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• 39 state EFNEP &/or SNAP-Ed Coordinators responded

• 88% of respondents were from 1862 institutions

• 10% of respondents were from 1890 institutions
Nutrition & Foods Topics

• Goals, Outcomes & Impact Indicators had been drafted years ago by the Youth Evaluation work group

• Revised in 2009 as part of the Wisconsin project to invest additional effort into the Youth Evaluation project

• See handout
Nutrition & Foods Topics

• 97% of respondents said the topics included content they were teaching

• Range of topics taught is broad; a few topics are unique to children/youth

• A few additional topics were suggested
Age Groups Taught

• Range from Pre-K to 12\textsuperscript{th} grade

• Most frequently taught groups: 1\textsuperscript{st} through 5\textsuperscript{th} graders
Percent of EFNEP Programming Offered to Children/Youth

• One state reported no work with youth

• In many states, youth programming is 11% to 49% of their EFNEP work

• Four states reported that youth programming is 75% to 90% of their EFNEP work
Percent of SNAP-Ed Programming Offered to Children/Youth

- One state reported no work with youth

- In many states, youth programming is 25% to 74% of their EFNEP work

- Three states reported that youth programming is 75% to 100% of their EFNEP work
Number and Length of Lessons Taught to Children & Youth

• Generally, EFNEP youth participants receive more lessons/series than do youth participants in SNAP-Ed

• Generally, each lesson taught to EFNEP youth participants is longer than each lesson taught to youth participants in SNAP-Ed
Locations & Partnerships for Youth Programming in EFNEP & SNAP-Ed

• Partnerships and teaching locations were similar for EFNEP & SNAP-Ed programming

• Common partnerships include:
  – School classrooms
  – After school programs associated with public schools
  – After school programs associated with Boys & Girls Clubs and similar organizations
  – Summer school and summer recreation programs
Priorities for Youth Evaluation Work

• “Very Important”:
  – Tools that are shared are valid and reliable
  
  – Tools that are shared have been reviewed for face validity and there is evidence that they have been used successfully
  
  – Tools that are shared are easy to use and not seem like a test
Priorities for Youth Evaluation Work

• “Less Important”:
  – A wide variety of tools is shared
  – Evaluation efforts focus on a specific age range
  – Evaluation efforts focus on a specific content area
EFNEP & SNAP-Ed Youth Data in ES-237 Report

• Some respondents stated that data either wasn’t included in ES-237 or they did not know for sure

• In some states the data is included at the state level

• In some states the data is included at the local level
EFNEP & SNAP-Ed Youth Data in ES-237 Report

• The category choices in ES-237 don’t match easily with all EFNEP & SNAP-Ed youth programming

• Usual choices for EFNEP & SNAP-Ed youth data:
  – “4-H Special Interest/Short-term Programs”
  – “School Enrichment Programs”
Conclusions—Results of Survey

• Children & Youth programming is generally a greater part of SNAP-Ed than EFNEP

• The Goals, Outcomes and Topics as drafted seem to be on target

• Methods and tools for evaluation of outcomes and impacts remains a high priority need
Conclusions—Results of Survey

• Reporting of outputs and outcomes of youth programming could be improved

• Nutrition education programming for children & youth in EFNEP and SNAP-Ed is tremendously varied