT on fruit and vegetable purchases? (For example: Health Bucks, Fresh Bucks, Double Up Food Bucks, or similar)

❍ Please enter number of Farmers' Markets with incentives for fruits and vegetables (1) _____
❍ I don't know (2)
❍ None (3)

EQ16 Does your EFNEP program partner with CHILD CARE CENTERS?

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To How many do you know of that have a p...If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Does your agency partner with any GROCERY...

EQ17 Of the child care centers that you partner with, what percentage have a policy on health, nutrition, and/or physical activity?

EQ18 As part of your EFNEP program, have you developed or delivered any training or technical assistance regarding health policy for child care centers?

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)

EQ19 Does your EFNEP program partner with any GROCERY RETAILERS (corner stores, convenience stores, mini-marts, large grocery chains, supermarkets)?

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To Have you developed or delivered any training...If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Are there any mandatory menu labeling...

EQ20 Have you developed or delivered any training or technical assistance regarding environmental changes for grocery retailers that support healthy eating?

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)

EQ21 As part of your EFNEP programming, have you completed any environmental assessments or scans of grocery retail partners?

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To In your EFNEP program, what retail environmental... If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Are there any mandatory menu labeling...

EQ22 In your EFNEP program, what retail environmental assessment(s) have you used? Select all that apply

❑ Nutrition Environment Measures Survey - Store (NEMS-S) (1)
❑ Nutrition Environment Measures Survey - Corner Store (NEMS-CS) (2)
❑ Rudd Center Revised Nutrition Environment Measures Survey - Retail (NEMS-S) (3)
❑ CX3 Tier 2 - Food Availability and Marketing - Store Survey (4)
❑ Stock Healthy Shop Healthy Store Assessment Form (5)
❑ Other (please specify): (6) _____

EQ24 Are there any mandatory menu labeling laws for fat, including total fat, trans fat, or saturated fat within your state or region?

○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)
○ I don't know (3)

EQ25 Does your EFNEP program partner with any RESTAURANTS OR FAST-FOOD VENUES?

○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To Have you developed or delivered... If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Does EFNEP program partners with WORK...

EQ26   As part of your EFNEP program, have you developed or delivered any training or technical assistance for restaurants or fast-food venues?

○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)

EQ27 As part of your EFNEP program, have you completed any environmental assessments or scans in restaurants or fast-food venues?

○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To What retail environmental assessment/...If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Does EFNEP program partners with WORK...

EQ28 What retail environmental assessment(s) have you used? Select all that apply

❑ Nutrition Environment Measures Survey - Restaurant (NEMS-R) (1)
❑ Other (please specify): (2) _____

EQ29 Does your EFNEP program partner with WORK SITES?

○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To Have you developed or delivered any training... If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Does your EFNEP program partner with EMERGENCY...

EQ30 As part of your EFNEP program, have you developed or delivered any training or technical assistance regarding healthier environmental changes environmental changes promoting healthier work sites?

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)

EQ31 As part of your EFNEP program, have you completed any environmental assessments or scans of these work sites?

❍ Yes. Please enter name of the assessment or scan. (1) _____
❍ No (2)

EQ32 Does your EFNEP program partner with EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE SITES (Example: food banks, food pantries)?

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)
If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To As part of your EFNEP program, have you developed or delivered... If No Is Selected, Then Skip To The next section of questions explore...

EQ33 As part of your EFNEP program, have you developed or delivered any training or technical assistance regarding environmental change to promote healthy food choices at Emergency Food Assistance Sites?

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)

EQ34 As part of your EFNEP program, have you completed any environmental assessments or scans with Emergency Food Assistance Sites?

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)
If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To Which food bank or pantry environment...If No Is Selected, Then Skip To The next section of questions explore...

EQ35 Which food bank or pantry environmental assessments or scans have you used? Select all that apply.

- ❑ CX3 - NF6 Food Banks Survey (1)
- ❑ CX3 - NF6 Emergency Food Outlet Survey (2)
- ❑ Oregon Food Bank - Healthy Pantry Snapshot (3)
- ❑ Feeding America Healthy Food Bank Hub (4)
- ❑ Alaska Food Bank Scan (5)
- ❑ Other (please specify): (6) _____

ET4 The next section of questions explores the types of programming your EFNEP program might conduct with local education agencies who qualify as Title 1 Schools with 50% or more of the student population receiving free and reduced meals.

EQ37 How many schools does your EFNEP program partner with in a year?

- ❍ Please enter number of schools (1) _____
- ❍ I don't know (2)
- ❍ None (3)

If Please enter number of schools Is Greater Than or Equal to 1, Then Skip To Of these schools, how many integrate...If I don't know Is Selected, Then Skip To Does your EFNEP program partner with...If None Is Selected, Then Skip To Does your EFNEP program partner with...

EQ38 Of these schools, how many integrate nutrition education into K-12 academic standards?

- ❍ Please enter number of schools: (1) _____
- ❍ I don't know (2)

EQ39 Of the school districts that you work in, how many have a policy to procure locally sourced food for school meals?

- ❍ Please enter number of schools districts: (1) _____
- ❍ I don't know (2)

EQ36 Does your EFNEP program partner with schools to conduct interventions for policy, systems, and environmental change?

- ❍ Yes (1)
- ❍ No (2)

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To Please indicate which of these policy...If No Is Selected, Then Skip To The next series of questions asks about...

EQ40 Please indicate which of these policy, systems and environmental change strategies that you conduct as part of your EFNEP school programming:

	Yes (1)	No (2)
Developing an action plan towards increasing water consumption (1)	❍	❍
Conducting walkability assessments in partnership with schools (2)	❍	❍
Conducting bikeability assessments in partnership with schools (3)	❍	❍
Implementing safe routes to schools in partnership with schools (4)	❍	❍
Revising the local school wellness policies (5)	❍	❍
Serving on school wellness committees (6)	❍	❍

EQ41 Does your EFNEP program evaluate school wellness policies using a specific evaluation tool?

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To Which tool does your EFNEP Program use... If No Is Selected, Then Skip To The next series of questions asks about...

EQ42 Which tools does your EFNEP Program use to evaluate school wellness policies? Select all that apply.

❑ WellSAT (Rudd Center) (1)
❑ SPAN-ET (Oregon) (2)
❑ Action for Healthy Kids Wellness Policy Tool (AFHK) (3)
❑ School Health Index (CDC) (4)
❑ Other (5) _____

ET5 The next series of questions asks about different types of social marketing interventions that your EFNEP program may pursue in the future.

EQ43 Currently, are social marketing and/or awareness campaigns a part of your EFNEP plan?

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To Which topics below are included in... If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Are you currently planning or implement...

EQ44 Which topics below are included in a social marketing campaign in your EFNEP plan. Select all that apply.

- ❑ Community/ school gardens (1)
- ❑ Early childhood health (2)
- ❑ Farmers' Markets (3)
- ❑ Farm-to-Fork (4)
- ❑ Farm-to-School (5)
- ❑ Food Standards for School Meals (6)
- ❑ Healthy Food Pantries/ Food Banks (7)
- ❑ Healthy Beverage Standards (8)
- ❑ Healthy Retail (9)
- ❑ Joint Use Agreements (10)
- ❑ Healthy Restaurants (11)
- ❑ Safe Routes to School (12)
- ❑ School Wellness Policies (13)
- ❑ Structured Physical Activity (14)
- ❑ School Water Consumption (15)
- ❑ Work site Wellness (16)
- ❑ Other: (please specify) (17) _____

EQ46 What type of messages would be the highest priority for a social marketing campaign for your EFNEP program?

	High priority (1)	Medium priority (2)	Not a priority (3)
Fruit and vegetable messages (1)	❍	❍	❍
Healthy beverage messages (2)	❍	❍	❍
Messages targeting African-American audiences (3)	❍	❍	❍
Messages targeting Hispanic/Latino Audiences (4)	❍	❍	❍
Message to support healthy school environments (K-8) (5)	❍	❍	❍
Messages to support healthy retail stores within low-income communities (6)	❍	❍	❍
Message to support physical activity promotion (7)	❍	❍	❍
Other (please specify): (8)	❍	❍	❍

EQ45 Are you planning or implementing social media as a strategy to support EFNEP goals? (Example: Facebook pages, Twitter, Pinterest)

❍ Yes, I am currently implementing a social media strategy. (1)
❍ No, but I am planning to implement a social media strategy in the future. (2)
❍ No, but I am interested in implementing social media strategies in the future. (3)
❍ No, I do not implement or plan to implement social media. (4)

EQ47 Which staff training topics below are part of your EFNEP staff training plan for this year? Select all that apply.

❑ Community/ school gardens (1)
❑ Early childhood health (2)
❑ Farmers' Markets (3)
❑ Farm-to-Fork (4)
❑ Farm-to-School (5)
❑ Food Standards for School Meals (6)
❑ Healthy Food Pantries/ Food Banks (7)
❑ Healthy Beverage Standards (8)
❑ Healthy Retail (9)
❑ Joint Use Agreements (10)
❑ Healthy Restaurants (11)
❑ Safe Routes to School (12)
❑ School Wellness Policies (13)
❑ Structured Physical Activity (14)
❑ School Water Consumption (15)
❑ Work site Wellness (16)
❑ Other: (please specify) (17) _____

EQ48 EFNEP supervisors are often members of community coalitions or committees that address policy, systems and environmental change. Which of the topics listed below are currently a focus of coalitions or committees that your supervisors attend? Select all that apply.

- ❑ Community/ school gardens (1)
- ❑ Early childhood health (2)
- ❑ Farmers' Markets (3)
- ❑ Farm-to-Fork (4)
- ❑ Farm-to-School (5)
- ❑ Food Standards for School Meals (6)
- ❑ Healthy Food Pantries/ Food Banks (7)
- ❑ Healthy Beverage Standards (8)
- ❑ Healthy Retail (9)
- ❑ Joint Use Agreements (10)
- ❑ Healthy Restaurants (11)
- ❑ Safe Routes to School (12)
- ❑ School Wellness Policies (13)
- ❑ Structured Physical Activity (14)
- ❑ School Water Consumption (15)
- ❑ Work site Wellness (16)
- ❑ Other: (please specify) (17) _____

SQ1 Do you represent SNAP-Ed in your State or Region?

- ❍ Yes (1)
- ❍ No (2)

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To Please select what best describes you...If No Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Block

SQ2 Please select what best describes your agency's role in SNAP-Ed.

- ❍ State Agency (1)
- ❍ Implementing Agency - Non-profit (2)
- ❍ Implementing Agency - Government Agency (3)
- ❍ Implementing Agency - Land Grant University (4)
- ❍ Other (please specify): (5) _____

If State Agency Is Not Selected, Then Skip To We would like to inquire about the lo...

SQ3 Is your State Agency also an Implementing Agency?

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To End of BlockST1 We would like to inquire about the locations where your SNAP-Ed program is connected within the community. Please complete the following questions using your SNAP-Ed Plan submitted in FFY15.

SQ4 Please enter the number of location sites and community partnerships included in your SNAP-Ed Plan (as reported in SNAP-Ed Delivery Site in EARS):

	# of Different Program Delivery Sites/Location (1)
Adult Education & Training Sites (1)	
Adults Rehabilitation Center (2)	
Faith Organizations/Churches (3)	
Community Centers (4)	
Emergency Food Assistance sites (5)	
Extension Offices (6)	
Farmers' Market (7)	
Retail Food Stores (8)	
Head Start Sites (9)	
Health Care Sites (10)	
Libraries (11)	
Other youth education sites (12)	
Public Housing (13)	
Schools (14)	
Shelters (15)	
SNAP Offices (16)	
WIC Program Sites (17)	
Work sites (18)	
Other (please specify): (19)	
Other (please specify): (20)	

SQ5 Where does most of your state's SNAP-Ed programming occur?

❍ Rural areas (population less than 10,000) (1)
❍ Towns or suburb areas (population between 10,000 and 50,000) (2)
❍ Urban cities (population of more than 50,000) (3)

SQ6 What percentage of your SNAP-Ed program participants identify as Hispanic?

ST2 Now we would like you to think about the different settings that your SNAP-Ed program works in policy, systems, or environmental change.

SQ7 Does your SNAP-Ed program work in policy, systems and/or environmental change?

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To Where does most of your SNAP-Ed program's policy...If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Does your SNAP-Ed program provide MASTER GARDENER...

SQ8 Where does most of your SNAP-Ed program's policy, systems, and environmental change work occur?

❍ Rural areas (population less than 10,000) (1)
❍ Towns or suburb areas (population between 10,000-50,000) (2)
❍ Urban cities (population of 50,000 or more) (3)

SQ9 Please rank how important the following activities are to your SNAP-Ed program efforts on policy, systems, and environmental change interventions within local communities.

	Not important (1)	A little important (2)	Somewhat Important (3)	Very Important (4)
Conduct needs assessments (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Develop action plans (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Evaluate implementation (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Develop policies (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Implement action plans (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Change physical environments (6)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Make recommendations (7)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Provide information (8)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Support policy adoption (9)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Support activities (10)	❍	❍	❍	❍

SQ10 Please select all of the location where your SNAP-Ed program is engaged in policy, systems, and environmental change efforts. Select all that apply.

❑ Adult Education & Training Sites (1)
❑ Adult Rehabilitation Centers (2)
❑ Faith Organizations (3)
❑ Community Centers (4)
❑ Emergency Food Assistance Sites (5)
❑ Extension Offices (6)
❑ Farmers' Markets (7)
❑ Retail Food Stores (8)
❑ Head Start Sites (9)
❑ Health Care Sites (10)
❑ Libraries (11)
❑ Other Youth Education Sites (12)
❑ Public Housing (13)
❑ Schools (14)

- ❑ SNAP Offices (15)
- ❑ WIC Program Sites (16)
- ❑ Work sites (17)
- ❑ Other (18) _____

SQ11 Does your SNAP-Ed program provide Master Gardener or gardening skills training?

- ❍ Yes (1)
- ❍ No (2)

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To How many gardening skills training do...If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Does your SNAP-ED program partner with FARMERS'...

SQ12 How many gardening skills training do you provide each year?

- ❍ Please enter number of yearly trainings: (1) _____
- ❍ I don't know (2)

SQ13 Does your SNAP-Ed program partner with FARMERS' MARKETS?

- ❍ Yes (1)
- ❍ No (2)

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To How many of your farmers market partners...If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Does your agency work with any CHILD ...

SQ14 How many of your SNAP-Ed Farmers' Market partners accept SNAP benefits?

- ❍ Please enter number of Farmers' Markets that accept EBT (1) _____
- ❍ I don't know (2)
- ❍ None (3)

SQ15 Of your SNAP-Ed Farmers' Market partners, how many provide financial incentives for using SNAP/ EBT on fruit and vegetable purchases? (For example: Health Bucks, Fresh Bucks, Double Up Food Bucks, or similar)

- ❍ Please enter the number of farmer's markets with incentives for fruits and vegetables (1)
  _____
- ❍ I don't know (2)
- ❍ None (3)

SQ16 Does your SNAP-Ed program partner with CHILD CARE CENTERS?

○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To How many have a policy...If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Does your agency partner with any GROCERY...

SQ17 Of the Child Care Centers that your SNAP-Ed program partners with, how many have a policy on health, nutrition, and/or physical activity?

○ Please enter number of center with policy (1) _____
○ I don't know (2)
○ None (3)

SQ18 As part of your SNAP-Ed program, have you developed or delivered any training or technical assistance regarding health policy for Child Care Centers?

○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)

SQ19 Does your SNAP-Ed program partner with any GROCERY RETAILERS (corner stores, convenience stores, mini-marts, large grocery chains, supermarkets)?

○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Are there any mandatory menu labeling...

SQ20 Have you developed or delivered any training or technical assistance regarding environmental changes for Retail Grocery Partners to support healthy eating?

○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)

SQ21 As part of your SNAP-Ed programming, have you completed any environmental assessments or scans with Retail Grocery Partners?

○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Are there any mandatory menu labeling...

SQ22 Which retail environmental assessment(s) have you used? Select all that apply

❑ Nutrition Environment Measures Survey - Store (NEMS-S) (1)
❑ Nutrition Environment Measures Survey - Corner Store (NEMS-CS) (2)
❑ Rudd Center Revised Nutrition Environment Measures Survey - Retail (NEMS-S) (3)
❑ CX3 Tier 2 - Food Availability and Marketing - Store Survey (4)
❑ Stock Healthy Shop Healthy Store Assessment Form (5)
❑ Other (please specify): (6) _____

SQ23 Are there any mandatory menu labeling laws for fat, including total fat, trans fat, or saturated fat within your state or region?

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)
❍ I don't know (3)

SQ24 Does your SNAP-Ed program partner with any RESTAURANTS OR FAST-FOOD VENUES?

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Does your SNAP-Ed program partner with...

SQ25   As part of your SNAP-Ed program, have you developed or delivered any training or technical assistance for restaurants or fast-food venues?

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)

SQ26 As part of your SNAP-Ed program, have you completed any environmental assessments or scans in restaurants or fast-food venues?

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Does your SNAP-Ed program partner with...

SQ27 Which retail environmental assessment(s) have you used? Select all that apply

❑ Nutrition Environment Measures Survey - Restaurant (NEMS-R) (1)
❑ Other (please specify): (2) _____

SQ28 Does your SNAP-Ed program partner with WORK SITES?

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To Have you developed or delivered any training... If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Does your SNAP-Ed program partner...

SQ29 As part of your SNAP-Ed program, have you developed or delivered any training or technical assistance regarding environmental changes promoting healthier work sites?

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)

SQ30 As part of your SNAP-Ed program, have you completed any environmental assessments or scans of these work sites?

❍ Yes, please specify the name of the assessment or scan: (1) _____
❍ No (2)

SQ31 Does your SNAP-Ed program partner with EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE SITES (Example: food banks, food pantries)?

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To The next section of questions explore...

SQ32 As part of your SNAP-Ed program, have you developed or delivered any training or technical assistance regarding environmental changes promoting healthier food choices at Emergency Food Assistance Sites?

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)

SQ33 As part of your SNAP-Ed program, have you completed any environmental assessments or scans with Emergency Food Assistance Sites?

❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To Which food bank or pantry environment...If No Is Selected, Then Skip To The next section of questions explore...

SQ34 Which food bank or pantry environmental assessments or scans have you used? Select all that apply.

- ❑ CX3 - NF6 Food Banks Survey (1)
- ❑ CX3 - NF6 Emergency Food Outlet Survey (2)
- ❑ Oregon Food Bank - Healthy Pantry Snapshot (3)
- ❑ Feeding America Healthy Food bank Hub (4)
- ❑ Alaska Food Bank Scan (5)
- ❑ Other (please specify): (6) _____

ST3 The next section of questions explores the types of programming your agency might conduct in with local education agencies who qualify as Title 1 Schools with 50% or more of the student population receiving free and reduced meals.

SQ35 Does your SNAP-Ed program partner with schools to conduct interventions for policy, systems, and environmental change?

- ❍ Yes (1)
- ❍ No (2)

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To About how many schools will your SNAP-Ed Program partner with...If No Is Selected, Then Skip To The next series of questions asks about...

SQ36 How many schools does your SNAP-Ed program partner with in a program year?

- ❍ Please enter number of schools (1) _____
- ❍ I don't know (2)

SQ37 Of these schools, how many integrate nutrition education into K-12 academic standards?

- ❍ Please enter number of schools: (1) _____
- ❍ I don't know (2)
- ❍ None (3)

SQ38 Of the school districts that you work in, how many have a policy to procure locally sourced food for school meals?

- ❍ Please enter number of schools districts: (1) _____
- ❍ I don't know (2)
- ❍ None (3)

SQ40 Please indicate which of these policy, systems and environmental changes strategies that you conduct as part of your SNAP-Ed school programming:

	Yes (1)	No (2)
Developing an action plan towards increasing water consumption (1)	○	○
Conducting walkability assessments in partnership with schools (2)	○	○
Conducting bikeability assessments in partnership with schools (3)	○	○
Implementing safe routes to schools in partnership with schools (4)	○	○
Revising the local school wellness policies (5)	○	○
Serving on school wellness committees (6)	○	○

SQ41 Does your SNAP-Ed program evaluate school wellness policies using a specific evaluation tool?

○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To The next series of questions asks about…

SQ42 Which tool does your SNAP-Ed program use to evaluate school wellness policies? Select all that apply.

❑ WellSAT (Rudd Center) (1)
❑ SPAN-ET (Oregon) (2)
❑ Action for Healthy Kids Wellness Policy Tool (AFHK) (3)
❑ School Health Index (CDC) (4)
❑ Other (5) _____

ST4 The next series of questions asks about different types of social marketing interventions that your SNAP-Ed program may pursue in the future.

SQ43 Currently, are social marketing and/or awareness campaigns in your SNAP-Ed Program or Plan?

○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To Which topics below are included in a …If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Are you currently planning or implementing…

SQ44 Which topics below are included in a social marketing campaign in your SNAP-Ed plan. Select all that apply.

- ❑ Community/ school gardens (1)
- ❑ Early childhood health (2)
- ❑ Farmers' Markets (3)
- ❑ Farm-to-Fork (4)
- ❑ Farm-to-School (5)
- ❑ Food Standards for School Meals (6)
- ❑ Healthy Food Pantries/ Food Banks (7)
- ❑ Healthy Beverage Standards (8)
- ❑ Healthy Retail (9)
- ❑ Joint Use Agreements (10)
- ❑ Healthy Restaurants (11)
- ❑ Safe Routes to School (12)
- ❑ School Wellness Policies (13)
- ❑ Structured Physical Activity (14)
- ❑ School Water Consumption (15)
- ❑ Work site Wellness (16)
- ❑ Other: (please specify) (17) _____

SQ46 What type of messages would be the highest priority for a social marketing campaign for your SNAP-Ed program?

	High priority (1)	Medium priority (2)	Not a priority (3)
Fruit and vegetable messages (1)	❍	❍	❍
Healthy beverage messages (2)	❍	❍	❍
Messages targeting African-American audiences (3)	❍	❍	❍
Messages targeting Hispanic/Latino Audiences (4)	❍	❍	❍
Message to support healthy school environments (K-8) (5)	❍	❍	❍
Messages to support healthy retail stores within low-income communities (6)	❍	❍	❍
Message to support physical activity promotion (7)	❍	❍	❍
Other (please specify): (8)	❍	❍	❍

SQ45 Are you planning or implementing social media as a strategy to support SNAP-Ed goals? (Example: Facebook pages, Twitter, Pinterest)

❍ Yes, I am currently implementing a social media strategy. (1)
❍ No, but I am planning to implement a social media strategy in the future. (2)
❍ No, but I am interested in implementing a social media strategies in the future. (3)
❍ No, I do not implement or plan to implement social media. (4)

SQ47 Which staff training topics below are part of your SNAP-Ed staff training plan for this year? Select all that apply.

❑ Community/ school gardens (1)
❑ Early childhood health (2)
❑ Farmers' Markets (3)
❑ Farm-to-Fork (4)
❑ Farm-to-School (5)
❑ Food Standards for School Meals (6)
❑ Healthy Food Pantries/ Food Banks (7)
❑ Healthy Beverage Standards (8)
❑ Healthy Retail (9)
❑ Joint Use Agreements (10)
❑ Healthy Restaurants (11)
❑ Safe Routes to School (12)
❑ School Wellness Policies (13)
❑ Structured Physical Activity (14)
❑ School Water Consumption (15)
❑ Work site Wellness (16)
❑ Other: (please specify) (17) _____

SQ48 SNAP-Ed staff are often members of community coalitions or committees that address policy, systems and environmental change. Which of the topics listed below are currently a focus of coalitions or committees that your staff attend? Select all that apply.

❑ Community/ school gardens (1)
❑ Early childhood health (2)
❑ Farmers Markets (3)
❑ Farm-to-Fork (4)
❑ Farm-to-School (5)
❑ Food Standards for School Meals (6)
❑ Healthy Food Pantries/ Food Banks (7)
❑ Healthy Beverage Standards (8)
❑ Healthy Retail (9)
❑ Joint Use Agreements (10)

- ❑ Healthy Restaurants (11)
- ❑ Safe Routes to School (12)
- ❑ School Wellness Policies (13)
- ❑ Structured Physical Activity (14)
- ❑ School Water Consumption (15)
- ❑ Work site Wellness (16)
- ❑ Other: (please specify) (17) _____

SQ49 Do you use the "Western Region's SNAP-Ed Evaluation Framework: Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Obesity prevention Outcomes" to evaluate/report your SNAP-Ed policy, systems, and environmental change efforts?

- ❍ Yes (1)
- ❍ No (2)

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To Please select outcome indicators your...If No Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Block

SQ50 Please select outcome indicators your agency measures related to obesity prevention interventions to evaluate environmental level (organizational changes, policies, rules, marketing and access to make healthy choices easier) and sectors of influence (community and public health approaches). Select all that apply.

- ❑ ST4: Opportunity Identification (1)
- ❑ ST5: Local Champions (2)
- ❑ ST6: Partnerships (3)
- ❑ MT4: Nutrition Supports Adopted (4)
- ❑ MT5: Physical Activity Supports Adopted (5)
- ❑ MT6:Marketing (6)
- ❑ LT9: Nutrition Supports Implementation (7)
- ❑ LT10: Physical Activity Program Implementation (8)
- ❑ LT11: Program Recognition (9)
- ❑ LT12: Media Coverage (10)
- ❑ I3: Resources (11)
- ❑ I4: Sustainability Plan (12)
- ❑ I5: Barriers Mitigated (13)

SQ51 Please select outcome indicators your agency measures related to obesity prevention interventions to evaluate sectors of influence level (organizational changes, policies, rules,

marketing and access to make healthy choices easier) and sectors of influence (community and public health approaches). Select all that apply.

- ☐ ST8: Community Partnerships (1)
- ☐ ST9: Community Obesity Prevention Plan (2)
- ☐ MT7: Food Industry (3)
- ☐ MT8: Local Government (4)
- ☐ MT9: Agriculture (5)
- ☐ MT10: Education (6)
- ☐ MT11: Community Design and Safety (7)
- ☐ MT12: Health Care (8)

- ☐ MT13: Media (9)
- ☐ LT13: Food Industry Healthy Outlets (10)
- ☐ LT14: Local Government Healthy Food Sales (11)
- ☐ LT15: Agriculture Sales (12)
- ☐ LT16: Educational Attainment (13)
- ☐ LT17: Shared Use Streets, and Crime Reduction (14)
- ☐ LT18: Health Care Cost Savings (15)
- ☐ LT19: Healthy Advertising (16)
- ☐ I6: Let's Move Recognition (17)
- ☐ I7: Regional Food Hubs (18)
- ☐ I8: Nutrition in Community General Plan (19)

A1 The remaining questions will help us to better describe the sample of policy, systems, and environmental change within the NIFA Western Region. Your answers will be held in confidence.

A2 Please select the NIFA Western Region State or Region that your agency resides within:

○ Alaska (1)
○ American Samoa (2)
○ Arizona (3)
○ California (4)
○ Colorado (5)
○ Federated Stated if Micronesia (6)
○ Guam (7)
○ Hawaii (8)
○ Idaho (9)
○ Montana (10)
○ Nevada (11)
○ New Mexico (12)
○ Northern Mariana Islands (13)
○ Oregon (14)
○ Washington (15)
○ Wyoming (16)
○ Mariana Islands (17)
○ Other (please specify) (18) _____

A3 Please select what role best describes your position:
○ State Coordinator/Leader/Manager (1)
○ Local Supervisor (oversee 1-3 counties) (2)
○ Regional supervisor (oversee 3 or more counties, not state lead) (3)
○ Principal Investigator (4)
○ Other (please specify): (5) _____

A4 May we contact you if we have questions?
○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)
If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To Please provide contact information: If No Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey

A5 Please provide contact information:

Name (1)
Email (2)
Phone (3)

B. Best Practices Survey Summary of SNAP-Ed Implementing Agencies: Additional Information

Total responses 70

Implementing Agency, Program Leader	43 (63%)
Implementing Agency, Staff	17 (25%)
FNS Regional Nutritionist	1 (1%)
State SNAP Agency Personnel	6 (9%)
SNAP-Ed Supporter/Stakeholder	1 (1%)
Skipped response	2

Tables and text below are from the 60 responses from Implementing Agencies

Table 7: Program Design		
Best Practice	Confidence Level [†] Mean	Interest in Staff Development (yes, definitely n = 24) (yes, probably n = 13) % out of 37 (n)
Curriculum Content	4.0	38% (14)
Research Based (based on accurate, reliable, and current research, e.g., DG)	4.2	43% (16)
Goal Setting (included participant behavior change goals)	3.7	35% (13)
Appropriate for Target Audience (visuals, activities, recipes, language, etc.)	3.8	43% (16)
(Appropriate) Literacy Considerations	3.7	43% (16)
Behavior Change Theories	3.6	62% (23)
Program has clearly stated goals and objectives that drive intervention and evaluation	4.0	30% (11)
Social Ecological Model (inclusion of multiple levels)	3.6	68% (25)
[†] Range of means: 1 (not comfortable with ability to apply this best practice); 2 (understand the concept but not comfortable applying it); 3 (fairly comfortable with best practice and my ability to apply it); 4 (confident in ability to apply the best practice); 5 (consider myself an expert)		

Table 8: Program Delivery

Best Practice	Confidence Level † Mean	Interest in Staff Development (yes, definitely n = 18) (yes, probably n = 15) % out of 33 (n)
Learning Styles (accommodates visual, auditory and kinesthetic style)	3.6	58% (19)
Experiential Activities (learner centered methods that includes experiential activities with minimal lecture)	3.7	55% (18)
Contacts (sufficient duration and frequency to achieve learning outcomes)	3.8	33% (11)
Fidelity (implemented consistently and as designed in its entirety)	3.8	55% (18)
Enhancement items (items and strategies to reinforce learning at home)	3.8	30% (10)
Collaboration (within and among national, state, and local health promotion initiatives to reach participants in multiple settings)	3.9	64% (21)

† Range of means: 1 (not comfortable with ability to apply this best practice); 2 (understand the concept but not comfortable applying it); 3 (fairly comfortable with best practice and my ability to apply it); 4 (confident in ability to apply the best practice); 5 (consider myself an expert)

Table 9: Educator Characteristics

Best Practice	Confidence Level [†] Mean	Interest in Staff Development (yes, definitely n = 15) (yes, probably n = 10) % out of 25 (n)
Relate to the target audience	3.3	65% (17)
Expertise in content	3.4	46% (12)
Expertise in teaching methods	3.4	85% (22)
Performance Expectations clearly defined and shared with educators	3.6	73% (19)
[†] Range of means: 1 (not comfortable with ability to apply this best practice); 2 (understand the concept but not comfortable applying it); 3 (fairly comfortable with best practice and my ability to apply it); 4 (confident in ability to apply the best practice); 5 (consider myself an expert)		

Table 10: Educator Training

Best Practice	Confidence Level [†] Mean	Interest in Staff Development (yes, definitely n = 15) (yes, probably n = 11) % out of 26 (n)
Initial training prior to program delivery	3.3	70% (19)
Ongoing training	3.4	85% (23)
Observations of program delivery at least annually	3.5	74% (20)
[†] Range of means: 1 (not comfortable with ability to apply this best practice); 2 (understand the concept but not comfortable applying it); 3 (fairly comfortable with best practice and my ability to apply it); 4 (confident in ability to apply the best practice); 5 (consider myself an expert)		

Table 11: Evaluation

Best Practice	Confidence Level † **Mean**	Interest in Staff Development (yes, definitely n = 20) (yes, probably n = 11) **% out of 31 (n)**
Formative Evaluation	3.4	63% (19)
Process Evaluation	3.4	73% (22)
Outcome Evaluation	3.4	67% (20)
Impact Assessment	3.1	83% (25)
Sustained Behavior Change	3.0	80% (24)
Goals and objectives measured	3.6	57% (17)
Social Ecological Model Evaluation (each level within program design)	3.0	93% (28)

† Range of means: 1 (not comfortable with ability to apply this best practice); 2 (understand the concept but not comfortable applying it); 3 (fairly comfortable with best practice and my ability to apply it); 4 (confident in ability to apply the best practice); 5 (consider myself an expert)

Table 12: Format of staff development - preferences

Format	*Very Interested*	*Interested*	*Possible Interest*	*Not Interested*	*Average Rating†*
Short Webinar (1-2 hours)	58% (21)	33% (12)	3% (1)	6% (2)	2.4
Series of Webinars (1-2 hours each)	56% (20)	28% (10)	6% (2)	11% (4)	2.3
Half-day Webinar	13% (4)	17% (5)	27% (8)	43% (13)	1.0
Half-day Workshop (pre/post meeting)	35% (13)	24% (9)	32% (12)	8% (3)	1.9
Full-day Workshop (pre/post meeting)	234% (7)	29% (9)	26% (8)	23% (7)	1.5
View training at own convenience	53% (18)	26% (9)	15% (5)	6% (2)	2.3

† Very interested = 3; not interested = 0