NC3169 Annual Meeting Minutes

October 17-19, 2019

South Plainfield, NJ

**OCT 17 Thursday**

Morning Moderator: Janet Mullins – introduced self and administrators, hosts. Thanked Susan Baker for historic leadership. Others in attendance: Deb Hamernik, Helen Chipman, Patricia Guenther, Kate Yerxa, Sandy Procter, Andrea Leschewski, Dave Weatherspoon, Beth Olson, Garry Auld, Kavitha Sankavaram, Debi Head, Kelly Webber, Geb Bastien, Catalina Aragon. New member: L. Karina Diaz Rios, from UC Merced (kdiazrios@ucmerced.edu). Annie Roe, Carrie Durward, Karen Barale on Zoom.

 Welcome: Administrative Advisor, Dr. Deb Hamernik, UNL – Announced mid-term review following this meeting. Thanked group for Impact Statement. Link for impact statement: <https://www.mrfimpacts.org/single-post/2019/08/26/Evaluating-EFNEP-NC-2169-2013-2018>

Federal Partner, Dr. Helen Chipman – National Program Leader, USDA/NIFA. Explained her role in relationship to this project – review of proposal, oversight of EFNEP.

Site Host, Dr. Debra Keenan – welcome. Introduced Jennifer Cunningham, Admin. Assistant and site coordinator for this meeting

Co-Chairs: M. Catalina Aragón, MS, CN – introduced self and urged group to consider leadership opportunity.

9:40 AM New Members & Leadership Needs – Janet urged the group to consider joining her as co-leader during Catalina’s maternity leave. Experience shared to help new attendees learn about group. We need new members for this group. We try to balance researchers and EFNEP program specialists to facilitate work of the project. Susan: spoke to future needs and momentum needed to keep EFNEP’s evaluation tools current. Helen: Pointed out that the Cost-Benefit/Effectiveness Analysis is extremely important, so encouraged group to continue to make effort. Jeb: mentioned the great opportunity for motivated PhD students. Garry: this group also is great for junior, tenure-seeking faculty. Catalina: suggested someone to join group who has Spanish language (academic department) skills. What other languages, or overall language speaking, evaluation, teaching skills would serve this group well, and inform our paraprofessional development as well.

**Dietary Assessment and Behavior** (DAB) – Kavitha mentioned they will need new leadership and a new secretary for DAB.

**Quality of Life** – needs help with data collection but leadership okay.

**Cost-benefit group** – Lots going on, Dave and Andrea will continue to lead. What skills might be useful from new members? Those who have done cost-benefit research would be welcome. Kate will contact someone at Maine to help review the methodology. Dave mentioned that a biostatistician would be a welcome addition, as the one he has worked with is retiring.

Catalina – Looking for site for next year’s meeting. Florida is a possibility – Orlando area. An expensive choice, but offered. Helen urged us to consider more cost-effective sites. Las Vegas is mentioned, Washington (state) is also possibility. Madison WI could be a potential site. Beth will inquire about availability, avoiding a football weekend. Needed: room block, electronics/AV, meal set up, access to airport. Must be after October 1.

Continuing project updates:

**Cost Benefit/Effectiveness Analysis:** Slides will be available to group. Andrea recapped: Use of biometric indicators to measure effect of EFNEP. Reviewed work done to this point. Shared results of pilot.

Washington: using the new biometric CBA, which uses BMI, the ratio is much improved (2.29 per dollar spent previous method to 2.85 per dollar spent now) Colorado findings: 4.87 to 6.12 now. Findings showed that 30 – 35% showed BMI decrease. **These are conservative numbers**, but trends are very positive. Reviewed methodology of project, which compares to previous CBA studies. This did use Behavior Checklist questions, not new FPAQ questions, and looks at 6 mos. post-data as well. Indirect benefits – looked at savings in lost earnings vs. healthcare savings (direct benefits). Much higher indirect benefits seen with use of biometric methods.

Dave discussed next steps – asked group to be sure literature cited is most current and representative. Is JNEB best place for this initial finding to be published? A policy brief will be created for EFNEP professionals. Funding sources are needed – foundations, grants. Discussed next paper looking beyond the indicator of BMI – blood pressure, A1C. Are the small changes cumulative, with simultaneous impact? Third paper will address this. Discussion around publishing strategies and steps – is this a public health focused paper rather than a methodological paper?

Catalina – represented Nicole and Catalina’s work in the discussion on the validation of translation. Revised methodology based on literature reviewed. Looking for FPAQ expert reviewers, native Spanish speakers, in one of five content domains. Applied for and received a mini-grant that has allowed hiring a graduate student and gift card purchase. Timeline: expert review completed soon, by end of 2020 should have the 3.0 version ready to share. Data would be available 2023. Discussion around timing of project and WebNEERS followed. Will use full 32 question tool for expert review.

Geb – update on retrospective/pre project – A side project related to FPAQ, testing to see if this method might be more accurate capture of New Jersey, Colorado, Tennessee, Maryland, Guam will participate in cognitive testing the abridged version of tools. Will identify which survey design works best with participants, all native English speaking for this testing.

Carrie Durward – ASA24 Results and Proposal – Exploratory study of what could happen with use of ASA24 in field (use of end of RNECE funds). Study conducted in three states (ME, CO, TN) with 10 educators. 37 participants entry, 30 at exit. Quantitative and qualitative (interviews and focus groups) data collected. Results: very similar between paper and pencil (P&P) tool and ASA24 use. Results overall very positive. Educator preference – evenly split. Qualitative themes – accuracy noted; group size was concern – both positive and negative; barriers identified. Duration of recalls was tested. Total calories reported in both methods was identical; total food items reported was also similar. Discussion followed.

Next steps: Carrie welcomed feedback as paper writing moves forward. In NC3169 proposal, proposed full pilot study of ASA24, with external funding needed for extensive work to recruit and collect data from comparison group. Carrie believes NIH grant might be most appropriate. Heather Eicher-Miller from Purdue has submitted an RO1 grant on use of ASA24 (she is with SNAP-Ed there). IN, TX, UT, FL in this submission. Discussion followed around concerns of both SNAP-Ed and EFNEP in same study. The proposal is under review but should be reviewed this month.

Helen spoke to group about collaboration encouraged by Farm Bill, and this proposed study could show that. RE: earlier comments about study done and WebNEERS developing prototype to have participants enter data directly, either online or off-line. Challenge to incorporate new processes, technology into development. Also, need to look at fidelity to curriculum once it is identified – issues that could affect outcomes, and must be mentioned in limitations section. EFNEP is a program, and it will always be “real” compared to research model, but upfront recognition of issues is essential.

24HR Participant Focus Groups (Janet shared for Serena Fuller) – Work has been submitted to JNEB. Title: *Qualitative Assessment of the EFNEP Group-Delivered 24-hour Dietary Recall.*Reviewers are being sought – discussion around reviewers from non-participating members of this group.

Infant Feeding education – Beth Olson. Lexie (former graduate student) published paper on her project. Cognitive interviews, content review conducted as with other domains. Some are ready (knowledge, attitude questions) so goal is to get some of the questions into WebNEERS.

Membership list – Janet asked about the accuracy of the membership spreadsheet she sent out to the group. Please check the list and provide feedback to Janet.

Quality of Life (QoL) – Garry shared the QoL of cognitive interview training – discussed our efforts to this point, we want to do in the future. Participants’ improvement seen mostly in “being,” and educators in “belonging.” Since no existing tool captures EFNEP’s effects, this work deemed needed. Now need to do cognitive interviews to examine what details of tool could be most useful. CO, TN, KS, ME, AR, NJ, ID – seven states will be doing this phase. Why does QoL matter? Relationship in QoL literature to self-sufficiency? Bring out these factors into research, policy brief about this topic.

1:30 PM Working Groups - Open Session for All (see note from Catalina) – all discussed so all could participate in each

NIMSS reporting – Have updates for each listed objective; objective and methods updates discussed here.

DAB –

24 hr recall -- We don’t have an understanding of how we collect data. Need to survey coordinators.

FPAQ – Need validity testing, and removal of “10-minute bouts” from PA questions

Spanish validity – moving forward

Infant feeding – paper has results listed related to goals, looking at separate questions

QoL – testing and research going forward; looking at tool

5:00 PM DINNER (Group Dinner, included in registration)

**OCT 18 Friday --revised**

Morning Moderator: Janet Mullins. Joined by Sara Amin (Zoom), new member from Connecticut.

9:00 AM Reviewed USDA Impact Statement; many edits and suggestions made. Changes sent to Kate and Garry, who will be forwarding them on to the author.

Helen – Reviewed our group’s intersection with WebNEERS progress. What “bank” questions, next steps is the group considering? Multiple questions that need to be answered regarding the extra tested questions – where stored? How used by coordinators? Different sets will be used in different ways – QoL occasionally, vs. Infant Feeding when specific programming is delivered. We need a historical connection between questions and their source. Helen proposed a webinar focused on NC3169 rather than adding info to conference.

Helen recommended that the group check out the AFRI grant A1344 (Diet, Nutrition and the Prevention of Chronic Diseases) due March 19, 2020, as possible funding to support NC3169 work. Technology work group – moving ahead to incorporate technology into their state EFNEP programs. Three levels (low, medium, high) are possible.

Direct data entry – feasibility of creating this function is being examined. Many aspects must be considered – cost, security, on- and offline capability, to name a few. Next step will be beta-testing.

11:00 AM FPAQ Recommendations: It is our recommendation that the list we will present today will replace the previous bank of questions.

 Deb Palmer – Overview of DAB and EFNEP Evaluation Challenges/Limitations. (slides)

 Recommended: Keep 25 Items; keep three in bank; remove two food safety and two food security questions. We believe that food resource management is the proxy for food security and that EFNEP is uniquely able to make significant changes in food resource management. The net effect on the core set: from 32 to 25 items.

 Susan: Sharing version of 32 item set. Noted edits to the distributed version. Move #6 to bank, eliminate #10, #11. #14, #15 can be eliminated or put in bank. Move #20 to bank. #26 is ok – ignore the red x. #27 --- move to bank.

 Distributed page with six questions from USDA – can group working with Food Security help format these questions for use?

 Infant feeding questions – need formatting, dates should be noted for each question reflecting when added to bank, testing reflected. **Infant feeding reflects knowledge and attitudes because at time of teaching, there is no capacity for behavior change** (content is being taught to pregnant women).

 List of questions to be revisited based on new DGA, PA guidelines:

CE Working Group – including indicator statements (these will inform coordinators on use, application of this work). We need to start this discussion – what standards or protocol will the WebNEERS statements be based on?

 QoL Working Group– including indicator statements

DAB Working Group– including indicator statements for each FPAQ question

12:30 PM LUNCH

Afternoon Moderator: Catalina Aragon

1:30 PM Discussion of departure times

**CE group next steps –**

Funding – Dave discussed potential feasibility of submission for AFRI (A1344) grant, in light of data collected previously. Comparison group discussed. What are outcomes we want to see? 1) Tie together biometrics and new FPAQ, 2)

Dave shared objectives presented to Dr. Ramaswamy (NIFA) in 2017, as basis for formation of this proposal. Is this what we want to proceed with?

“Outcomes will include:

* A cost analysis assessment model that can be adopted by states to estimate the value direct nutrition education represents for their states
* Recommendations on:
	+ Evaluating direct nutrition education programs’ impact at the individual and societal levels
	+ Allocating resources for direct nutrition education programs
* Adapting and improving programming efforts for different audiences to increase effectiveness
* Illustrate how research and extension feedback models improve program outcomes and cost effectiveness

Implications include:

* Approaches to increase the long-term compliance of direct nutrition education outcomes
* Understanding that some nutrition programs may be more cost effective than others
* Demographics matter and effectiveness can be increased by using a model tailored to individual groups”

Discussion followed. Cost-benefit analysis must come through in our priority – first bullet? Develop, implement and evaluate innovative research, educational and outreach strategies to improve…..” Suggest drafting ideas and sending to Deb Hamernik to assure fit. Bullet 2: Investigate, assess and recommend food and nutrition research and program interventions with the goal to improve and sustain health.

Is there more testing for any of the domains?

* Including indicator statements for each FPAQ question
* Inclusion criteria – paras and professionals

State Inclusion Criteria:

* Program standardized across state:
	+ curriculum
	+ number of lessons
	+ number of sessions
	+ fidelity?
* Size of program? Different sizes represented (tiers?)
* Dosage
* Training?
* Group education

Kavitha, Carrie, Kelly, Catalina, Garry & Susan would like to be involved with this.

3:10 PM DAB Group – is there more testing? There is a need for more validity testing – Garry. In Nutrition group, tried multiple 24 hr recalls. Two issues with protocol of timeframe with this.

 Validity work needs to be done with Spanish tools. Will add manuscript to next DAB call to determine those interested.

 Susan – What impact indicator statements are/could be related to these FPAQ questions? This effort will begin here, but what process will we use to determine these statements? Subgroup work? Three sentence approach -- Need to be sure that the “so what?” statement is prominent in each, to provide context.

 Are we doing this for each item? For each scale? Will there be a template? Use of national impact pages as reference point for developing our impact indicators.

 List of accomplishments need to be forwarded to Janet by **November 1**. Each working group chair should forward their group’s impact statement to Janet.

5:30 PM DINNER (on your own; opportunity for local Indian food option)

**OCT 19 Saturday**

Morning Moderator: Janet Mullins

9:00 AM Impact indicator statements – process.

Plans for Virtual Mid-Year Meeting Spring 2020-Friday, April 24, 2020 – 9 pacific, 10 mountain, 11 central, 12 eastern. 3 hour meeting

November 5, 6, 7 is alternative date, with October 21-24 the first choice.