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Appendix A. Template 1

Section A: SNAP-Ed Narrative Annual Report 7 CFR 272.2 (i) OMB No. 0584-0083

Template Directions: Consolidate all Implementing Agency information into one State annual report using the template below. Refer to the Definitions Section for terms used in this template.

1. SNAP-Ed Program Overview:

Directions - Provide a one page (not more than 500 words) executive summary of SNAP-Ed activities during the reporting fiscal year. Please include the following as applicable:

- Progress in Achieving Overarching Goal(s):

  **CSU-E:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY’12 Goals</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
  | Increase reach of Colorado SNAP-Ed | • Closed the professional educator model.  
  | | • Hired and trained four supervisors and 17 paraprofessional educators in 13 counties.  
  | | • Reached 720 families directly and 2,468 family members indirectly. |
  | Improve overall diet quality and physical activity of SNAP-Ed participants | • 92% of participants improved in nutrition practices.  
  | | • 56% of participants improved in physical activity. |
  | Improve SNAP-Ed participants’ food resource management behaviors by maximizing limited resources. | • 90% of participants improved food resource management. |

  **Cooking Matters Colorado:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY12 Goals</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200 Courses, 80% graduation rate</td>
<td>297 Courses, 83% graduation rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 Families at Community Events</td>
<td>9,085 Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Shopping Matters Tours, 132 Participants</td>
<td>83 Tours, 416 Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 Families, Pantry Project</td>
<td>887 Families</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INEP: provided hands on classroom based nutrition education classes to 6,086 students and their families. Goals for increasing student outcomes and carryover to home exceeded projected improvement.

Denver Urban Gardens (DUG): provided nutrition education classes to 3 low-income schools, serving approximately 129 students and their families, and showed significant increases in participant’s improvement in overall diet quality.

- **Number of New Projects implemented during the reporting year by primary approach (Direct, Indirect, and Social Marketing):**

**Direct:**

- **CSU-E:** Paraprofessional nutrition educator model utilizing an 8 class series.
- **Cooking Matters Colorado:** Shopping Matters teaches families how to shop healthy on a limited budget at a grocery store.
- **INEP:** Enhanced outreach and connections between classroom and family/home.
- **DUG:** None

**Indirect:**

- **CSU-E:** 4,283 newsletters, 2,838 through exhibits.
- **Cooking Matters Colorado:** None
- **INEP:** None
- **DUG:** None

**Social Marketing:**

- **CSU-E:** None
- **Cooking Matters Colorado:** None
- **INEP:** none
- **DUG:** none

- **Number of ongoing projects that were operational during the reporting year by primary approach (Direct, Indirect and Social Marketing):**

**Direct:**

- **CSU-E:** NA – new program
- **Cooking Matters Colorado:** CMC provided 297 courses, with 5 curricula, in 42 counties. CMC offered one-time activities and the pantry project.
- **INEP:** served 7 counties, 27 low-income schools, 6,086 students and their families.
DUG: served 129 students and their families.

Indirect:

CSU-E: none
Cooking Matters Colorado: CMC provided cooking demos at health fairs, farmers markets, and food pantries.
INEP: Enhanced outreach and connections between classroom and family/home; bilingual recipes from lessons, recipe books and newsletters.
DUG: bilingual recipes and newsletters.

Social Marketing:

CSU-E: none
Cooking Matters Colorado: none
INEP/DUG: none

- Major Achievements (not already addressed):
  CSU-E: Newsletter developed, distributed. Most educators exceeding enrollment and behavior change goals.

  Cooking Matters Colorado: CMC exceeded goals and expected evaluation outcomes. This was accomplished by creating new satellite partnerships in several counties.

  INEP: exceeded goals for improved nutritional behaviors and knowledge; refined approach to work within high needs rural communities; improved family outreach and evaluation methods.

  DUG: Improved family outreach and evaluation methods.

- Major Setbacks, if any:
  CSU-E: Failed search for a supervisor led to the inability to hire six educators, limiting reach and the projected number of graduates in FY’12 by 288.

  Cooking Matters Colorado: Staff and leadership transitions caused some growing pains this year. While we navigated the changes smoothly, our need for volunteers continues to grow as the program grows.

  INEP: none

  DUG: none
Overall Assessment:

CSU-E: FY’12 was a year of transition involving the hiring and training of four supervisors and 17 educators. Educators met teaching goals and behavior change outcomes exceeded expectations proposed in the FY’12 Plan.

CMC: In 2012 CMC continued to grow with a strong year of program development. We had positive outcomes in all aspects of the program. CMC continues to have more requests for courses than we can currently accommodate.

INEP: well received in rural communities, strong feedback and positive evaluation results on positively changing the nutrition behaviors of our students and their families.

DUG: significant increases in participant’s improvement in overall diet quality.
## Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Education Guidance
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#### 2. SNAP-Ed Administrative Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Administrative Expense:</th>
<th>CSU-E</th>
<th>Cooking Matters</th>
<th>INEP/DUG</th>
<th>CDHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Salary</td>
<td>$315,415</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$162,603</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Training Functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Costs (identify % related to EARS, if possible)</td>
<td>$2,765</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment/Office Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,382</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Costs</td>
<td>$248,578</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>$5,563</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>$231,617</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>$39,293</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Charges (space, HR services, etc.)</td>
<td>$2,388</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. SNAP-Ed Evaluation Reports Completed for this Reporting Year

Using the chart below, identify the type(s) of SNAP-Ed evaluations (by project) that resulted in a written evaluation report of methods, findings and conclusions. Use the definitions of each type of evaluation that are provided in Box 1 (on the following page). Include a copy of each evaluation report that was produced in the appendix to this report. Impact evaluation reports should include the components described in Box 2 (on the following page). Each evaluation report should identify clearly the associated project name(s) on the cover or first page.

Colorado SNAP-Ed Plan Color Code:
Applies to all Implementing Agencies

CSU-Extension SNAP-Ed (CSU-E SNAP-Ed)
Cooking Matters Colorado (CMC)
Integrated Nutrition Education Program (INEP)
Denver Urban Gardens (DUG)
Colorado Department of Human Services (CDHS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Key Project Objective(s)</th>
<th>Target Audience</th>
<th>Check all Evaluation Types for which Reports Are Included*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU-E</td>
<td>CSU-E SNAP-Ed programs will be established in nine counties in Colorado and through staff recruitment and agency relations reach ~800 SNAP and SNAP eligible participants through: confirming county SNAP office support; advertising, hiring and training supervisors and nutrition paraprofessionals; developing new and continuous existing agency partnerships; and, training supervisors and paraprofessionals and reinforcing training through ongoing staff development activities.</td>
<td>Adult, pregnant women</td>
<td>FE PE OE IE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35% of SNAP-Ed participants will think about healthy food choices when deciding what to feed their family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% of SNAP-Ed participants will use the “Nutrition Facts” on the food label to make food choices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSU-E cont.</th>
<th>35% of SNAP-Ed participants will eat more than one kind of vegetable each day</th>
<th>Adults; pregnant women</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35% of SNAP-Ed participants will eat more than one kind of fruit each day.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30% of SNAP-Ed participants will eat meals that consist of a variety of foods.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20% fewer SNAP-Ed participants will leave meat and dairy foods sitting out for more than two hours.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40% fewer SNAP-Ed participants will thaw frozen foods at room temperature.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10% of SNAP-Ed participants will wash their hands with soap and warm running water before preparing food.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40% of SNAP-Ed participants will use a meat thermometer to measure the doneness of meat.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40% of SNAP-Ed participants will plan meals ahead of time.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40% of SNAP-Ed participants will compare prices before buying food.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30% of SNAP-Ed participants will not run out of food before the end of the month.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40% of SNAP-Ed participants will shop with a grocery list.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SNAP-Ed participants will decrease the amount of money spent on food last month by $60.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35% of SNAP-Ed participants will participate in at least 30 minutes of physical activity every day.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU-E cont.</td>
<td>15% of SNAP-Ed participants will get moderate physical activity on an average day.</td>
<td>Adults; pregnant women</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooking Matters Colorado</strong></td>
<td>• 50% of SNAP-Ed participants will intend to increase or increase fruit and vegetable consumption</td>
<td>Adults; children</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 50% of SNAP-Ed participants will intend to increase or increase whole grain consumption</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 40% of SNAP-Ed participants will intend to increase or increase low-fat dairy consumption</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 25% of SNAP-Ed participants will intend to increase or increase physical activity</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 20% of SNAP-Ed participants will intend to increase or increase at least one food safety practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 50% of SNAP-Ed participants will intend to increase or improve at least one food resource management practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 75% of participants will improve their cooking skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INEP</strong></td>
<td>• 50% of INEP children will increase their preference for fruits and vegetables</td>
<td>Elementary aged children and their families</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 40% or more INEP students will list more fruits and vegetables as favorite foods.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 75% or more INEP students will increase fruits and vegetables as listed preferences.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 40% of INEP children will increase their self-efficacy for preparation of a vegetable salad, fruit salad and/or fruit/vegetable-based snack</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 40% or more INEP students will increase their food preparation self-efficacy skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 70% or more INEP students will have taken the INEP recipe home.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 50% or more INEP students will indicate they made INEP recipes at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INEP cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary aged children and their families</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 30% of INEP children will increase their self-efficacy to eat more fruits/vegetables at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 30% or more INEP students will increase their self-efficacy to eat more fruits/vegetables pre- to post-evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 70% or more INEP students will have taken the INEP recipe home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 50% or more INEP students will indicate they made INEP recipes at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 70% of INEP children will be more knowledgeable about nutrition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• INEP teachers will indicate that 80% of their students are more aware of nutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 50% of INEP children will be more willing to try new foods because of increased exposure to the new foods as reported by their classroom teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• INEP teachers will indicate that 75% of their students are more willing to try new foods because of increased exposure through the INEP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 74% of INEP students that they eat more fruits and vegetables as a result of the nutrition classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 24% of students reported a decrease in the frequency of their soda consumption.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 24% of students reported an increase in the frequency of their milk consumption.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Classroom observations found &gt;75% of children observed were engaged in food activity during lessons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INEP cont.</td>
<td>Classroom observations found &gt;75% of children observed tasted the foods from the lessons.</td>
<td>Elementary aged children and their families</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUG</td>
<td>95% of students report eating more fruits and vegetables since class started.</td>
<td>Elementary aged students and their families</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57% of students reported that their family was eating more vegetables since class started.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Box 1-Evaluation Definitions:

**Formative Evaluation (FE)** usually occurs up front and provides information that is used during the development of an intervention. It may be used to determine if a target audience understands the nutrition messages or to test the feasibility of implementing a previously developed intervention in a new setting. Formative research results are used to shape the features of the intervention itself prior to implementation.

**Process Evaluation (PE)** systematically describes how an intervention looks in operation or actual practice. It includes a description of the context in which the program was initiated such as its participants, setting, materials, activities, duration, etc. Process assessments are used to determine if an intervention was implemented as intended. The findings answer the question of what worked or didn’t work.

**Outcome Evaluation (OE)** addresses the question of whether or not anticipated group changes or differences occur in conjunction with an intervention. Measuring shifts in a target group’s nutrition knowledge before and after an intervention is an example of outcome evaluation. Such research indicates the degree to which the intended outcomes occur among the target population. It does not provide definitive evidence, however, that the observed outcomes are due to the intervention.

**Impact Evaluation (IE)** allows one to conclude authoritatively, whether or not the observed outcomes are a result of the intervention. In order to draw cause and effect conclusions, impact evaluations incorporate research methods that eliminate alternative explanations. This requires comparing those (e.g., persons, classrooms, communities) who receive the intervention to those who either receive no treatment or an alternative intervention. The strongest impact evaluation randomly assigns the unit of study to treatment and control conditions, but other quasi-experimental research designs are sometimes the only alternative available.

Box 2-Impact Evaluation:

Include the following items in each impact evaluation report:

- **Name of the Project**
- **Project Goals (specifically those evaluated)**
- **Evaluation Design**: Describe the unit of assignment to intervention and control or comparison groups. Describe how assignment to these groups was carried out. Be explicit about whether or not this assignment was random. Describe how many units (and individuals if they were not the unit of assignment) were in the intervention and control or comparison groups at the start and end of the study.
- **Impact Measures**: Describe the measure(s) associated with each intervention goal. Describe the points at which data were collected and how. If there were any differences in measures for intervention and control or comparison groups, describe them.
- **Findings**: Describe the measurement results for intervention and control or comparison groups at each point data were collected.
- **Description of how evaluation results will be used**:
- **Point of Contact**:
- **Relevant Journal References**:
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4. SNAP - Ed Planned Improvements:

**Directions** - Describe any modifications planned for in the next fiscal year to improve the effectiveness of specific SNAP-Ed projects and/or to address problems experienced during the past year. Please identify the specific project(s).

**CSU-E:**

- The *Healthy Families* newsletters will be published and distributed quarterly instead of monthly. Newsletter reader feedback from the FY’12 pilot evaluation will be incorporated into the FY’13 newsletter.
- The CSU-E SNAP-Ed program will hire and train new paraprofessional educators once in FY’13 instead of twice which occurred in FY’12. After the close of the previous programming model, two rounds of hiring and training were necessary in FY’12 to implement the paraprofessional model.
- Additional continuous quality improvement measures will be implemented to ensure program model integrity and consistency across the state.

**Cooking Matters Colorado:**

- In the next year we plan to expand both geographically into high needs areas, and in the number of courses that we offer throughout the state. Expansion areas will include areas of high need and where there is a strong partner for course implementation. We will continue to build capacity with the train-the-trainer program, in the metro and satellite areas, to offer more courses without increasing our number of staff members.
- During the upcoming year we will review our outcome measures across implementation models to identify areas for program growth and improvement. This will help us to continue our efforts in offering high quality nutrition education programming across the state.
- In this next year, CMC will expand the Shopping Matters program to provide more families around the state with the education needed to shop healthy on a limited budget. CMC will build new partnerships and train additional facilitators to provide more families with grocery store tours. We also hope to enhance our partnership with CSU SNAP-Ed to offer Shopping Matters to CSU SNAP-Ed graduates.
- Communications improvements. Cooking Matters Colorado will work with the local and national staff to better brand, streamline, and conduct outreach to improve our communication about the programs offered in the community.
- In FFY13 CMC will focus on serving adults, specifically mothers of young children. CMC will continue to offer youth programming but with limitations.
- In FFY13 CMC will use onetime educational activities to recruit adult participants for CMC and CSU SNAP-Ed courses.

**INEP:**

- In FFY13 an updated curriculum will be used that introduces the new USDA MyPlate food guidance system and messages. Along with this shift, all materials used in the classrooms, schools and parent outreach will be used to reinforce core messages suggested through the MyPlate food guidance system. These messages are as follows;
  - Make half your plate fruits and vegetables!
Vary your veggies!
Focus on fruit!
Whole wheat is great to eat!
Keep your bones strong, calcium can’t be wrong! Drink and eat low-fat dairy foods.
Be active every day, in your own way!
Eat healthy foods together as a family!
Be brave and try new foods!
Wash your hands regularly!

- New methods will be adopted to enhance the connection between classroom nutrition lessons and messages, and the efforts to share these same messages with the family/home. In addition to the bilingual lesson recipes and nutrition tips that are sent home after every lesson, 3 newsletters will be sent home with every participating INEP student. These newsletters (provided in English and Spanish) will reinforce the messages listed above and will also share nutrition information, recommendations and recipes. After participating in the INEP program students will receive a recipe book to take home and share with their family.
- Additionally, in an effort to reinforce the core nutrition messages via multiple exposures, every school will be provided with an assortment of nutrition posters (bilingual where available), primarily promoting the importance of eating more fruits and vegetables, and the promotion of the MyPlate website. Posters will be provided to all school lunchrooms, classroom teachers, physical education teachers, and to each school to post in areas frequented by parents.
- A partnership with the University of Colorado School of Public Health will be expanded to provide greater expertise and advise from their statistical and evaluation staff. This will allow us to improve methods used to evaluate the impact of messaging and nutrition education on the child and the impact on the home environment.
- Expanded partnerships and collaboration will be pursued with other SNAP-Ed programs in Colorado to encourage our INEP schools to promote adult nutrition education classes that can be provided by CSU-Extension and Cooking Matters Colorado. Multiple strategies will be used to enroll parents in these classes through optimizing the already established relationships that INEP has with schools. Reaching parents will happen via single event Parent Nutrition Nights, postings at the schools, and face-to-face invitations to parents. The opportunity to provide a series of nutrition education classes to the parents of INEP students, who are concurrently receiving nutrition education in school through INEP, is based on the social ecological model to provide multiple sources of similar messaging for optimal impact on long-term behavior change.
- In addition to the partnership opportunities listed above, INEP staff will also collaborate with CSU-Extension and CMC in areas where INEP is no longer offered, but where children recently participated in the INEP program and where relationships with prior schools remain strong. This will happen primarily in the urban metro areas of Denver and Aurora.

DUG:

- For FFY13 a new model will be instituted focusing on a Train-the-Trainer approach. Participating classroom teachers will be offered the opportunity to have the DUG staff teach the lessons with the classroom, while role modeling and instructing teacher on best practices for the teaching of these lessons. The goal will be that those teachers can then teach the classrooms independently the following year, with ongoing support offered by DUG. This will allow greater reach for the DUG classes.
- DUG will continue to look for ways to enhance the classroom to home connections. These happen via newsletters, take home information from the classes, invitations to parents to
attend classes if their schedules allow, and a single event Parent Night where parents are invited to come learn more about what their student has been learning through these classes.

5. EARS Feedback:

Directions: For this reporting year, provide FNS feedback on State implementation of EARS. Include the following as applicable:

- Comments regarding any challenges you encountered in gathering and reporting data for EARS and actions taken to resolve or address these challenges: Identify the section and item number when making comments. For example: Comment: Question 10. It was challenging to get this information. We addressed this by providing all partners with spreadsheets and training to help them track these costs.

CSU-E:

Overall, new systems other than the Nutrition Education Evaluating and Reporting System (NEERS5) had to be created in order to capture data required for EARS. Perhaps a national committee could be formed to discuss the different methods used by states to capture required EARS data and provide opportunities to share successes with other states. In our opinion, NEERS5 should continue to be utilized by SNAP-Ed. However, it would be helpful if SNAP-Ed leaders at the national level could work with EFNEP leadership at the national level to ask that the changes identified here be incorporated into the next version of NEERS5 (Web NEERS). Ideally, FNS would contract with an IA to develop a web-based system or enhance NEERS5 such that all EARS requirements could be input into one web-based reporting system. This would not only make reporting easier for IA, but also allow for aggregation of data at the regional and national levels of FNS.

1a - Participants by Age and SNAP Status

NEERS5 can be utilized for this, though it is cumbersome because filters must be created for the different age ranges, and a separate report printed for each age range.

It is hard to incorporate many Implementing Agencies explanations about providing Estimated Counts into the box which limits to 100 characters.

1b - SNAP Contacts by Age and SNAP Status

No method exists for capturing this data, so another method had to be created.

It is hard to incorporate many Implementing Agencies explanations about providing Estimated Counts into the box which limits to 100 characters.

2a - Direct Education: SNAP-Ed PARTICIPANTS by Gender

It is hard to incorporate many Implementing Agencies explanations about providing Estimated Counts into the box which limits to 25 characters.

2b - Direct Education: SNAP Contacts by Gender

No method exists for capturing this data, so another method had to be created.

It is hard to incorporate many Implementing Agencies explanations about providing Estimated Counts into the box which limits to 25 characters.
3 - Direct Education: Race and Ethnicity

In NEERS5, the totals for Hispanic and non-Hispanic under each race do not match, so additional calculations must be made, and assumptions based on the numbers provided.

4 – Direct Education: Number of Delivery Sites by Type of Setting; 5 – Direct Education Programming Format; 6 – Educational Topic Areas of Emphasis

No method exists for capturing this data, so another method had to be created.

6 – Primary Content of Direct Education

With multiple Implementing Agencies, limiting the options of primary content of direct education to four choices is very limiting and misses the breadth of many direct education endeavors.

Cooking Matters Colorado:

We were still challenged this year in collecting demographic data for contacts at one time event for questions 1, 2, and 3. We improved our process for FFY12 by working with our national office to create a new reporting tool to collect this data at one time events and trained staff to use this tool.

INEP: No comments.

- Does FNS need to provide additional EARS training or resources? If yes, specify training topics and/or type of resources needed.

CSU-E:

- A national committee of state SNAP-Ed IA’s could be formed to share ideas, suggestions and resources for capturing EARS data among states;
- FNS could facilitate regular (perhaps quarterly) calls for data management personnel to discuss questions, challenges and share solutions.
- FNS could create a national list serve for data management personnel. This list serve could be used to share information and ask questions.

Cooking Matters Colorado:

It is very burdensome for Cooking Matters staff locally and nationally to report quarterly EARS data to the state SNAP office. This is due to our collection and processing method. If there is training on how to do this more efficiently or resources to support the effort it would be appreciated.

INEP: No comments.
What, if any, changes did you make in your IT system or manual data collection procedures for EARS in the prior fiscal year? If available, attach a description of updated IT systems and/or manual data collection procedures.

**CSU-E:**
We began collecting agency collaboration information and teaching visit numbers from educators as an ongoing, monthly report. This information is then used to complete the EARS report at the end of the year.

**Cooking Matters Colorado:**
Cooking Matters updated its data collection system for more accurate reporting. An additional enrollment tools was created to help input more accurate information from onetime events into the data collection system.

**INEP:**
Classroom teachers track the number of students in attendance for each INEP lesson. Demographic information is extrapolated from Colorado Department of Education data. A new form was developed for use by classroom teachers in FY12 in an attempt to gather more accurate classroom counts. Because INEP is a school based program, EARS data is gathered based on the school calendar with attendance data collected after the fall semester and the spring semester.

Do you plan to make any changes in your IT system or manual data collection procedures for EARS in the next FY? If yes, provide a short summary of changes planned.

**CSU-E:**
Access reports will be improved so that data isn’t being pulled from so many different reports and sources.

**Cooking Matters Colorado:**
CMC is considering how to streamline the process for quarterly EARS reporting. We will need to change something to be in compliance with the quarterly requirement of the state SNAP office and the very short turnaround time. We are still not sure how to change things to accomplish this.

**INEP:**
Class lists are collected from each school office three times yearly to compare official class counts with the numbers reported by the classroom teacher to ensure accurate reporting. A process to collect participant data from parent nights will be implemented.
- Will all IAs report actual unduplicated data for EARS in the upcoming fiscal year? If not, why?

  **CSU-E:** Yes  
  **Cooking Matters Colorado:** Yes  
  **INEP:**
  The actual number of participating students is tracked for each lesson. The actual counts are averaged over the course of each semester to determine the unduplicated count.

- Share suggestions for modifications to the EARS form, if any. Indicate how the modification would improve EARS, i.e. the reporting process for State, data quality, etc. **Identify the section and item number when making suggestions please. For example: Direct Ed Section, Question 3, Race and Ethnicity. Consider adding a narrative field to allow IAs to make notations about the data or the collection procedures.**

  **CSU-E:**
  EARS only allows IAs to report demographics and direct and indirect numbers and not outcomes or impacts. Consider adding a section after both direct and indirect sections for IA to fill-in “project specific goals” and a compatible section to report outcomes associated with those goals.

  **Cooking Matters Colorado:** None  
  **INEP:** None

- Other comments.

  **CSU-E:** none  
  **Cooking Matters Colorado:**

  - Quarterly EARS reporting (as required by Colorado state SNAP office) is very challenging for our local and national staff. It is a time consuming process that is very labor intensive. The requirement that the report be completed within 30 days after the quarter is almost impossible for CMC to achieve since our data is compiled and analyzed at the national Share Our Strength (SOS) office with an outside contractor. We would request that for Q1-3 we would have 60 days to complete the report and we will make the necessary rush for the year-end report to be complete within 30 days.

  - Although we improved the data collection process from last year to this year there were still some challenges in providing data collection without some estimation. I feel confident that next year will go even more smoothly with even better data collection as we continue to understand our needs within the process better. Thank you for working with us and your patience as we continue to move towards more a more comprehensive data collection process.
Appendix A. Template 1. Section A Continued:

6. Appendices:

**Directions** - Attach evaluation reports included under item # 3. Optional: States may also provide a brief description or information that highlights other SNAP-Ed projects that are not reported under the sections above.

**Reports included below are Outcome Evaluation reports and not Impact Evaluations. These Outcome Evaluations were included because there is no other place provided in the FY'12 SNAP-Ed Year End Report template to include these Outcome Evaluations. **

**CSU-E:**

Name of Project: CSU-E SNAP-Ed Adult lesson series

Project Goals (specifically those evaluated):

By September 30, 2012:

1) CSU-E SNAP-Ed programs will be established in thirteen counties in Colorado and through staff recruitment and agency relations reach ~800 SNAP and SNAP eligible participants.

2) After participating in a series of lessons (Eating Smart • Being Active), the following participant nutrition behaviors will improve from paired pre- and post-tests:
   - thinking about healthy food choices when deciding what to feed their family improve by 35%.
   - using the “Nutrition Facts” on the food label to make food choices improve by 50%.
   - eating more than one kind of vegetable each day improve by 35%.
   - eating more than one kind of fruit each day improve by 35%.
   - eating meals that consist of a variety of foods improve by 30%.

3) After participating in a series of lessons (Eating Smart • Being Active), the following participant food safety behaviors will improve from paired pre and post-tests:
   - leaving meat and dairy foods sit out for more than two hours decrease by 20%.
   - thawing frozen foods at room temperature decrease by 40%.
   - washing their hands with soap and warm running water before preparing food improve by 10%.
   - using a meat thermometer to measure the doneness of meat improve by 40%.

4) After participating in a series of lessons (Eating Smart • Being Active), the following participant food resource management behaviors will improve from paired pre and post-tests:
   - planning meals ahead of time improve by 40%.
   - comparing prices before buying food improve by 40%.
   - running out of food before the end of the month decrease by 30%.
   - shopping with a grocery list improve by 40%.
   - amount of money spent on food last month decrease by $60.

5) After participating in a series of lessons (Eating Smart • Being Active), the following participant physical activity behaviors will improve from paired pre- and posttests:
   - participating in at least 30 minutes of physical activity every day increase by 35%.
   - getting moderate physical activity on an average day increase by 15%.

**Evaluation Design:**

Adults reached with a core curriculum (Eating Smart • Being Active) will have outcomes measured using the Nutrition Education Evaluating and Reporting System (NEERS5). NEERS5 provides for input and analysis of class participant demographics, nutrition, food safety, physical
activity and food budgeting. Data are collected using Entry (pre) and Exit (post) surveys, which include 19 questions from the NEERS5 behavior checklist and/or supplemental question database as well as a 24-hour dietary analysis.

NEERS5 features CSU-E SNAP-Ed use includes:

- Demographic information on the program participants;
- Pregnancy and/or nursing status of female participants;
- Public assistance programs participants are receiving (free or reduced school lunch or breakfast, Food Distribution – Indian Reservations, SNAP, Head Start, TANF, TEFAP, WIC);
- Behavior checklist component to assess improvement(s) in the areas of nutrition practices, food resource management, physical activity, and food safety;
- 24-hour food recall; and,
- Comparison of entry and exit information to assess class series impacts.

Impact Measures:
NA

Findings:
CSU-E SNAP-Ed nutrition class series improved participants’ preferences for and attitudes towards fruits and vegetables, and helped improve their overall diet quality, food resource management skills and physical activity.

By September 30, 2012:

**Goal 1** - CSU-E SNAP-Ed programs were established in thirteen counties in Colorado and through staff recruitment and agency relations reached 720 SNAP and SNAP eligible participants. A failed search for a supervisor in the western part of the state led to a reduction in the number of educators hired, two paraprofessional nutrition educator terminations and one resignation which limited the reach of the CSU-E SNAP-Ed program and the projected number of participants reached.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 2 - after participating in a series of lessons (Eating Smart • Being Active), the following participant nutrition behaviors improved from paired pre- and post-tests:</th>
<th>FY'12 Behavior change</th>
<th>FY'12 Actual behavior change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>thinking about healthy food choices when deciding what to feed their family improve by __%.</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>using the “Nutrition Facts” on the food label to make food choices improve by __%.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eating more than one kind of vegetable each day improve by __%.</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eating more than one kind of fruit each day improve by __%.</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eating meals that consist of a variety of foods improve by __%.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Goal 3 - after participating in a series of lessons (Eating Smart • Being Active), the following participant food safety behaviors improved from paired pre- and post-tests:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>FY'12 Behavior change</th>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>FY'12 Actual behavior change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>leaving meat and dairy foods sit out for more than two hours decrease by ___%.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thawing frozen foods at room temperature decrease by ___%.</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>washing their hands with soap and warm running water before preparing food improve by ___%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>using a meat thermometer to measure the doneness of meat improve by ___%.</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Goal 4 - after participating in a series of lessons (Eating Smart • Being Active), the following participant food resource management behaviors will improve from paired pre and post-tests:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>FY'12 Behavior change</th>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>FY'12 Actual behavior change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>planning meals ahead of time improve by ___%.</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comparing prices before buying food improve by ___%.</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>running out of food before the end of the month decrease by ___%.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shopping with a grocery list improve by ___%.</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amount of money spent on food last month decrease by $___.</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$10.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Goal 5 - after participating in a series of lessons (Eating Smart • Being Active), the following participant physical activity behaviors improved from paired pre- and post-tests:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>FY'12 Behavior change</th>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>FY'12 Actual behavior change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>participating in at least 30 minutes of physical activity every day increase by ___%.</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>getting moderate physical activity on an average day increase by ___%.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CSU-E SNAP-Ed Outreach – Total Numbers for FY’12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class series - ESBA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of persons in program families</td>
<td>2,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Families newsletters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families reached through newsletters</td>
<td>9,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibits and displays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families reached through exhibits and displays</td>
<td>2,838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description of how evaluation results will be used:
The program evaluation results are reported annually to the Colorado Department of Human Services (CDHS) and Mountain Plains Regional USDA Office documenting the behavioral outcomes of SNAP-Ed funding provided to CSU-E SNAP-Ed. In addition, the program evaluation results are utilized by CSU-E SNAP-Ed staff members to maintain and/or improve program implementation, curricula, training, educational materials and evaluation instruments.

Point of Contact:
Susan Baker, EdD
Associate Professor/Extension Specialist Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program-Education (SNAP-Ed)
Dept. of Food Science and Human Nutrition
101 Gifford, Campus Box 1571
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, CO 80523-1571
Email: Susan.Baker@colostate.edu
Phone: (970) 491-5798
Fax: (970) 491-8729

Relevant Journal References:
None
**Name of Project:** CSU-E SNAP-Ed *Healthy Families* newsletters

**Project Goals (specifically those evaluated):**

The CSU-E SNAP-Ed newsletter delivered to SNAP and SNAP eligible adults will aim to reinforce educational messages similar to the *Eating Smart • Being Active (ESBA)* curriculum.

1. Focus groups will be arranged with a sample of the target population to gather feedback about newsletter design, content and messaging to help in designing the newsletters for distribution in spring/summer 2012.
2. Return evaluation postcards will be included in each newsletter for readers to reply about: overall attitudes of the newsletter; trying the recipe(s); and, trying the physical activity.

**Evaluation Design:**

CSU-E SNAP-Ed newsletters that are sent to Denver County SNAP participants by mail and are not delivered to an appropriate address will be returned to CSU mailing services. This number will be used to estimate how many newsletters were delivered to SNAP participants. For individuals returning the evaluation postcard, the following will indicate performance:

- A return rate of 10% for questionnaire postcards
- 50% of respondents indicate favorable attitude of newsletters
- 40% of respondents indicate using recipes in newsletters
- 25% of respondents tried physical activity included in newsletters

**Formative Evaluation:**

Evaluation of newsletter concept, formatting, nutrition and physical activity messages will be collected through focus groups with the target audience in winter 2012. Feedback will help direct newsletter design and message content.

**Process Evaluation:**

The Evaluation Director will monitor how many CSU-E SNAP-Ed newsletters are returned to CSU mailing services as a measure of receipt of newsletters.

**Outcome Evaluation:**

Once information from focus groups is gathered, design of the newsletters will proceed. From the content of the newsletters, the postcard questionnaires will be created. Questions will relate to the newsletter design and content. Results from returned postcards will be collected and analyzed and measurements will be compiled.

**Impact Measures:**

NA

**Findings:**

**Formative Evaluation:**

Six focus groups (3 English, 3 Spanish) were conducted with individuals in their first class of an *Eating Smart • Being Active* nutrition education series; the curriculum used in Colorado to teach CSU-E SNAP-Ed participants. The focus groups were audio-taped and recordings were transcribed and summarized for content themes and formatting preferences.
Focus group questions included topics addressing access to health information, how health information is used, what types of health information are important with this audience, formatting preferences (layout design, font, colors, etc.) and desired content areas (physical activity, children's content, recipes, nutrition facts, etc.). Preferences regarding content areas and formatting/design were discussed using 4 previously published nutrition newsletters found on the USDA SNAP-Ed Connections website and 3 mock newsletters created by the CSU-E SNAP-Ed research team. English and Spanish focus groups were evaluated separately and combined, with differences between groups noted. Emergent themes included healthy eating, recipes, child nutrition, physical activity; with formatting preferences indicating ease of reading, attention-grabbing colors/color blocking, provision of contact information/resources and bilingual requirement. Overall, participants revealed a desire for simple, understandable, relevant and application-based information in a newsletter format. This study provides verification of the desire for nutrition education by low-income populations, and validates the receptiveness of SNAP-eligible individuals to receiving nutrition information in a newsletter.

Four pilot newsletters were created using the feedback provided from the focus groups. Formatting application included color-blocking each section, using real pictures, keeping the reading level low, plenty of white space, and bulleting information/using list formats when applicable. Content area application included provision of contact information, a required main-dish recipe that was simple and required minimal, low-cost ingredients, a physical activity section, a cohesive main topic theme, and relevant, easily understood/applied nutrition or food safety information. Newsletters were provided in both Spanish and English, albeit separately (1 double-sided page in English, 1 double-sided page in Spanish). For mailing, each envelope included both the English and Spanish versions of the newsletter. Postage paid, pre-addressed feedback postcards were additionally included with each newsletter.

**Process Evaluation:**

Once the newsletters were developed, the distribution was monitored by tracking 1) the number of newsletters returned because of invalid addresses and 2) the number of newsletters that were distributed at community agencies. In addition, we queried educators about what their clients and agency personnel said about the newsletters. Comments were quite positive and agencies requested more newsletters and expressed interest in continuing to receive newsletters.

**Outcome Evaluation:**

As of September 30th, 2012, over 250 postcards have been returned – 43% from mailings and 57% from picking up at an agency. Over 80% of respondents read the newsletter and 12% indicated they planned on reading it. A third had tried the recipe while 53% were planning on making the recipe. Depending on the month, from 37-61% had tried the physical activity; Spanish readers were more likely (70%) to have done the physical activity than English readers (40%). Those who received the newsletters in the mail (versus picking up at an agency) were more likely to make the recipe (46% versus 27%) and try the physical activity (64% versus 34%).

**Description of how evaluation results will be used:**

Data from the returned postcards will be used to help confirm the value of the newsletters to participants, determine if there continues to be a difference between English and Spanish readers, and verify what participants are learning from the newsletters.
Point of Contact:
Garry Auld, PhD, RD  
Professor  
Department of Food Science and Human Nutrition  
105 Gifford  
Colorado State University  
Fort Collins, CO 80523  
970-491-7429 (w) 970-491-7252 (fax)

Relevant Journal References:
Cooking Matters Colorado:

Name of Project: Cooking Matters Colorado

Project Goals (specifically those evaluated): By September 30, 2012

• 50% of SNAP-Ed participants will intend to increase or increase fruit and vegetable consumption.
• 50% of SNAP-Ed participants will intend to increase or increase whole grain consumption.
• 40% of SNAP-Ed participants will intend to increase or increase low-fat dairy consumption.
• 25% of SNAP-Ed participants will intend to increase or increase physical activity.
• 20% of SNAP-Ed participants will intend to increase or increase at least one food safety practice.
• 50% of SNAP-Ed participants will intend to improve or improve at least one food resource management practice.
• 75% of SNAP-Ed participants will improve their cooking skills.

Program Specific Project Goals:
Adult participants will:
• Increase consumption of fruits, vegetables, whole grains and low fat dairy products
• Increase skills and confidence in prepare meals that include a variety of foods from MyPlate
• Increase how often food prices are compared before buying food
• Decrease often food is left out for more than 2 hours
• Decrease how often run food runs out before the end of the month
• Receive information on how to participate in SNAP
• Increase or intention to increase participation in physical activity

Youth participants will:
• Increase confidence in being able to prepare something with vegetables
• Increase confidence in being able to prepare something with fruit
• Know how to follow a recipe directions

Evaluation Design:
Cooking Matters adult, teen and young parent participant outcomes were measured using a post-retrospective evaluation tool that allows participants answer both what they did before the course started and what they do at the end of the 6-week course. The tool measures percent change of the participant. The tool is designed to measure knowledge, behavior and attitude as related to nutrition, cooking skills, food budgeting, and food safety practices. It also gives participants an opportunity to provide feedback on their course experience. Each specific goal has at least one related question on the survey tool.

Child participant outcomes were measured using a pre- and post-survey. The survey tool asks questions regarding attitude, knowledge and behavior and provides an opportunity for participant feedback.
• 297, 6-week long courses completed, reaching 3,859 families
• Courses were conducted in partnership with 249 different agencies
### Cooking Matters Course Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Total number of courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooking Matters for Adult (English and Spanish and with EXTRAs)</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking Matters for Families (English and Spanish)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking Matters for Teens</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking Matters for Kids</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking Matters for Young Parents</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Matters</td>
<td>83 tours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 887 Families were reached through Pantry demonstrations, and one time education events.
- 9,085 Families were reached through nutrition 101 events, health fairs, produce fairs, and other onetime events.
- 416 Families were reached through Shopping Matters Tours

### Cooking Matters Contacts Chart – Total Numbers for FFY 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Education</th>
<th>Unduplicated Contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families Reached through Courses</td>
<td>3,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families Reached through onetime events</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families Reached through Pantry Project</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families Reached through Shopping Matters</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect Education</th>
<th>Contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families Reached through Onetime event</td>
<td>8,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families Reached through Pantry Project</td>
<td>773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact Measures:

NA
Findings: Cooking Matters Evaluation Outcomes for each curriculum type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Participant Change in Dietary Quality/Positive Eating Habit Changes</th>
<th>Adults in CM for Adults</th>
<th>Adults in CM for Families</th>
<th>Teens in CM for Teens</th>
<th>Teens in CM for Young Parents</th>
<th>Youth in CM for Families</th>
<th>Youth in CM for Kids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Increased vegetable consumption (increase confidence can make something with vegetables)
- Increased fruit consumption (increase confidence can make something with fruit)
- Increased whole grain consumption
- Increased low fat dairy and fat free dairy products
- Increased confidence to talk to family about health eating/Learned one new thing about healthy eating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 2</th>
<th>Participant Change in Positive Changes in Cooking Habits</th>
<th>Adults in CM for Adults</th>
<th>Adults in CM for Families</th>
<th>Teens in CM for Teens</th>
<th>Teens in CM for Young Parents</th>
<th>Youth in CM for Families</th>
<th>Youth in CM for Kids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Improved/learned one new cooking skill(s) (increased confidence to talk to family about health cooking)
- Increase how often made meals including at least 3 food groups
- Increased of often/liked making meals at home with their family (CMK-Increased confidence in following a recipe)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 3</th>
<th>Participant Change in Shopping Behavior/Food Resource Management</th>
<th>Adults in CM for Adults</th>
<th>Adults in CM for Families</th>
<th>Teens in CM for Teens</th>
<th>Teens in CM for Young Parents</th>
<th>Youth in CM for Families</th>
<th>Youth in CM for Kids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>356%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 4</th>
<th>Participant Change in Food Safety</th>
<th>Adults in CM for Adults</th>
<th>Adults in CM for Families</th>
<th>Teens in CM for Teens</th>
<th>Teens in CM for Young Parents</th>
<th>Youth in CM for Families</th>
<th>Youth in CM for Kids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 5</th>
<th>Participant Change in Food Security</th>
<th>Adults in CM for Adults</th>
<th>Adults in CM for Families</th>
<th>Teens in CM for Teens</th>
<th>Teens in CM for Young Parents</th>
<th>Youth in CM for Families</th>
<th>Youth in CM for Kids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 6</th>
<th>Physical Activity</th>
<th>Adults in CM for Adults</th>
<th>Adults in CM for Families</th>
<th>Teens in CM for Teens</th>
<th>Teens in CM for Young Parents</th>
<th>Youth in CM for Families</th>
<th>Youth in CM for Kids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description of how evaluation results will be used: The evaluation results will be beneficial to Cooking Matters for planning activities during the coming year. These outcomes will direct the education and training provided to both Cooking Matters staff and volunteers. With the data collected we will develop an improved volunteer educator training. The outcomes will also help us to look at the programming offered around the state and help to determine which model(s) for implementation are achieving the strongest behavior change. This will be important for program planning and development moving forward.

The evaluation results will allow us to focus our efforts on the quality of the nutrition education and cooking skills courses we provide. These outcomes will serve as a benchmark for future outcomes. We would like to at least maintain if not increase the high quality outcomes we achieved in FFY2012 in FFY2013.
INEP:

Name of Project: Integrated Nutrition Education Program, classroom based nutrition lesson series.

Project Goals (specifically those evaluated):

By September 30, 2012:

1) INEP programming (curriculum and lesson materials for a series of 12 grade specific nutrition lessons per classroom) will be continued in 7 counties; Alamosa, Conejos, Costilla, Rio Grande, Saguache, Mesa and Weld; serving approximately 16 school districts, 32 schools and 346 classrooms, reaching approximately 6,900 elementary aged children and their families;

2) The following objectives will be evaluated via a pre/post classroom survey, teacher survey and teacher feedback.
   a. 50% of INEP children will increase their preference for fruits and vegetables;
   b. 40% of INEP children will increase their self-efficacy for preparation of a vegetable salad, fruit salad and/or fruit/vegetable-based snack;
   c. 30% of INEP children will increase their self-efficacy to eat more fruits/vegetables at home;
   d. 70% of INEP children will be more knowledgeable about nutrition;
   e. 50% of INEP children will be more willing to try new foods because of increased exposure to the new foods as reported by their classroom teacher.

Evaluation Design:

INEP students, whose classrooms are participating in the INEP program, will be administered pre/post classroom surveys using a bilingual tool (provided in either English or Spanish) that measures food preferences, self-efficacy, and nutrition behaviors.

Impact Measures:

See report below

Findings:

Children participating in the INEP program showed improvement in overall diet quality, improved preferences for fruits and vegetables, improved self-efficacy and knowledge around promotion of fruits and vegetables, an increased willingness to try new foods, and a majority of students reported taking INEP lessons home and then trying recipes at home with their families.

Integrated Nutrition Education Program Objectives and Outcomes for the 2011-2012 School Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective and Indicator</th>
<th>Actual Outcome</th>
<th>Objective Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1 – By September 30, 2012, 50% of INEP children will increase their preference for fruits and vegetables pre- to post-evaluation</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.1 – After completion of classroom-based lessons (12 or 18 lessons), 40% or more INEP students will list more fruits and vegetables as favorite foods.</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.2 – After completion of classroom-based lessons (12 or 18), 75% or more INEP students will increase fruits and vegetables as listed preferences.</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2 – By September 30, 2012, 40% of INEP children will increase their self-efficacy for preparation of a vegetable salad, fruit salad and/or fruit/vegetable-based snack pre- to post-evaluation</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 2.1 –</strong> After completion of classroom-based lessons (12 or 18 lessons), 40% or more INEP students will increase their food preparation self-efficacy skills.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 2.2 –</strong> After completion of classroom-based lessons (12 or 18 lessons), 70% or more INEP students will have taken the INEP recipe home.</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 2.3 –</strong> After completion of classroom-based lessons (12 or 18 lessons), 50% or more INEP students will indicate they made INEP recipes at home.</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>Almost Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 3 – By September 30, 2012, 30% of INEP children will increase their self-efficacy to eat more fruits/vegetables at home pre- to post-evaluation</td>
<td>44-45%</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 3.1 –</strong> After completion of classroom-based lessons (12 or 18 lessons), 30% or more INEP students will increase their self-efficacy to eat more fruits/vegetables pre- to post-evaluation</td>
<td>Fruit = 45%</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veg = 44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 3.2 –</strong> After completion of classroom-based lessons (12 or 18 lessons), 70% or more INEP students will have taken the INEP recipe home.</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 3.3 –</strong> After completion of classroom-based lessons (12 or 18 lessons), 50% or more INEP students will indicate they made INEP recipes at home.</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>Almost Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 4 – By September 30, 2012, 70% of INEP children will be more knowledgeable about nutrition as reported by their classroom teacher</td>
<td>85-99%</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 4.1 –</strong> After completion of classroom-based lessons (12 or 18 lessons), INEP teachers will indicate that 80% of their students are more aware of nutrition</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 4.2 –</strong> After completion of classroom-based lessons (12 or 18 lessons), INEP teachers will indicate that 85% of their students are more knowledgeable about nutrition</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 5 – By September 30, 2012, 50% of INEP children will be more willing to try new foods because of increased exposure to the new foods as reported by their classroom teacher</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 5.1 –</strong> After completion of classroom-based lessons (12 or 18 lessons), INEP teachers will indicate that 75% of their students are more willing to try new foods because of increased exposure through the INEP</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Noteworthy Results Highlights:**
- 74% of INEP students said that they eat more fruits and vegetables as a result of the nutrition classes.
- After completion of INEP, 54% of the students indicate that they have set a goal to eat more fruits and 34% said they have set a goal to eat more vegetables.
- After the completion of INEP, 24% of students reported a decrease in the frequency of their soda consumption.
After the completion of INEP, 24% of students reported an increase in the frequency of their milk consumption.

**Description of how evaluation results will be used:**

The program evaluation results are reported annually to the Colorado Department of Human Services (CDHS) and Mountain Plains Regional USDA Office documenting the behavioral outcomes of SNAP-Ed funding provided to INEP. In addition, the program evaluation results are utilized by INEP staff members to maintain and/or improve program implementation, curricula, training, educational materials and evaluation instruments.

**INEP, Name of Project: Classroom observations**

**Project Goals (specifically those evaluated):** A minimum of 15 classroom observations will be conducted to help determine lesson quality and fidelity to intended lesson delivery.

**Evaluation Design:** Trained INEP staff will schedule and observe INEP lessons delivered by classroom teachers. A standard observation tool is used and then results are combined for reporting purposes.

**Findings:** Our observations showed that teachers were doing a good job of following the intent and components of the lessons. Students were observed discussing and engaging in the nutrition messaging. Even more important, students were very excited to prepare and taste the variety of foods introduced in the INEP lessons, and indicated an excitement and willingness to take recipes home and encourage their families to prepare the recipes at home.

**Description of how evaluation results will be used:** All lessons will be updated to include the MyPlate food guidance system and core messaging. This will help to ensure that all teachers are sharing that joint nutrition education information with students. In addition, the lesson observation tool will be revised and updated to allow for greater uniformity in reporting from all INEP observations. This will allow for improved reporting as well.

**INEP FY12 Classroom Observations - Summary**

- 20 classroom observations were conducted;
- 13 schools had at least one lesson observation;
- 85% of teachers observed adhered to lesson’s components satisfactorily;
- 89% of children practiced hand-washing before food preparation in the lesson;
- >75% of children observed were engaged in food activity during the lesson;
- >75% of children observed tasted the food(s) from the lesson.
- 70% of teachers observed gave students copy of recipe to take home and encouraged them to try it at home.
Classroom Observations (N=20 teachers/class observations, note: N will change if question is N/A)

Results
Number of Observations = 20
Number of Schools = 13
Number of teachers = 20

Lessons Observed
Kinder- My Five Senses - Little Red Hen (2 times) - Vegetable Bug - Graphing Your Favorite Fruits
1st Grade- Blueberries for Me (2 times) - Bread, Bread, Bread (2 times) - Chinese Chopsticks – Fruity Milkshake
2nd Grade- Bean Bag Salad - Parts of the Plant Salad - Taste Your Words
3rd Grade- Still Life (2 times) - Mapping the Tongue (2 times)
4th Grade- Whole Grains
5th Grade- Germ Scientist

Set-Up
Complete – 17 (90%)
Partial – 2 (10%)
None - 0
Incomplete Observation – 1

Hand Washing
Yes – 16 (89%)
No – 2 (11%)
Incomplete Observation – 2

Key Nutrition Behavior
Yes – 18 (90%)
No – 2 (10%)

Book and Texts (14 lessons observed had books, 3 lessons had text, 3 lessons had neither)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>% Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did teacher use book? (14)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did teacher use text? (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All &gt;75%</th>
<th>Most 50-75%</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>% &gt;75%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were Kids focused on book? (14)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were Kids focused on text? (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recipe** (12 lessons observed have recipes – 8 lessons do not)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>% Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did teacher go over recipe? (12)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did teacher give each student a copy of the recipe? (12)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did teacher encourage students to take recipe home and use it? (12)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 left blank and 1 incorrect answer

**Food Activity** Individual lessons have different types of food activities.

### Proportion of Students Engaged

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All &gt;75%</th>
<th>Most 50-75%</th>
<th>Less than half (&lt;50%)</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Not Obsv.</th>
<th>% &gt;75%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cutting up food n=6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixing (stir recipe) n=9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring n=4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembled Food (food bar) n=13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasted Food n=17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged in Activity n=17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Activity Other than Cooking** Some lessons have activities that do not include cooking.

### Proportion of Students Engaged

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All &gt;75%</th>
<th>Most 50-75%</th>
<th>Less than half (&lt;50%)</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>% &gt;75%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actively Participated n=14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were Paying Attention and Enjoyed Activity n=14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Activity Sheet**

**Proportion of Students Engaged**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All &gt;75%</th>
<th>Most 50-75%</th>
<th>Less than half (&lt;50%)</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Left Blank</th>
<th>% &gt;75%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actively Participated n=16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying Attention and Enjoyed Activity n=16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Make Health Happen/Lesson Summary**

Yes-12 (71%)
No-5 (29%)
Left Blank-3

**INEP Point of Contact:**

Julie Atwood, MNM
Program Manager
Integrated Nutrition Education Program
University of Colorado Denver
julie.atwood@ucdenver.edu
303/724-4457
Fax: 303/724-4466
- **Staff/Partner Trainings**

During fiscal year 2012, CSU-E SNAP-Ed conducted two rounds of training for newly hired paraprofessional nutrition educators occurring in October 2011 and April 2012. Each training lasted four weeks and included: being a CSU employee, the SNAP-Ed and CSU-E SNAP-Ed missions, goals, funding and records and reporting, nutrition lesson content, food preparation and cooking skills, physical activity demonstrations, civil rights, and teaching classes according to adult learning theory.

In addition to the two initial trainings, the annual CSU-E SNAP-Ed in-service training was held the week of August 13, 2012. This annual in-service training allows all of the educators to come together and review programmatic issues and review new or updated processes. At this year’s in-service, topics included: records and reporting; civil rights; ordering supplies; classroom management when young children are present; a farmers’ market discussion and tour; introduction of a new physical activity DVD; and, collecting feedback on the *Healthy Families* newsletters.

Trainings were also held for the two current and two new Nutrition Programs Supervisor (NPS) agents. Quarterly trainings occurred during the weeks of: December 5, March 5, July 31, and September 3. During these quarterly meetings, topic agendas included: operating within Extension; overview of SNAP-Ed program; records and reporting; supervisory skills; conducting performance appraisals; and, working with collaborating agencies.

For the new NPS agents, intensive trainings took place the weeks of: September 4 and September 24 and are scheduled for October 15, November 5 and November 12 in FY’13. Topics covered during FY’12 include those mentioned above, as well as: an overview of CSU Extension and SNAP-Ed; working with Human Resources; being a CSU employee; current NPS mentoring new NPS; working with paraprofessionals; IRB training; state classified system and performance appraisals; records and reporting; Serv Safe certification; and, recruitment and marketing the CSU-E SNAP-Ed program.

- **Conference presentations and or journal publications**

The results of the formative evaluation piece of the *Healthy Families* newsletters were presented at the Society for Nutrition Education and Behavior (SNEB) annual conference held in Washington, DC in July 2012. The abstract for the poster was published in the SNEB journal, Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior:

Curriculum development

The *Eating Smart • Being Active* curriculum, which is used to teach adult participants enrolled in CSU-E SNAP-Ed classes, is purchased by the CSU-E SNAP-Ed program. This curriculum was recently updated to include the 2010 Dietary Guidelines for Americans and MyPlate.

Partnership activities

CSU-E SNAP-Ed continues to partner with a variety of agencies and organizations at the state level and county level. Recruitment of participants and hosting a site to teach the nutrition lessons is one of the greatest assets that agencies and organizations contribute to our outreach efforts. In return, CSU-E SNAP-Ed delivers a highly effective nutrition education curriculum to the participants of the agency. Some of these agencies include: SNAP, TANF, Work Force/Employment First, Human Services, WIC, churches, public housing, food pantries and health clinics.

In an attempt to most efficiently serve the citizens of particular counties, CSU-E and CMC have been engaged in an information sharing strategy during FY’12. County CSU-E SNAP-Ed and CMC supervisors schedule times to meet and discuss agencies where each currently have on-going classes or are trying to recruit participants. Each local agency representative creates a list of those agencies and shares the list with the other local agency representative. Agencies on these lists are not to be contacted by the other IA so as not to create competition and maximize both IA recruitment and teaching efforts.

Collaboration talks have begun with CSU-E SNAP-Ed and Cooking Matter’s - Shopping Matters program in an attempt to enroll CSU-E SNAP-Ed graduates into these one-time grocery store tours. Evidence of this specific collaboration between CSU-E SNAP-Ed and CMC should be measurable in FY’13.

In addition, CSU-E SNAP-Ed is beginning a collaboration with INEP to recruit parents of children in schools where INEP teaches youth classes. An outreach coordinator has been hired by INEP to facilitate dialogue with the schools to get their buy-in for advertising to the parents, arrange facilities where the classes could be taught, and to provide a smooth transition for parent participants to meet and enroll in the CSU-E SNAP-Ed classes.

CSU-E SNAP-Ed has met with state coordinators of the Title 10 Family Planning Clinic (FPC) to discuss possible recruitment efforts of FPC participants into CSU-E SNAP-Ed lessons. A pilot project was proposed for Larimer County, and will assess: recruitment efforts by FPC staff; number of participants who sign-up for the CSU-E SNAP-Ed lessons; numbers of participants graduating from the CSU-E SNAP-Ed series; and, behavior change information for those graduates. This pilot project is scheduled to begin early in FY’13.
Case studies

Agency Partnership: Denver County CSU Extension was invited by the Denver Healthy People Program to attend the Denver Food Access SNAP Workgroup meeting. At this meeting Denver County CSU Extension presented the CSU Extension Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program- Education (SNAP-Ed) program guidelines, target audiences and curriculum to the committee which included the Denver Human Services (DHS) Director for the Family & Adult Assistance Division. Due to the high number of clients within DHS and the potential number of program participants, the partnership with DHS was developed to more efficiently provide their clients with CSU-E SNAP-Ed.

Through subsequent calls and emails partnership goals were defined and strategies devised for providing nutrition education to SNAP recipients and other DHS clients. Early on, Denver Department of Human Services provided insight and approval of marketing and referral processes and future program planning to develop and expand the partnership. Since the development of the goals listed below, DHS front line staff have received the ESBA lessons, been trained on and began referring their participants and CSU-E SNAP-Ed is currently teaching lessons to DHS participants.

Partnership Goals:

Short term
- Increase Denver Human Services employees’ knowledge of CSU Extension SNAP-Ed programs as well as marketing, recruitment/referral materials and procedures.
- Distribution of CSU Extension Healthy Families newsletter in waiting rooms, lobby areas and by staff of all 3 DHS locations.
- Provide on-site CSU Extension nutrition education classes for DHS employees, including SNAP intake/eligibility staff. Firsthand knowledge of and experience with Eating Smart • Being Active class series will increase likelihood that DHS employees will make referrals to CSU Extension nutrition education classes.
- Increase Denver Human Services clientele, including SNAP recipients, knowledge and awareness of the CSU Extension SNAP-Ed nutrition education classes.
- Enroll SNAP and other Denver Human Services clients into local SNAP-Ed classes held within the community.

Long term
- On-going marketing and recruitment of CSU Extension SNAP-Ed programs within DHS
- Agreement for CSU Extension SNAP-Ed Eating Smart • Being Active classes to be held on site at all 3 Denver Human Services locations.
- SNAP intake workers/eligibility staff and other DHS Family & Adult Assistance Division employees recruit and directly enroll clients into on-going 8-week Eating Smart • Being Active class series. Classes would be held mornings and afternoons several days of the week. Every two weeks a new class series would be scheduled to start at each site in order to accommodate clients’ needs and facilitate quick enrollment into the program.

Awards

Recently, the Epsilon Sigma Phi National Extension Fraternity, Zeta chapter for Colorado awarded one of our collaborating agencies with the prestigious, Friends of Extension award. This award recognizes those agencies or organizations that...
have given outstanding public service and support to extension programs. The OUR Center provides a space for CSU-E SNAP-Ed educators to teach classes. Center case managers and volunteers recruit and enroll their clientele into CSU-E SNAP-Ed classes. The center provides food for the in class food preparation and to participants to take the class recipe and related ingredients home to make the recipes learned in class. The center also provides grocery store gift cards to participants that take all 8 of the classes in the lesson series as an incentive to encourage participants to complete the series.

Cooking Matters Colorado:

- **Staff/Partner Trainings**

Cooking Matters Colorado participated in and offered a variety of trainings this year. All of the Cooking Matters Colorado Staff attended the Cooking Matters National Annual Summit and Share Our Strength’s Conference of Leaders. In addition CMC hosted our first Annual CMC State Convening. This brought together partners and volunteers together from around the state to learn together and share best practices. Two staff members attend the national Food Research and Action Center’s annual conference and two staff members attend the annual Society for Nutrition Education and Behavior conference. One staff member attended the Colorado Dietetic Association annual conference. Staff members that work in the CMC classrooms are required to participate in Serve Safe and First Aid training. All Staff members complete Civil Rights training. Trainings were provided for new partner agencies and supplementary training for all agencies was delivered as needed. Volunteer trainings were offered monthly for new volunteers. Select volunteers from around the state participated in the CMC State Convening.

- **Conference presentations and or journal publications**

All Cooking Matters Colorado staff presented at the CMC Annual Convening in spring of this year. Several Cooking Matters Colorado staff presented at the Cooking Matters National Annual Summit and Share Our Strength’s Conference of Leaders. Topics included: Cultural Competency, Outreach to the Latino Community, Food Based Nutrition Education, Grocery Budgeting, Healthy Pantry Project, and Volunteer Engagement. Other conference presentations include: Society for Nutrition Education and Behavior Conference, Healthy Communities Conference, Building Blocks for Healthy Kids Conference, Rural Grocery Store Summit, and Making a Case for School Health Conference.

- **Curriculum development**

National Cooking Matters staff develops curriculum to support the 32 local program partners around the country. Each curriculum is developed using current research findings. In the next year Cooking Matters will begin revisions on the Cooking Matters for Adults curriculum to make sure it is up to date and reflects current research and best practices.
Partnership activities
Cooking Matters partners with many organizations around the state in efforts to run successful, high quality programs. These great partners include: Live Well, Colorado Health Foundation, the Area Health Education Centers, the Family Resource Center Association, Local Foods Coalitions, CSU-Extension, and INEP, Colorado Food Banks such as Care and Share Food Bank and County Health Departments. We appreciate and greatly value all the partners that make our state wide efforts possible.

INEP:

Staff/Partner Trainings
All INEP coordinator and management staff participate in an annual statewide conference. This is usually a three day conference with intensive training, review and planning, based on what has been learned in the prior year, and what changes have been decided upon. In addition, this staff also participates in ongoing program wide conference calls (usually monthly or as needed). Any issues or additional training that needs to be shared with the whole team is discussed and assigned via these calls.

Conference presentations and or journal publications
INEP presentation to University of Colorado Denver, School of Medicine, Department of Pediatrics, Section Retreat, February, 2012.

Curriculum development
INEP curriculum lessons are updated when needed, based on classroom observations and teacher feedback. We are currently updating lessons to include the new USDA MyPlate food guidance system. All lessons will be made available next year with these revisions.

Partnership activities
INEP continues to partner with local agencies and organizations, working to coordinate nutrition education efforts for our communities. These range from connections with school based health teams, to local health coalitions and programs, local food banks, as well as statewide groups such as Hunger Free Colorado and Live Well Colorado. Additionally, new ways of coordinating and partnering more efficiently with the other SNAP-Ed programs in the state are being pursued.

Case studies
In the San Luis Valley, INEP was invited to participate with the local LiveWell Alamosa and Local Foods Coalition, when they sponsored and participated in a Nutrition Night for parents at the local elementary school in La Jara. Dinner was provided by these groups, as well as nutrition education stations being set up. INEP was able to attend and discuss with parents the connections between the INEP classroom lessons and materials, and the nutrition messages at the event. INEP also invited Cooking Matters Colorado to attend and as a result CMC was able to offer their nutrition class series to the parents at the event, who expressed great interest in attending one of these class series.

Provide the information requested below for any significant evaluation efforts (generally considered as costing greater than $400,000) that were completed during the previous year.

1. Name of Project or Social Marketing Campaign
   If multiple projects or campaigns were part of a single impact evaluation, please list them all.
   
   CSU-E: NA
   CMC: NA
   INEP: NA

2. Key Evaluation Impact(s)
   Identify each impact being assessed by the evaluations. For example are SNAP-Ed participants more likely than non-participants to report they intend to increase their fruit and vegetable intake? Or do a greater proportion of SNAP-Ed participants choose low-fat (1% or fat-free) milk in the school cafeteria compared to non-participants?

   CSU-E: NA
   CMC: NA
   INEP: NA

3. Evaluation participants
   Describe the population being evaluated and its size. For example, all (1200) kindergarten students at public schools in one school district.

   CSU-E: NA
   CMC: NA
   INEP: NA
4. Assignment to intervention and control or comparison conditions

   a. Describe the unit of assignment to intervention and control groups.

      For example, an intervention focused on kindergarten students may assign school districts, individual schools, classrooms, or individual student to intervention and control groups.

      CSU-E: NA
      CMC: NA
      INEP: NA

   b. Describe how assignment to intervention and control groups was carried out.

      Be explicit about whether or not assignment was random. For example, ten kindergarten classrooms were randomly assigned to intervention and control groups.

      CSU-E: NA
      CMC: NA
      INEP: NA

   c. Describe how many units and individuals were in the intervention and control groups at the start of the intervention.

      CSU-E: NA
      CMC: NA
      INEP: NA

5. Impact Measure(s)

   For each evaluation impact, describe the measure(s) used. Descriptions should indicate if the focus is on knowledge, skills, attitudes, intention to act, behavior or something else. Each measure should also be characterized in terms of its nutritional focus, e.g. low fat food preparation, number of whole grain servings consumed, ability to accurately read food labels. Finally indicate if impact data were collected through observation, self-report, or another method, you may:

   Describe the points at which data were collected from intervention and control group participants.
For example, these points may include pre-test or baseline, midway through the intervention, post-test as intervention ends or follow-up some weeks or months after the intervention ends.

CSU-E: NA
CMC: NA
INEP: NA

6. Results

Compare intervention and control groups at each measurement point, by individual measure. Report the number of intervention and the number of control group participants measured at each point. Describe any tests of statistical significance and the results.

CSU-E: NA
CMC: NA
INEP: NA

7. Reference

Provide a contact for additional details and a reference to any other report of the evaluation.

CSU-E: NA
CMC: NA
INEP: NA