Food & Nutrition Extension Education Division

Poster Abstracts

FN1 The Food Stamp Cycle Negatively Impacts Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Participants' Ability to Make Use of Fruit and Vegetable Incentives

Carrie Durward, PhD, RD, Carrie.Durward@usu.edu, Utah State University, 8700 Old Main Hill, Logan, UT 84322; G. Zimmerman, BS; M. S. Roskos, MPH, RD

Objective: Fruit and vegetable (FV) incentive programs have been proposed as a way to increase FV intake in SNAP recipients. The most common incentive model matches incentives to the amount of SNAP benefits spent. Our objective was to determine if the food stamp cycle influences the use of matching FV incentives.

Design, Setting, Participants, and Intervention: In study 1 SNAP recipients were randomly assigned to receive either matching (n=13) or non-matching (n=15) FV incentives for use at the local farmers market (FM). Qualitative interviews were conducted among a subsample (n=14) of participants. In study 2 SNAP recipients (n=138) who used the Utah Double Up Food Bucks (DUFb) program were surveyed at the FM and over the telephone 4 weeks later.

Outcome Measures and Analysis: In study 1 a chi-square test was used to evaluate the dropout rate between the matching and non-matching incentive groups. In study 2 at follow up, participants were asked to specify why they did or did not continue to use the DUFb program.

Results: In study 1 the matching group had a significantly higher dropout rate (46% vs. 13%, $p<0.001$). In the interview data, difficulty budgeting SNAP benefits was identified as a barrier for using the incentives. In study 2 the most common reason for not continuing to use the DUFb program was being out of SNAP benefits (20/37; 54%).

Conclusions and Implications: The high dropout rate in the matching group indicates this intervention may not have intended reach. This may be because the food stamp cycle provides a barrier to use. Nutrition education for this population should include skills needed to budget SNAP benefits.

Funding: USDA, Utah State University

FN2 Parent Survey Validation Project

Katie Holland, MS, RD, kholland@uaex.edu, University of Arkansas Division of Agriculture Cooperative Extension, 2301 South University Avenue, Little Rock, AR 72204; A. McClelland, MS, RD; S. David, MA, MBA; R. Rodibaugh, PhD, RD, LD

Objective: The University of Arkansas Cooperative Extension SNAP-Ed program developed a parent survey to evaluate behavior change in the eating habits of families as a result of nutrition education in schools. The purpose of this project was to assess face validity of the survey. Effective program evaluation stems from using valid evaluation tools.

Design, Setting, and Participants: Family and Consumer Sciences County Agents were asked to evaluate the parent survey. Comments were collected from this 11 person expert panel using a questionnaire. Edits were made to the Parent Survey based on this information. Data was then gathered through the completion of focus groups held in seven different counties consisting of 3-14 participants per group for a total of 46 participants. Focus group participants were parents of elementary school children participating in the SNAP-Ed Program.

Outcome Measures and Analysis: A domain analysis approach was used to complete a transcript-based analysis of focus group data. Results were used to revise the parent survey reflecting participant perceptions to enhance face validity.

Results: Focus group data consistently brought to light similar suggestions for revision, including how questions address race and ethnicity, and participation in government assistance programs, as well as wording to be more inclusive of the entire family to provide more accurate measurement of change. Participant perceptions contributed to evaluating face validity of the survey and bringing about revision.

Conclusions and Implications: The result was an improved parent survey currently used as one tool to evaluate the Arkansas SNAP-Ed school-based nutrition education program.

Funding: Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program – Education, University of Arkansas Division of Agriculture Cooperative Extension

FN3 Intervention Planning and Baseline Characteristics of College Students Trained to Implement Wellness on Campus: Get Fruved Study

Melissa D. Olfert, DrPH, MS, RDN, melissa.olfert@mail.wvu.edu, West Virginia University, G016 Ag Sc Building, Morgantown, WV 26506; A. Mathews, PhD, RDN, University of Florida; K. Riggsbee, BS, University of Tennessee-Knoxville; K. Leichter, BS, South Dakota State University; K. K. Kattlemann, PhD, RDN; S. E. Colby, PhD, RDN, University of Tennessee-Knoxville

Objective: Train college students from four universities (Florida, South Dakota, Tennessee, and West Virginia), over a semester course (16-weeks), to develop school year worth (24 weeks) of a social marketing intervention based around nutrition/food/diet, physical activity, stress management, sleep, and time management.

Target Audience: College students over 18 years old interested in taking a course to develop a peer-led, social marketing intervention.

Theory, Prior Research, Rationale: GetFruved is a multi-state project that uses a community-based participatory research (CBPR) approach for development and implementation of a peer-led intervention to increase health and wellness among college students. By

Continued on page S143

FN3 (continued)

recruiting and training interested students, an intervention would be developed that would increase the likelihood of relevance and acceptability of incoming college freshmen.

Description: Seventy-five students were recruited (8 = SD, 12 = TN, 26 = WV, and 29 = FL); with the population being predominately female (85%), Caucasian (79%), and sophomore standing (63%). Over the course of the semester, class content was delivered by current scientists, health professionals and community extension agents. Topics ranged from health behavior change, policy influences, environment influences, physical activity, stress management, healthful dietary behavior, marketing, art design, and environmental assessment.

Evaluation: Upon completion of course material, Social Marketing and Environment Intervention students developed 24 weeks of intervention events focused on diet, physical activity, stress management, sleep, and time management. Each week had corresponding advertisements, artwork, and social media posts. Students ultimately gained skills and knowledge of leadership and scientific research that aided them in developing an accurate and acceptable intervention.

Conclusions and Implications: Training students through CBPR allows for the development of an intervention that is factually based and accepted by incoming students.

Funding: USDA

FN4 Extension Leadership Training Program for Teen Researchers to Deliver Community Based Programing Through the Health Science Technology Academy (HSTA)

Melissa D. Olfert, DrPH, MS, RDN, melissa.olfert@mail.wvu.edu, West Virginia University, G016 Ag Sc Building, Morgantown, WV 26506; O. A. Famodu, MS, RDN; M. L. Barr, BS; S. J. King, MS; S. E. Colby, PhD, RD, University of Tennessee; L. Franzen-Castle, PhD, RD, University of Nebraska Lincoln; K. Kattelmann, PhD, RD, South Dakota State University; A. White, PhD, RD, University of Maine

Objective: To develop and implement an effective teen leadership/research training program that empowers teen researchers in HSTA to deliver intervention programs and collect data in community health.

Description: This program was developed to provide extension leadership training for teen researchers prior to delivery of community based participatory research (CBPR). The training was delivered to the HSTA, a STEM-based program that promotes research education for underrepresented students. Training materials included videos, quizzes, and teach backs that focused on community based approaches and extension leadership materials.

Target Audience: HSTA teens interested in implementing CBPR.

Theory, Prior Research, Rationale: Previously teen HSTA students were trained on research methods in basic

sciences, with little focus in CBPR interventions that focused on policy, system, and environmental (PSE). Support materials and training is needed to assist young researchers to measure impact and effectiveness in the community, especially Extension collaborations. This training program highlighted PSE awareness, guiding teen researchers through effective leadership skills, social-effective teaching across ages (youth to adult) participants, data collection and data analysis.

Evaluation: Following a conference call of expectations, clubs were sent resources and divided into groups of three to review. Fifteen HSTA clubs (n=44 students) started with 10 completing the training program. Feedback from the HSTA teachers reported: training materials were clear, age appropriate for teens and accessible. Students reported video and quizzes helped to enrich learning but printed manuals were somewhat overwhelming at times. Students are currently running CBPR interventions and collecting data.

Conclusions and Implications: Training program will allow the teen researchers in HSTA to gain knowledge and data on CBPR and PSE change in nutrition education.

Funding: USDA

FN5 University Student Auditors Report on Experience and Impact of Campus Environment and Policies

Melissa D. Olfert, DrPH, MS, RDN, melissa.olfert@mail.wvu.edu, West Virginia University, G016 Ag Sc Building, Morgantown, WV 26506; M. L. Barr, BS; O. A. Famodu, MS, RDN; R. L. Hagedorn, BS; S. J. King, MS

Objective: To evaluate student environment, auditors who assessed their university environment on the process of data collection, their perception of findings on the health of the student population, and possible policy to be implemented.

Design, Setting, and Participants: In Spring/Fall 2015 semesters, a team of West Virginia University students were trained to evaluate the healthfulness of the campus environment using the Healthy Campus Environmental Audit (HCEA), a tool developed by a multi-state team of researchers assessing: walkability/ bikeability, vending, dining halls, convenience stores, recreation services, and health policies in place.

Outcome Measures and Analysis: Data were entered into the audit tool and the campus received a score for each area audited. Student auditors then reported these observations at 2 town hall meetings of their peers highlighting policy, systems and environment sectors and dialoging about possible change. A focus group and survey of audit team experience over the two semesters was collected and thematically analyzed.

Results: Student auditors reported town hall meetings with their peers highlighted: the campus lacked healthy dining and vending options; recreation services were not sufficient to support the student population; audit tool needed further development to be user-friendly; tool did collect accurate depiction of campus environment; and

Continued on page S144