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The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, commonly referred to by its abbreviation SNAP, is the largest program in America’s hunger safety net.

Section 241 of the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 amended the 2008 Food and Nutrition Act (FNA) and established a nutrition education and obesity prevention grant program.

SNAP-Ed Goal: To improve the likelihood that persons eligible for SNAP will make healthy food choices within a limited budget and choose physically active lifestyles consistent with the current Dietary Guidelines for Americans and MyPlate.
SNAP-Ed Key Behavioral Outcomes

1. Maintain appropriate calorie balance during each stage of life – childhood, adolescence, adulthood, pregnancy, breastfeeding, and older age
2. Make half your plate fruits and vegetables, at least half your grains whole grains, and switch to fat-free or low-fat milk and milk products
3. Increase physical activity and reduce time spent in sedentary behaviors as part of a healthy lifestyle
SNAP-Ed Roles and Responsibilities

**Federal**
- SNAP-Ed policy
- Approves plan
- Monitors state projects
- Provides technical assistance

**State**
- Sets statewide goals
- Funds and monitors sub grantees
- Works in partnership with sub grantees to develop a coordinated, cohesive plan

**Local**
- Develops plans and projects for plan
- Implements and evaluates projects and interventions
- Coordinates with other nutrition education and obesity prevention program
Purpose of the SNAP-Ed Evaluation Framework

- Evaluate program effectiveness
  - Document policies, systems, and environmental changes
  - Support multi-level approaches
  - Consistent methodology
  - Evidence-based
  - Streamlined step-by-step guide
Framework Foundations

- The Social-Ecological Model of Food and Physical Activity Decisions.
  - Adapted from CDC social ecological model of health promotion.
  - A tool that can help address the issue of obesity.
  - Shown by research to impact food and beverage intake and physical activity shown at all levels of the SEM.

# SNAP-ED Evaluation Framework

**Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Obesity Prevention Indicators**

### Individual

**Readiness & Capacity (Short Term)**
- GOALS AND INTENTIONS
  - ST1: Healthy Eating
  - ST2: Food Resource Management
  - ST3: Physical Activity and Reduced Sedentary Behavior
  - ST4: Food Safety

**Organizational Motivators**
- STE: Need and Readiness
- STG: Champions
- STP: Partnerships

**Environmental Settings**
- EAT, LIVE, WORK, LEARN, SHOP, AND PLAY

**Sectors of Influence**
- Multisector Partnerships and Planning

### Changes (Medium Term)

**Behavioral Changes**
- MTA1: Healthy Eating
- MTA2: Food Resource Management
- MTA3: Physical Activity and Reduced Sedentary Behavior
- MTA4: Food Safety

**Organizational Adoption and Promotion**
- MTA5: Nutrition Supports
- MTA6: Physical Activity and Reduced Sedentary Behavior Supports

**Multi-sector Changes**
- MTA7: Government Policies
- MTA8: Agriculture
- MTA9: Education Policies
- MTA10: Community Design and Safety
- MTA11: Health Care
- MTA12: Community Linkages
- MTA13: Social Marketing

### Effectiveness & Maintenance (Long Term)

**Maintenance of Behavioral Changes**
- LT1: Healthy Eating
- LT2: Food Resource Management
- LT3: Physical Activity and Reduced Sedentary Behavior
- LT4: Food Safety

**Organizational Implementation and Effectiveness**
- LT5: Nutrition Supports Implementation
- LT6: Physical Activity Supports Implementation
- LT7: Program Recognition
- LT8: Media Coverage
- LT9: Leveraged Resources
- LT10: Planned Sustainability
- LT11: Unexpected Benefits

**Multi-sector Impacts**
- LT12: Food Systems
- LT13: Government Investments
- LT14: Agriculture Sales and Incentives
- LT15: Educational Attainment
- LT16: Shared Use Streets and Crime Reduction
- LT17: Health Care Cost Savings
- LT18: Commercial Marketing of Healthy Foods and Beverages
- LT19: Community-Wide Recognition Programs

### Population Results (R)

**Trends and Reduction in Disparities**
- RD1: Overall Diet Quality
- RD2: Fruits & Vegetables
- RD3: Whole Grains
- RD4: Dairy
- RD5: Beverages
- RD6: Food Security
- RD7: Physical Activity and Reduced Sedentary Behavior
- RD8: Breastfeeding
- RD9: Healthy Weight
- RD10: Family Meals
- RD11: Quality of Life

---

Source: SNAP-Ed Connection Website
SNAP-ED EVALUATION FRAMEWORK
Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Obesity Prevention Indicators

Structure

PSE: Organizations and coalitions

Collective impact

• Typically large scale evaluations
Structure

Levels

SNAP-ED EVALUATION FRAMEWORK
Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Obesity Prevention Indicators

INDIVIDUAL
- GOALS AND INTENTIONS
  - S1: Healthy Eating
  - S2: Food Resource Management
  - S3: Physical Activity and Reduced Sedentary Behavior
  - S4: Food Safety

BEHAVIORAL CHANGES
- MT1: Healthy Eating
- MT2: Food Resource Management
- MT3: Physical Activity and Reduced Sedentary Behavior
- MT4: Food Safety

MAINTENANCE OF BEHAVIORAL CHANGES
- LT1: Healthy Eating
- LT2: Food Resource Management
- LT3: Physical Activity and Reduced Sedentary Behavior
- LT4: Food Safety

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTINGS
- ORGANIZATIONAL MOTIVATORS
  - S5: Need and Readiness
  - S6: Champions
  - S7: Partnerships

ORGANIZATIONAL ADOPTION AND PROMOTION
- MT5: Nutrition Supports
- MT6: Physical Activity and Reduced Sedentary Behavior Supports

ORGANIZATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION AND EFFECTIVENESS
- LT5: Nutrition Supports Implementation
- LT6: Physical Activity and Reduced Sedentary Behavior Supports Implementation
- LT7: Program Recognition
- LT8: Media Coverage
- LT9: Leveraged Resources
- LT10: Planned Sustainability
- LT11: Unexpected Benefits

SECTORS OF INFLUENCE
- MULTI-SECTOR CAPACITY
  - S10: Multi-Sector Partnerships and Planning

MULTI-SECTOR CHANGES
- MT10: Government Policies
- MT11: Agriculture
- MT12: Education Policies
- MT13: Community Design and Safety
- MT14: Health Care
- MT15: Clinical Community Linkages
- MT16: Social Marketing
- MT17: Media Practices

MULTI-SECTOR IMPACTS
- LT12: Food Systems
- LT13: Government Investments
- LT14: Agriculture Sales and Incentives
- LT15: Educational Attainment
- LT16: Shared Use Streets and Crime Reduction
- LT17: Health Care Cost Savings
- LT18: Commercial Marketing of Healthy Foods and Beverages
- LT19: Community-Wide Recognition Programs

CHANGES IN SOCIETAL NORMS AND VALUES

POPULATION RESULTS (R)
- R1: Overall Diet Quality
- R2: Fruits & Vegetables
- R3: Whole Grains
- R4: Dairy
- R5: Beverages
- R6: Food Security
- R7: Physical Activity and Reduced Sedentary Behavior
- R8: Breastfeeding
- R9: Healthy Weight
- R10: Family Meals
- R11: Quality of Life

APRIL 2015

USDA
Evaluation Questions

- **Individual**: To what extent does SNAP-Ed programming improve and sustain participants’ dietary and physical activity behaviors?

- **Environmental**: To what extent does SNAP-Ed programming create and sustain access and appeal for improved dietary and physical activity choices in the settings where people eat, learn, live, play, shop, and work?

- **Sectors of Influence**: To what extent is SNAP-Ed programming working with other sectors to collectively impact lifelong healthy eating and active living in low-income communities?

- **Population Results**: To what extent does SNAP-Ed programming improve the low-income population’s achievement of the *Dietary Guidelines for Americans*’ recommendations and other health risk behaviors, compared to the general population?

- **Social and Cultural Norms and Values**: To what extent do community-level obesity prevention strategies impact the public’s priorities, lifestyle choices, and values for healthy living?
SNAP-Ed Priority Indicators

- MT 1 – Healthy Eating Behaviors
- MT 2 – Food Resource Management Behaviors
- MT 3 – Physical Activity and Reduced Sedentary Behaviors
- MT 5 – Nutrition Supports Adopted in Environmental Settings
- ST 7 – Organizational Partnerships
- ST 8 – Multi-Sector Partnerships and Planning
- R2 – Fruits and Vegetables
SERO Evaluation Efforts
Southeast Region
FFY 17 SNAP-Ed Outcome Evaluation

Suzanne Ryan-Ibarra, PhD, MPH
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Center for Wellness and Nutrition

Presenting on behalf of SERO Evaluation Workgroup
SERO Regional Evaluation FFY 17: The Beginning

• The Southeast Learning Community project was originally funded by CDC and implemented by Public Health Institute (PHI) in partnership with Southeast Regional Office
  • Currently funded through SERO SNAP-Ed

• A needs assessment was conducted to prioritize regional opportunities and support

• The majority of respondents were interested in using the SNAP-Ed Evaluation Framework
  • SERO Evaluation Work Group was formed
SERO Regional Evaluation FFY 17, Aim: Measure Individual-Level Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT1 – Healthy Eating Behaviors</th>
<th>MT2 – Food Resource Management Behaviors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ate more than one kind of fruit throughout the day or week (MT1c)</td>
<td>Choose healthy foods for my family on a budget (MT2a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ate more than one kind of vegetable throughout the day or week (MT1d)</td>
<td>Read nutrition facts labels or nutrition ingredients lists (MT2b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water more frequently (MT1g)</td>
<td>Not run out of food before month's end (MT2g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking fewer sugar-sweetened beverages (MT1h)</td>
<td>Compare prices before buying foods (MT2h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consuming low-fat or fat-free milk, milk products, or fortified soy beverages (MT1i)</td>
<td>Identify foods on sale or use coupons to save money (MT2i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cups of fruit consumed per day (MT1l)</td>
<td>Shop with a list (MT2j)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cups of vegetables consumed per day (MT1m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SERO Regional Evaluation FFY 17, Aim: Measure Environmental-Level Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT5 – Nutrition Supports/Policy, Systems, and Environmental Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of policy changes (MT5b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of systems changes (MT5c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of environmental changes (MT5d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of promotional changes (MT5e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach (MT5f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SERO Regional Evaluation FFY 17: Methods

• Individual-level indicators (n= 43,303 pre-test, n=43,256 post-test)
  • Standardize responses from multiple survey instruments
  • IAs submitted summary data, which was used to create analytical dataset (combined data from 25 implementing agencies)
  • Standard meta-analysis – pooled relative risk, 95% confidence intervals
  • Subgroup analyses – state, age group

• Environmental-level indicators
  • Descriptive analyses
Results from Pre- to Post-Test for MT1: Healthy Eating Behaviors, SERO Regional Evaluation FFY 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Relative Risk (95% Confidence Interval)</th>
<th>Likelihood of positive behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable (MT1d)</td>
<td>1.14 (1.12-1.15)</td>
<td>2 = Twice as likely at post-test compared to pre-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit (MT1c)</td>
<td>1.10 (1.09-1.11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar-sweetened beverages (MT1h)</td>
<td>1.10 (1.09-1.12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk and milk products (MT1i)</td>
<td>1.09 (1.08-1.11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water (MT1g)</td>
<td>1.04 (1.03-1.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = No change from pre- to post-test

p-value<0.05 for all statistics presented
Results from Pre- to Post-Test for MT1: Healthy Eating Behaviors, SERO Regional Evaluation FFY 17

Results from Pre- to Post-Test for cups of fruit and vegetables, SERO Regional Evaluation FFY 17

- Fruit (MT1f): 0.34 (0.31-0.37)
- Vegetables (MT1m): 0.22 (0.19-0.25)

p-value < 0.05 for all statistics presented
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>Relative Risk</th>
<th>Likelihood of Positive Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify foods on sale (MT2i)</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td></td>
<td>Twice as likely at post-test compared to pre-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not run out of food (MT2g)</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose healthy (MT2a)</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare prices (MT2h)</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop with list (MT2j)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition labels (MT2b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No change from pre- to post-test

p-value<0.05 for all statistics presented
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT5b</td>
<td>Total number of policy changes</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT5c</td>
<td>Total number of systems changes</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT5d</td>
<td>Total number of environmental changes</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total PSE adopted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>701</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT5e</td>
<td>Total number of promotional changes for PSE</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT5f</td>
<td>Number of individuals touched by PSE changes</td>
<td>830,049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reach counts do not include reach reported for promotional efforts (MT5e) only.
What improvements have taken place due to regional evaluation?

• Review of surveys
• State agencies review results and target IAs for technical assistance
• Quality improvement tool
Promoting the Results

Topline report can be widely distributed:

• Begin conversations with partners, stakeholders and decision makers

• Improve current programming

• Prioritize technical assistance
March 2015
Southeast Learning community funded by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Summer 2015
Regional evaluation identified as a top need in needs assessment of Southeast Region

October 2015
First Evaluation Workgroup meeting

February 2017
Evaluation Workgroup reaches consensus on selection of indicators

July 2017
Recoding guidelines finalized

February 2018
Final FFY 17 data submission from implementing agencies

September 2018
Final report to United States Department of Agriculture - Food and Nutrition Service

December 2018
Results of regional evaluation shared at Southeast Regional Meeting
Next Steps

• SERO Evaluation Workgroup continues to meet
• Discussing updating methodology and regional priorities
Thank you

• Brittany Souvenir and Veronica Bryant, USDA FNS
• United States Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service Southeast Regional Office
• SERO Evaluation Workgroup
• Laura Kettel Khan, PhD, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
• Sharon Sugerman, MS, RD, FAND, former Director of Research and Evaluation at the Center for Wellness and Nutrition, Public Health Institute
Thank you – Implementing Agencies

- Alabama Department of Human Resources
- Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical (A&M) University
- Alabama Department of Public Health
- Auburn University
- Florida Department of Children and Families
- University of Florida Extension Family Nutrition Program
- Georgia Department of Human Services, Division of Family and Children Services
- HealthMPOwers
- Open Hand Atlanta
- The University of Georgia College of Family and Consumer Sciences
- Kentucky Cabinet for Health and Family Services
- Kentucky State University
- University of Kentucky Nutrition Education Program
- Mississippi Department of Human Services
- Mississippi State University
- Tennessee Department of Human Services
- Tennessee State University Cooperative Extension
- University of Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service
- North Carolina Division of Social Services
- Alice Aycock Poe Center for Health Education
- Down East Partnership for Children
- Durham County Health Department
- East Carolina University
- North Carolina Agricultural and Technical (A&T) University
- North Carolina State University
- Second Harvest Food Bank of Northwest North Carolina
- North Carolina Cooperative Extension- Surry Center (NCCE-Surry)
- University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
- University of North Carolina at Greensboro
- YWCA of Asheville and Western North Carolina, Inc.
- South Carolina Department of Social Services
- Clemson University, Youth Learning Institute
- Lowcountry Food Bank
- South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control
- University of South Carolina School of Public Health
Funding acknowledgement
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The Scale of our Efforts

- California’s 2018 population estimated at 39.56 million
  - Similar to the population of Canada
  - Or 6 of 8 Southeastern states
- About 1/3 are low-income
  - 12.8 million
  - 1.4 million with diabetes diagnoses
  - 645,000 with heart disease diagnoses
  - 30.8% cannot always find fresh fruits and vegetables in their neighborhoods
The Scale of our Efforts

• California’s *CalFresh Healthy Living* SNAP-Education Program

**Oversight agency:** California Department of Social Services

**4 State implementing agencies:**
- 2 government agencies
- 1 faith-based organization
- 1 university extension program

**104 Local implementing agencies**

**Challenges:**
- Diverse and divergent populations served
- Different settings
- Different evaluation instruments and methods
- Different capacities within organizations
- Different ways of communicating results

1 CA Department of Aging, CA Department of Health; 2 Catholic Charities of CA; 3 CalFresh Healthy Living – University of CA
Policy, Systems, and Environmental Change

• Before 2018
  • Early adopters of the PEARLS database
    • Implementation pilot test 2015-2016*
  • Streamlines PSE reporting

• 2018 Methods
  • Process for 2018:
    • Download data
    • Run standardized data QC checks
    • Edit and run custom cleaning and analysis programs
    • Report descriptives

*Nutrition Policy Institute and CA Department of Public Health
### PSE Results 2018

- **1,566 sites across 54 counties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT5a</td>
<td>Number of sites with at least 1 change to support healthy eating</td>
<td>1,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT6a</td>
<td>Number of sites with at least 1 change to support physical activity</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PSE Results 2018

- 3,882 PSE changes
  - 2,779 nutrition-supportive changes
  - 997 physical-activity supportive changes

Changes by type analysis
- Not quite consistent with indicators MT5 and MT6 b, c, and d
  - Not broken down by nutrition vs. PA
  - But that is very possible
- 1% “other”
  - 55 of 3,882 PSE changes fell outside of the main categories
PSE Results 2018

- Planned sustainability (LT10)

Proportion of PSE Sites with a Sustainability Plan, by Implementation Stage

- Site agreed to participate: 57%
- Planning and preparation: 63%
- Began implementation: 71%
- Ongoing implementation: 79%
- Maintenance: 79%
- Follow-up and monitoring: 90%
Direct Education Before 2018

- Implementing agencies submitted inferential results only
  - Differences in methods
  - Differing capacities for reporting among agencies
- Results were reported by indicator and numerous...
  - but often difficult to interpret
- No substantive formal or informal synthesis was possible prior to 2018
Direct Education Methods and Results

• Methods
  • Questionnaires
  • State implementing agencies used 7 different pre-post questionnaires
  • 3 of the 7 contained identical questions
  • Questionnaires were not summative
  • Aggregated and analyzed data by item
    • 16 items could be combined and analyzed
    • Assessed medium-term nutrition, food resource management, and physical activity indicators
  • Implementing agencies collected 12,173 questionnaires; 7,629 could be analyzed
  • Used paired $t$-tests (continuous) and Wilcoxon signed-rank tests (ordinal)
  • Computed effect sizes

• Results
  • Of the 16 analyses, 12 revealed significant pre-post results
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Removing skin from chicken</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>MT1a</td>
<td>$r = 0.19$</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one kind of fruit</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>MT1c</td>
<td>$r = 0.22$</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more vegetables at your main meal</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>MT1d</td>
<td>$r = 0.21$</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one kind of vegetable</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>MT1d</td>
<td>$r = 0.21$</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit drinks and sports drinks</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>MT1h</td>
<td>$r = 0.15$</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soda</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>MT1h</td>
<td>$r = 0.20$</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cups of fruit per day</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>MT1l</td>
<td>$d = 0.49$</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cups of vegetables per day</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>MT1m</td>
<td>$d = 0.44$</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading nutrition labels</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>MT2b</td>
<td>$r = 0.26$</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not running out of food</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>MT2g</td>
<td>$r = 0.07$</td>
<td>Limited practical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating sweets (frequency)</td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>MT1k</td>
<td>$d = 0.04$</td>
<td>Limited practical significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical activity (days)</td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>MT3a</td>
<td>$d = 0.17$</td>
<td>Limited practical significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions and Future Directions

- PSEs over time
  - 2020 Objectives
    - Implement new changes to support healthy eating at existing sites; 30% of previously engaged sites will demonstrate at least one additional change support healthy eating.
    - Implement new changes to promote physical activity at continuing sites; 30% of previously engaged sites will demonstrate at least one additional change.

- Used PEARs data to develop realistic targets for additional objectives

- Findings are still difficult to interpret
  - Large $n$ …
  - but 37% unusable $n$

- Using effect sizes
  - Likely overpowered
    - Might be giving local implementers reporting more burden than necessary
  - Power calculations in colleagues’ studies

- Problem solving with California SNAP-Ed Evaluation Work Group
How can you use the SNAP-Ed Evaluation Framework to strengthen your program evaluation?
Discussion Questions

What benefits do you see with aggregating data in your state or region? What challenges might you anticipate?
Questions?
Resources: SNAP-Ed Connection

Features many resources including:

- Educational resources and curricula
- Training materials
- Current guidance and policy memos
- Models of SNAP-Ed evaluations
- Evaluation Framework

https://snaped.fns.usda.gov
Thank You

Follow us on Twitter - Take part in our interactive events! @phi_wellness

Connect to like-minded partners by joining us on LinkedIn
linkedin.com/company/center-for-wellness-and-nutrition

Have a question? Write to us at info@wellness.phi.org

The Center for Wellness and Nutrition is a program of the Public Health Institute.