**NC3169 Annual Meeting**

**October 21, 2020**

Attending:

Nicole Duffy - University of Florida, nicoleowens@ufl.edu;

Karen Franck - University of Tennessee - kfranck@utk.edu;

Dave Weatherspoon, weathe42@msu.edu;

Debie Head - University of Arkansas, dhead@uaex.edu

Annie Roe, University of Idaho, aroe@uidaho.edu

Kylie Pybus, Washington State University, kylie.pybus@wsu.edu

Mike Puglisi-University of Connecticut, michael.puglisi@uconn.edu

Andrea Leschewski, South Dakota State University, andrea.leschewski@sdstate.edu

Tala Awada - University of Nebraska-Lincoln,  tawada@unl.edu

Lola Adedokun, lola.adedokun@uky.edu, University of Kentucky

Karen Barale, Washington State Univ. kbarale@wsu.edu

Geb Bastian, Rutgers University, g.e.bastian@rutgers.edu

Patricia Guenther, University of Utah, Patricia.Guenther@utah.edu

Karina Díaz Ríos, University of California, kdiazrios@ucmerced.edu

Kate Yerxa, University of Maine, kate.yerxa@maine.edu

Beth Olson, UW Madison, bholson@wisc.edu

Deb Palmer-Keenan, Rutgers University, dkeenan@njaes.rutgers.edu

Susan Baker, Colorado State University susan.baker@colostate.edu

Kerri-Ann Chambers, University of Florida, kchambers40@ufl.edu

Qing Chen, Rutgers, qc52@scarletmail.rutgers.edu

Nurgul Fitzgerald - Rutgers University, nurgul.fitzgerald@rutgers.edu

Helen Chipman, NIFA, helen.chipman@usda.gov

Sandy Procter, Kansas State University, procter@ksu.edu

Catalina Aragon, Washington State University, c.aragon@wsu.edu

Janet Tietyen Mullins, University of Kentucky, janet.mullins@uky.edu

**Introductions**

**Update from Helen Chipman**

**NC3169 Procedural Guidelines:**

* Reminder to use guidelines when working on publications
* Non-author contributions, order for authors
* Each member needs to submit their work over the previous year to their committee chair at the annual meeting.

Will need leadership roles for next year (to be decided on last day of annual meeting)

* NC3169: Co-Chairs
* QoL: Chair & Note Taker
* CBA: Note Taker
* DAB: Chair & Note Taker

**CBA Update:**

* AFRI Grant Submission – recommended for funding but not funded
* Manuscript submission from pilot data – JAND (Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics) under review
	+ Paper Objectives: (1) conduct a CBA of CO and WA adult EFNEP using an objective chronic disease biomarker, BMI, to monetize program benefits and (2) to compare benefit-cost ratio estimates obtained using BMI and self-reported health behaviors

**DAB Breakout Session**

**October 21, 2020**

**Attending:** Lola Adedokun, Catalina Aragon, Susan Baker, Karen Barale (notetaker), Geb Bastian, Kerri-Ann Chambers, Qing Chen, Karina Diaz Rios, Karen Franck, Nurgul Fitzgerald,Patricia Guenther, Beth Olson, Deb Palmer-Keenan, Michael Puglisi, Kylie Pybus, Annie Roe

**Accomplishments**

Please send accomplishments/project reports to Deb by November 4. Include publications, abstracts, description of awork accomplished October 1, 2109 – September 30, 2020.

**Leadership**

For the FY2021 year: Deb Palmer-Keenan, Chair; Michael Puglisi, Minutes

**Call Schedule**

3rd Thursday each month at 10 AM Pacific, 11AM Mountain, Noon Central, 1 PM Eastern. Deb will resend invitation updated through next September.

**2021 Meetings Submissions**

Beth Olson offered to do a presentation for the EFNEP National Meeting on the Infant Feeding Questions

**Objectives 1 and 2**

**OBJECTIVE 1.** To improve standardization of EFNEP 24HDR (24-hour dietary recall) methods.

| **Objective Section** | **Plan** | **Update** | **Timeline and Notes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Develop standardized training and administration protocols for educators for the paper-and-pencil, group-administered 24HDR
 | Based on work completed in NC2169, investigators in University of Wisconsin-Extension and University of Maryland, will lead the work to evaluate and recommend the best 24HDR training practices and 24HDR training protocols for EFNEP paraprofessionals. A critical examination of current practices and the objectives of the 24HDR will be conducted using data collected from EFNEP state coordinators in NC2169.  | * Protocols and IRBs have been completed to interview program assistants.
* Plan to start interviews this year.
 | FFY2021 – Interviews should be completed in. |
| 1. Conduct controlled pilot study of implementing the Automated Self-administered 24HDR (ASA24) in EFNEP, including comparison groups, in several regions
 | Based on work led by Utah State University, investigators will evaluate food-related behavior change by EFNEP participants using ASA24 in a geographically-diverse representative sample with a comparison group. Investigators at Utah State will lead the work of recruiting six to eight states to collect ASA24 recalls at pre and post from their participants. These states will also be recruiting an income-comparable group who will also complete the ASA24 twice at approximately the same time as EFNEP participants do, typically, pre and post.  | **From Carrie Durward:** * ASA24 Pilot Field Trial: Karen F., Susan, and Katie have all provided data (qualitative and quantitative) to Carrie about their program’s experiences piloting ASA24. Carrie is working on drafting a manuscript and hopes to have it ready by early next year.
* ASA24 Training for Nutrition Educators: Dawn Earnesty and Imelda Galdamez from EFNEP Michigan are using the online training we created to train their educators to use ASA24, and plan to start collecting 24 hour recalls using ASA24. [NOTE: *we believe this is being done as part of the WebNEERs Beta Team work to use ASA24 participant entry to connect with WebNEERs*] Carrie provided advice about using ASA24; preliminary results from the Field Trial in the form of our poster for SNEB annual conference; contact information for Susan, Katie, and Karen F. if they had questions about how ASA24 worked for their educators (did they reach out to any of you?); and did a training webinar for their educators on how to use the Canvas course.

RO1 EFNEP/SNAP-Ed evaluation using ASA24: Heather Eicher-Miller (Purdue) and team resubmitted the R01 application, but I believe it is now focused on SNAP-Ed only. I was not involved with the resubmission.  | No longer active. Since Carrie needs to step back from chairing this project and it appears that there is a program implementation pilot for the EFNEP, we will not pursue further research at this time.Should future research be contemplated, Michael, Annie, Patricia and Nurgul would be interested in participating. NOTEs: 1. *We would appreciate National Office clarification regarding the use of ASA24 as a data entry option for participants to enter their own data directly into WebNeers.*
2. *We would like to have people working on an ASA24 Interface with WebNEERs attend our next call to provide details of the current program implementation work. This would help with our understanding of what ASA24 research might be important for future consideration. Is this the correct group to invite:*

*Imelda – Michigan Pilot and WebNEERs Beta Team member* *Someone from the EFNEP Technology Team ?Michael**Someone from*  |

**OBJECTIVE 2:** To complete and expand testing of newly developed EFNEP Food and Physical Activity Behavior Questionnaire (FPAQ)

| **Objective Section** | **Plan** | **Update** | **Timeline** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Complete further reliability testing
 | Investigators from New Jersey, Kentucky, and Idaho will take the lead to finalize reliability testing of the FPAQ, using the complete 32-item questionnaire. The data will be analyzed to test the reliability (i.e. reliability over time and internal consistency) of the 20-items currently used nationwide in EFNEP, as well as the 32-items available. Test/re-test reliability will be conducted with all 32-items at one-month intervals with EFNEP eligible participants with national/regional representation. To test for internal consistency, a secondary analysis on FY 2018 national data set will be conducted.  | * Waiting for data to be available for FFY2021.
 | Fall 2021/Winter 2022 – Conduct secondary analysis on FY 2021 national data to test for internal consistency. NOTE*: Need a crosswalk of the original 32 question FPAQ and the 25 questions recommended to the National Office for use as well as the 30 questions approved by the National Office for the 2020 Adult EFNEP Questionnaire.*  |
| 1. Conduct Spanish reliability and validity testing
 | Investigators in Florida and Washington will lead the testing of the Spanish translation of the FPAQ. The translated questions will be tested for face validity, internal consistency and reliability using cognitive interviews, expert panels (Lynn, 1986), and test-retest procedures. Reliability and validity testing will build on the previous work of NC2169 by following the adapted versions of the original protocols for reliability and validity testing of the FPAQ to the extent possible (Murray et al., 2017). Protocols of alternate studies which have successfully tested Spanish translations of validated health related pre-test post-test survey tools will also be consulted for guidance (Aragones et al., 2008).  | * Florida and Washington IRB’s approved.
* Amended IRB’s approved for revised questions, revised gift card process.
* Qualitative Qualtrics survey for expert reviewers completed.
* Continuing to look for native Spanish-speaking experts in the five domains.
* Clarified that questions to be tested are those from the 32 question set that were approved by the National Office for the new Adult EFNEP Questionnaire. The Spanish Food Security questions from the Household Food Security Screener are part of a validated questionnaire and therefore do not need to be tested.
 | FFY2021 Complete Spanish Expert review  |
| 1. Develop Retrospective pre/post questionnaire and examine feasibility of design on EFNEP impact reporting
 | A different survey administration method to assess program impacts (i.e., the use of a retrospective pretest in which both the pretest and posttest are collected at the end of the last class series) will be evaluated. At least one state from each of the four Cooperative Extension regions (i.e., North Central, Northeast, Southern, Western) will be recruited for testing this method. Participating states will continue to collect participants’ dietary, physical activity, and other behavioral data using the FPAQ before the start of the class series (pretest). At the end of the last class, participants will be asked to report their behaviors on the FPAQ again (posttest). They will additionally complete a retrospective pretest, in which they will be asked to recall and report their behaviors before they entered the program. Two different formats of the retrospective pretest will also be evaluated: 1) a combined retrospective pretest along with the posttest on a single survey; 2) a separate retrospective pretest survey from the posttest with the posttest presented first. This method will be examined in terms of its ease of use; and in terms of any differences, when compared to the traditional measures employed, that are detected in participant responses and the amount of class time displaced by evaluation.  | * Started collecting cognitive interviews; by March there were 6 interviews completed from Rutgers, Tennessee and Colorado.
* Now switching to online options due to the pandemic.

Protocols revised and IRB’s being amended. * Rutgers and Maryland should be ready to start at the end of October.
* For Phase 2, plan to ask EFNEP coordinators to test the new tool and provide the data as anonymized, secondary data. In the past, Rutgers has been able to ask for a letter from the EFNEP coordinators that gives approval for the use of secondary data. Since it is testing a program tool, it does not require IRB.

[NOTE: discussed numbers of participants/state. Goal for phase 2 is 150/state. IF back to normal face-to-face teaching, this could be possible. However, suggested to over-recruit, ie recruit 90, get 50.  | October 2020 – Start online interviews, complete during federal fiscal year. FFY2021 – Start Phase 2  |
| 1. Complete validity and reliability testing of infant feeding questions
 | Test-retest reliability. We will recruit 90 low-income mothers with infants who identify as African American, Hispanic, or white (30 for each group). Participants will complete the evaluation items two times, two weeks apart and will receive a $10 and $25 gift card for the first and second visit, respectively. We will analyze test-retest reliability using Spearman’s rank correlation, calculating each item separately. We will determine an average coefficient of stability among participants for each item; values above 0.7 will indicate reliable construct measures and those below 0.7 will be eliminated (Carter et al., 2013). Congruent validity. Lacking a “gold standard” for evaluation of healthy infant feeding, we will further validate this measure with convergent validity. We will compare the remaining items to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Infant Feeding Practices Study II (IFPS II) questionnaire measurements (CDC). This instrument has been used with a nationwide sample and has collected follow-up health outcomes (Grummer-Strawn et al., 2014). The items we will use measure the IF food frequency, food variety, age of introduction of solids, and formula and breastfeeding cessation. We will ask low-income mothers from the same race/ethnic groups to complete the IF items developed by the researchers and the IFPS II items during the same visit. Agreement between developed items and IFPS II items will be tested using correlation coefficients. | This work is complete. | Complete. |
| 1. NEW: Impact Statements Development - What impact indicator statements are/ could be related to these FPAQ questions?
 | What process will we use to determine these statements? 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 | * Kylie Pybus has joined the group to start the Impact Statement work.
* She will focus on the method development and Diet Quality impacts
 | Spring 2021 – Complete Diet Quality impact statements  |

**Thursday, October 22, 2020**

**Attending:** Helen Chipman by phone, Beth Olson, Geb Bastian, Karen Barale, Qing Chen, Nicole Duffy, Mike Puglisi, Kylie Pybus, Nurgul Fitzgerald, Karen Franck, Deb Palmer Keenan, Kate Yerxa, Karina Diaz Rios, Andrea Leschewski, Sandy Procter, Patricia Guenther, Kerri-Ann Chambers, Debie Head, Lola Adedokun, Catalina Aragon, Susan Baker

**EFNEP Adult Questionnaire Implementation Update**

Previously NC3160 recommended 25 questions to EFNEP National Office based on sensitivity analysis plus the 6 Question Household Food Security Screener

* EFNEP National office agreed to use the 25 recommended questions and:
	+ Added back 2 food safety questions we recommended dropping
	+ Added 3 U.S. Household Food Security Survey Module screening questions
* Questions ordered with 2 goals:
	+ Domain content
	+ Answer category
* National Office approved order of questions
* National Office agreed to call the evaluation tool “EFNEP Adult Questionnaire” instead of FPAQ
* Translated the questionnaire in Spanish and developed an English Facilitation Guide.
* Questionnaires and Facilitation Guide were formatted and disseminated to EFNEP Coordinators nationally.

**Impact Statement**

How is EFNEP Making a Difference in Low-Income Families Lives?

* Focus on Learning Outcomes (knowledge, skill and attitude)
* Action Outcomes (diet quality, PA, FRM, food safety and food security)
* Condition Outcomes? (reduced chronic diseases, health care cost)

**Spanish FPAQ Update**

* Reviewed the 3 phase of the research methods
* Have secured funding for gift cards, exempt IRB approval, looking for an expert panel (not paras) to review FPAQ – survey drafted

**Infant Feeding Questions**

**Retrospective pre/post FPAQ:**

* Examine the face validity, ease of use of two formats of retrospective pre/post
* Compare retrospective versus traditional pre/post in evaluating EFNEP programming
* Examine the cost‐efficiency of adopting retrospective pre/post versus traditional pre/post
* Current Study: Working on testing the retrospective pre/post FPAC, looking for other states to participate
* Future Study: Plan to examine the face validity and ease of use of the two FPAC formats
	+ Study design for testing the retrospective pre/post FPAC was reviewed

**ASA-24**

* **ASA24 Pilot Field Trial:** Karen Franck, Susan Baker and Kate Yerxa have all provided data (qualitative and quantitative) to Carrie about their program’s experiences piloting ASA24. Carrie is working on drafting a manuscript and hopes to have it ready by early next year.
* **ASA24 Training for Nutrition Educators:** Dawn Earnesty and Imelda Galdamez from EFNEP Michigan are using the online training we created to train their educators to use ASA24, and plan to start collecting 24 hour recalls using ASA24. Carrie provided advice about using ASA24; preliminary results from the Field Trial in the form of our poster for SNEB annual conference; contact information for Susan, Kate, and Karen if they had questions about how ASA24 worked for their educators (did they reach out to any of you?); and did a training webinar for their educators on how to use the Canvas course.
* **RO1 EFNEP/SNAP-ed evaluation using ASA24:** Heather Eicher-Miller and team resubmitted their R01 application, but I believe it is now focused on SNAP-Ed only. I was not involved with the resubmission. Perhaps Patricia knows more if she is in attendance.
* Nest steps: Invite Imelda Galdamez to future NC3169 meetings.

**24-Hour Recall Research**

* The overall goal of this research is to examine the current 24-hour dietary recall (24HDR) collection and training methods used by the adult EFNEP nationwide. Will focus on evaluating and recommend the best 24HDR training practices and 24HDR training protocols for EFNEP paraprofessionals who work in a group settings.
* EFNEP Coordinators will be invited through an email list-serv to participate in the web-based survey (Qualtrics).
	+ The survey is comprised of questions related to their knowledge, the process, training and implementation of 24 HDR.
	+ In phase II, EFNEP paraprofessionals will be contacted to participate in the study and will be asked to participate in in-depth interviews. The interviews will be conducted via secure university-based zoom/WebEX or via phone. The purpose of the interviews is to examine the perception, knowledge, and identify barriers in implementing 24HDR by paraprofessionals.
	+ In phase III, protocols for administering 24 HDR will be established based on the results obtained from Phase I and II. In phase IV, standardized training resources and protocols for group-administered 24HDR will be disseminated.

**QoL Breakout Group**

**October 22, 2020**

**Attending:** Kate Yerxa, Sandy Procter, Debie Head, Susan Baker and Annie Roe

**Plan of Work**

* Discussion about how to conduct conductive interviews. Conesus to implement cognitive interviews by Zoom and stated to discuss methods. Do other institutions have a defined protocol for conducting interviews through Zoom?
* Annie: Will create a simple Qualtrics survey to send to the listserv. It will be helpful to have a larger, multi-state pool to work from.

**Timeline**

* Cognitive Interviews: Completed by Summer 2021
* Reliability Testing: Fall 2021 and Spring 2022
* Further validity testing in spring 2022

**Leadership 2020-2021**

* Chair: Annie Row
* Co-Chair: Debie Head
* Notetaker: Kate Yerxa

**October 23, 2020**

**Large Group Meeting**

**Attending**: Geb Bastian, Janet Mullins, Qing Chen, Andrea Leschewski, Sandy Procter, Beth Olson, Karen Barale, Susan Baker, Helen Chipman, Karina Diaz Rios, Karen Franck, Lola Adedokun, Kate Yerxa, Patricia Guenther, Dave Weatherspoon, Nurgul Fitzgerald, Debie Head, Deb Palmer Keenan, Kerri-Ann Chambers,

**Quality of Life Update**

* See QoL breakout notes for timeline
* Question for the group: would like to conduct cognitive interviews through technology (Zoom) – does anyone have any best practices or experience using this modality to conduct cognitive interviews?
	+ Rutgers has submitted an IRB to conduct interviews through Zoom
	+ Phone not an option as there are visuals of questions and response options
	+ Actively looking for other states to help support this work – could happen in 1 of 2 ways: 1) recruit participants to be a part of the cognitive interviews, or 2) conduct the interviews in your state.
		- Only looking for 10 interviews per state

**Cost-Benefit Analysis Breakout Group Minutes**

**10/23/2020**

**Attending:** Andrea Leschewski, Catalina Aragon, Lola Adedokun, Nurgul Fitzgerald, Nicole Owens Duffy, Annie Roe, Debie Head, Patricia Guenther, Dave Weatherspoon, Susan Baker

**Brief introduction to work accomplished by the group for new members in attendance**

* JAND Manuscript – pilot biomarker CBA
* AFRI Grant – national EFNEP biomarker CBA

**Presentations**

* + Discussed potential conferences to present pilot biomarker cost-benefit analysis results at
	+ The group decided to submit to present at two conferences/meetings:
		- SNEB – biomarker CBA methodology and results
		- EFNEP Meeting – biomarker CBA results/interactive session on use of CBA extension tool

**New Group Research Projects**

* We discussed potential new research opportunities for the group to pursue this year
* The group decided to begin work on two new projects:
	+ - National cost-benefit analysis of EFNEP using Virginia/Behavioral CBA methodology
	+ Interested Participants: Catalina, Lola, Nicole, Annie, Nurgul, Susan, and Andrea
	+ Will setup first group research for November
	+ We spent some time discussing the importance of this research, as well as several questions we’ll need to answer during the research process including:
		- Which year should we obtain data from?
		- How should we account for measurement error in the 24HDR?
		- How do we adapt the EFNEP questionnaire to create ONB?
		- How do we estimate state level costs?
		- Which aspects of EFNEP could be compared at a national level using the CBA? Delivery method (online/in-person)? Curricula? Dosage?
		- Biomarker CBA of Florida EFNEP
			* + Interested Participants: Nicole, Andrea
				+ Meeting to discuss next steps in early November

**Discussion – Accomplishments Reporting**

**Mid-Year Virtual Meeting Dates**

* Friday, April 30, 2021
* 9 am PT; 10 am MT; 11 am CT; 12 pm ET

**Fall 2021 Annual Meeting**

* October 27 (travel day), 28, 29 and 30 2021
* Kansas City, Missouri

**NC3169 Plan of Work**

* Catalina will send out the current plan of work and ask for updates
* Need to provide an annual update 60 days after the annual meeting.
	+ Send accomplishments to

**Key Dates - Reporting**

* Send accomplishments from October 1st, 2019 to September 30th,  2020 to your Work Group Chairs:
* DAB send to Deb Palmer Keena – November 6th, 2020
* QoL send to Annie Roe – November 6th, 2020
* CBA send to Andrea Leschewski -  – November 6th, 2020
* Work Groups send Report to NC3169 Co-Chairs November 20th, 2020 *(Beth, Janet & Catalina)*
* Report to Tala: December 4th, 2020
* **Report to AES:** December 18th, 2020 (60 days after Annual Meeting)