Community Partner Impacts/Policy, Systems, and Environmental Change

National EFNEP Survey Highlights
Understanding EFNEP Community Partnership Impacts Across the Nation

- **Step 1:** Development of Qualtrics Survey
- **Step 2:** Survey vetted through EFNEP CPI/PSE Committee and NIFA
- **Step 3:** Identified EFNEP coordinators and state leaders through directory
- **Step 4:** Survey distributed via email in January 2019

**Response Rate**
- 54% responded partially (n=41)
- 43% provided complete responses (n=33)
Common Community Partnership Impact (CPI) Settings

• Adult Education and Training Sites
• Adult Rehabilitation Centers
• Community Centers
• Emergency Food Assistance Sites
• Head Start Sites
• Health Care
• Libraries
• Other Youth Sites
• Places of Worship
• Public Housing
• Schools
Survey Highlights - Resources and Training

• Suggested Resources
  • EFNEP Community Partnership Impacts (CPI) Toolkit
    • Examples of specific EFNEP Community Partnership Impacts (CPI)
    • Coalition building resources
    • Need to gather and share best practices from states across the nation

• Training materials
  • Materials specific to EFNEP
  • Some states develop or host trainings for professional staff
  • Some states collaborate with SNAP-ED colleagues
Survey Highlights - Reporting

• Improve WebNEERS Community Partnership Impact (CPI) reporting feature
  • For example, request to report over multiple years
  • Provide more flexibility for CPI reporting

• Standardized forms for reporting CPI

• Hybrid of CPI being reported at regional and institute level

• Additional guidance and examples needed
  • Guidance needed for type of impact, and short/medium/long term
Next Steps

• Survey Results will inform CPI Committee goals and objectives for the year

• Continuing development of EFNEP CPI/PSE website
  • Examples and resources for CPI
  • Reporting examples and standardized forms

• Seeking states to submit examples
  • If you are willing to share, please contact Amanda Feighner - feighn21@msu.edu

• Thank you to all who completed the survey!
CORNELL UNIVERSITY
Two online, self-paced, professional development courses designed to build EFNEP and other professionals’ capacity to prevent obesity through the use of policy, systems, and environmental (PSE) approaches.
What are Policy, System, and Environmental (PSE) Approaches?

- **Based on the socio-ecological model**
  *Looks beyond the individual to other factors impacting behavior change.*

- **Policies:** Written (officially adopted) statements of a position, decision, or course of action. Policies can be enacted at multiple levels of the socio-ecological model.

- **Systems:** Unwritten, ongoing decisions or changes that result in ways of conducting business that reach people within an organization or network of organizations in a community.

- **Environments:** The circumstances, objects, or conditions by which one is surrounded; can include built or physical environments, which are observable, and may also include economic or social environments.
The Need for PSE Training

Shifts in EFNEP guidance now allow using policy, systems, and environmental (PSE) approaches to complement direct nutrition education.

This shift has prompted nationwide engagement in PSE strategies to promote healthful eating and physical activity among low-income individuals and families.

Research with both Cooperative Extension and public health practitioners indicated that—regardless of academic training and professional development—many nutrition education professionals lack the knowledge or skills needed to incorporate PSE approaches into their efforts.
Group Activity

For those who have **not** yet engaged in PSE work:

What questions do you have about using policy, systems, and environmental (PSE) approaches to promote healthy eating and physical activity?

For those who **have** engaged in PSE work:

What are some challenges you have encountered using policy, systems, and environmental (PSE) approaches to promote healthy eating and physical activity?
Making the Healthy Choice the Easy Choice is designed to meet the needs of professionals using policy, systems, and environmental (PSE) approaches to increase access to healthy food and physical activity options for low-income individuals and families.

Two self-paced, online courses are available:

1. Making the Healthy Choice the Easy Choice – an in-depth 5-module course that introduces the learner to PSEs and uses an interactive workbook to guide the learner through designing their own PSE approach in their community. Learning time approximately 12 hours.

2. An Introduction to Policies, Systems, and Environmental Approaches – the first module of the in-depth course which provides both an introduction for those new to PSE approaches and an overview for those with more experience in PSEs. Learning time approximately 2 hours.

Both courses are designed for Nutrition educators and public health professionals working collaboratively with local partners to impact local communities – including those in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Education (SNAP-Ed) and the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP).

PROGRAM PRICING

For more details and to enroll, select which link is most appropriate for you:

- SNAP-Ed and EFNEP Professionals
- All Others
Welcome to An Introduction to Policy, Systems, and Environmental Approaches!

This online course is for professionals, soon-to-be professionals, community members, and others working to increase access to healthy food and physical activity options for low-income individuals and families. Nutrition educators and public health professionals can increase access to healthy food and activity options in communities through the use of policy, systems, and environmental (PSE) approaches.

This course is designed for nutrition educators and public health professionals in programs such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Education (SNAP-Ed) and the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP), working collaboratively with local partners to impact local communities. Those in pre-professional programs studying topics such as dietetics or public health may also find this introductory course of value.
Module 1: An Introduction to PSE Approaches

Content:
1. What are PSEs?
2. Complementary Approaches
3. Explore Successful PSEs
4. Understand the Importance of Community Context
5. Support the PSE Initiatives
6. Understand Types of Evidence and Explore Key Resources

Available as a stand-alone course* to:
- Introduce PSEs for those new to this work
- Provide an overview of PSEs for those with more experience in this field

Ideal for those:
- Who want to better understand PSE approaches and how they complement direct nutrition education
- Who are not yet ready to, or do not plan to, design and implement PSEs in their community

*Takes approx. 2 hours to complete and RDNs receive 2 CPEUs for completing the course
Making the HEALTHY choice the EASY choice

An in-depth, self-paced, 6-module online course

Aims to improving learners’ abilities to develop, implement, and evaluate effective PSE approaches

Takes approx. 12 hours to complete and RDNs receive 12 CPEUs for completing the course

Material include readings, videos, activities, and case studies

Includes a Discussion Guide for groups taking the course together
Modules 2-6

Module 2
- Describe Your Community of Interest and Identify Needs
- Create Your Community Map
- Initiate Relationships with Partners
- Assess Your Community’s Needs

Module 3
- Convene and Engage Your Partners
- Developing Partnerships
- Strengthen Partnerships
- Move Partnerships to Action

Module 4
- Select a PSE Intervention
- Introduction to Logic Models
- Choosing Indicators for the PSE Approach
- Prepare an Action Plan

Module 5
- Review Action Plan with Partners
- Train and Support Staff and Partners
- Implement the PSE Effort
- Plan for Sustainability

Module 6
- Types of Evaluations
- Evaluating PSE Approaches
- Develop Evaluation Plan
- Evaluate Partnerships
- Share Evaluation Findings
- Refine Action Plan
Modules 2-6 use an interactive workbook to guide learners through each step of designing, implementing, and evaluating their own PSE in their community of interest.

2 completed workbooks—one in an urban setting, and one in a rural setting—are also included to provide examples of how to complete the workbook.
Questions and Challenges
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ISSUE: Need to expand EFNEP recruitment effort
What is **MAPPING**?

The process of physically identifying program recruitment and delivery sites on county maps.
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HOW WE DID IT

1. EFNEP Agents acquire maps of the county or area.

2. EFNEP Agents map former & current sites of program delivery and recruitment.

3. Program Manager & EFNEP Agents meet to identify underserved areas and areas of opportunity.

Important Considerations

- Census Data Mapper can help
  - Pinpoint hot-spots for stronger potential eligibility
  - Ensure program parity

- Mapping quickly highlights
  - Oversaturated program areas
  - Underserved areas in the county
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Northwest Arkansas
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The Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Adults 2019</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Graduated</th>
<th>Adults 2018</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Graduated</th>
<th>Percent Change from 2018 to 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benton</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>93.9% 74.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.6% 644.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski</td>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.2% 60.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Impact

- Increased Adult Enrollment & Graduation
- Improved Program Visibility
- No Additional Costs Incurred
Retention and Outcomes by Partner Type

An Examination of WebNEERS Data
Montgomery County, MD
2016-2017
Description of Partner Types

- Community-based Social Service Organizations
- Early Childhood Education Programs
- Food Banks
- Healthcare Providers
- School-based Programs
- Subsidized Housing Programs
WebNEERS Tracking
Subgroups
Exporting the Data
Retention Rates by Partner Type 2016-2017

- Community-based Organizations: 67% (2016), 70% (2017)
- Early Childhood Education: 84% (2016), 83% (2017)
- Food Banks: 85% (2016), 92% (2017)
- Healthcare Providers: 54% (2016), 72% (2017)
- School-based Programs: 95% (2016), 98% (2017), 96% (2017)
- Subsidized Housing: 93% (2016), 92% (2017), 92% (2017)
Key Outcomes

Outcomes using pre- and post-test survey data

• Meal Planning: How often do you plan meals ahead of time?

• Vegetable Consumption: Do you currently eat 3 or more servings of vegetables every day, including fresh, frozen, canned and 100% juice?

• Physical Activity: How often do you participate in at least 30 minutes of moderate physical activity (sweeping, gardening, etc.) every day?
Percentage Improvement in Key Outcomes by Partner Type

(Graduates Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Outcomes</th>
<th>Meal Planning (N)</th>
<th>Vegetable Consumption (N)</th>
<th>Physical Activity (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-based Programs</td>
<td>45% N=32</td>
<td>56% N=40</td>
<td>63% N=45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>36% N=24</td>
<td>55% N=36</td>
<td>68% N=23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Banks</td>
<td>43% N=10</td>
<td>54% N=56</td>
<td>67% N=120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Providers</td>
<td>45% N=32</td>
<td>55% N=36</td>
<td>68% N=71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-based Programs</td>
<td>30% N=7</td>
<td>43% N=10</td>
<td>63% N=116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidized Housing</td>
<td>61% N=14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Analysis of Outcomes

*Desired outcomes* on entry and exit were compared by partner type. Desired outcomes were defined as responses “most of the time” or “always.”
**Desired Outcomes in Meal Planning**

**EFNEP Outcomes on Entry and Exit by Partner Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Type</th>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Exit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-based Social Services</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Banks</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Providers</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-based Programs</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidized Housing</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 71  
N = 66  
N = 34  
N = 104  
N = 184  
N = 23  
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Desired Outcomes in Vegetable Consumption

EFNEP Outcomes on Entry and Exit by Partner Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Type</th>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Exit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-based Social Services</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Banks</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Providers</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-based Programs</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidized Housing</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
 Desired Outcomes in Physical Activity

EFNEP Outcomes on Entry and Exit by Partner Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Type</th>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Exit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-based Social Services</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Banks</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Providers</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-based Programs</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidized Housing</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 71
N = 66
N = 34
N = 104
N = 184
N = 23
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Comparison of Desired Outcomes on Entry and Exit

Overall outcomes were higher than expected. Differences among individual partner types were identified. For example:

- Participants from Community-based Social Service Programs showed no improvement in Physical Activity.
- Subsidized Housing participants showed less improvement in Meal Planning.
Using Results to Change Policy, Systems and the Environment

Increasing **Physical Activity** among participants from **Community-based Social Services** partners

- **Parks Department**
- **Recreation Department**
Improving Meal Planning among participants from Subsidized Housing partners

- Provide tours at full-service grocery stores
- Refer EFNEP participants with specific dietary concerns to dietitians in grocery stores
Lessons Learned

Much can be learned by breaking down the WebNEERS data to illustrate differences in retention and outcomes in order to:

• Make decisions about how to work successfully with partners
• Improve lessons to increase outcomes for specific content areas and partner types
• Work with partners to make changes that impact policy, systems and the environment for EFNEP families
• The Findings and Conclusions in this Presentation Have Not Been Formally Disseminated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and Should Not Be Construed to Represent Any Agency Determination or Policy.

• The Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) is funded by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Institute of Food and Agriculture (USDA/NIFA).

• USDA is a equal opportunity provider and employer.