

Family Resiliency and Economic Well-Being and Human Nutrition and Health

Family Resiliency and Economic Well-Being and Human Nutrition and Health

V(A). Planned Program (Summary)

1. Name of the Planned Program

Family Resiliency and Economic Well-Being and Human Nutrition and Health

V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)

1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
602	Business Management, Finance, and Taxation	11%		0%	
607	Consumer Economics	3%		0%	
703	Nutrition Education and Behavior	33%		50%	
724	Healthy Lifestyle	19%		25%	
801	Individual and Family Resource Management	10%		0%	
802	Human Development and Family Well-Being	22%		25%	
806	Youth Development	2%		0%	
Total		100%		100%	

V(C). Planned Program (Inputs)

1. Actual amount of professional FTE/SYs expended this Program

Year: 2007	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
Plan	35.4	0.0	0.4	0.0
Actual	56.5	0.0	0.4	0.0

2. Actual dollars expended in this Program (includes Carryover Funds from previous years)

Extension		Research	
Smith-Lever 3b & 3c 1266199	1890 Extension 0	Hatch 0	Evans-Allen 0
1862 Matching 1266199	1890 Matching 0	1862 Matching 0	1890 Matching 0
1862 All Other 4400000	1890 All Other 0	1862 All Other 0	1890 All Other 0

V(D). Planned Program (Activity)

1. Brief description of the Activity

- Development of new curricula
- Adaptation & supplementation of existing curricula
- Development of marketing plan and materials
- Development of surveys, evaluation tool
- Searching out and applying for appropriate grants

• Delivery through classes, One-on-One, News Releases/TV/Radio, Participation in Events, Displays •Deliver I Can Problem Solve and other possible curricula resources to communities including children, youth, parents/caretakers, teachers, agencies and service providers, schools, and out-of-school programs. •Provide training and other staff development opportunities to county educators •Create public awareness of programs and resources through promotional and educational materials to be distributed to teachers, agency professionals, and other community members.

2. Brief description of the target audience

Youth, children; parents; teachers; adult volunteers; middle to low income families; race and ethnicity will also be recognized as an identifier of audiences; caretakers, agencies & service providers, schools, policy makers.

V(E). Planned Program (Outputs)

1. Standard output measures

Target for the number of persons (contacts) reached through direct and indirect contact methods

	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Year	Target	Target	Target	Target
Plan	1500	100000	2400	1000
2007	238367	1200000	357550	300000

2. Number of Patent Applications Submitted (Standard Research Output)

Patent Applications Submitted

Year	Target
Plan:	0
2007:	0

Patents listed

3. Publications (Standard General Output Measure)

Number of Peer Reviewed Publications

	Extension	Research	Total
Plan			
2007	13	0	13

V(F). State Defined Outputs

Output Target

Output #1

Output Measure

Revised online curriculum

Year	Target	Actual
2007	1	15

Output #2

Output Measure

Promotional materials and marketing campaign

Year	Target	Actual
2007	1	35

V(G). State Defined Outcomes

O No.	Outcome Name
1	Participants demonstrate improved food, nutrition, and/or physical activity behaviors
2	Participants plan to utilize recommended financial management practices
3	Participants plan to manage their use of credit and/or reduce debt
4	Participants will plan or revise an asset building strategy
5	Participants will utilize recommended financial management practices
6	Participants will manage their use of credit and reduce debt
7	Participants in asset building classes will have bought a home, started a savings account, started a retirement account, started a business, or made a positive change in their financial process
8	Number of teachers and child care providers learning interpersonal cognitive problem-solving techniques
9	Number of teachers and child care providers using interpersonal cognitive problem-solving techniques with children/youth
10	Number of children and youth using interpersonal cognitive problem-solving skills

Outcome #1

1. Outcome Measures

Not reporting on this Outcome for this Annual Report

2. Associated Institution Types

3a. Outcome Type:

3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
------	---------------------	--------

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

Issue (Who cares and Why)

What has been done

Results

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
---------	----------------

V(H). Planned Program (External Factors)

External factors which affected outcomes

- Public Policy changes
- Government Regulations
- Competing Public priorities
- Other (community/school support access)

Brief Explanation

•Support and engagement, access to schools – In two locations, county educators reported elementary school principals would not agree to complete the program implementation and evaluation protocol. In another location, a county educator reported staff turnover and teacher vacancy impeded the full implementation and completion of the program. •Other academic requirements, classroom priorities, and time constraints were reported by several county educators and/or teachers as challenges to program implementation.

External factors which may have affected outcomes include competing programmatic challenges and accessing school classrooms. Oklahoma State Department of Health (OSDH) has begun initiatives to implement Coordinated School Health Programs in school settings and after school programs, both of which nutrition education and physical activity components. The programs are delivered by county health educators. To minimize the affect, the OSDH and Cooperative Extension FCS are making strong efforts to work collaboratively in communities to brace up programs and strengthen behavioral impacts. Access to school classrooms is challenging in that great emphasis is placed on teaching the academic core curricula to meet federal and state performance criteria. The challenge is being addressed by tying nutrition education programming to the Oklahoma State Department of Education's Priority Academic Student Skills (PASS). Additionally, the Healthy Oklahoma Impact team will be encouraged to look for opportunities collaborate with OSDH to provide programming that reaches the targeted population in settings outside the classroom

V(I). Planned Program (Evaluation Studies and Data Collection)

1. Evaluation Studies Planned

After Only (post program)

Retrospective (post program)

Before-After (before and after program)

During (during program)

Time series (multiple points before and after program)

Case Study

Comparisons between program participants (individuals,group,organizations) and non-participants

Evaluation Results

Ratings by intervention teachers (N=15) regarding the overall effects of the ICPS program:

•Classroom climate - 20% "very positive" and 73% "somewhat good" •Children's social and emotional development - 13% "very positive" and 67% "somewhat good" •Children's behavior - 20% "very positive" and 73% "somewhat good" •Overall satisfaction with the ICPS program - 50% "very positive" and 43% "somewhat good" •Likelihood will use the ICPS program in the future – 40% "very positive" and 40% "somewhat good"

Nearly complete data was collected on about 18 intervention teachers and classes (those with which the ICPS program was implemented) and 18 comparison teachers and classes (those that did not receive the ICPS program). Partial data was collected from 3 other locations. It is anticipated that data analysis should include approximately 230 children in the intervention classes and 170 children in the comparison classes. Numerical data are being entered into SPSS software. Interview responses will be coded and entered. Qualitative responses to open-ended questions are being summarized. Data entry will continue through the spring 2008 and analysis should begin shortly thereafter.

Key Items of Evaluation

For both the intervention and comparison teachers and classes, all of the following measures and procedures for child interviews, teacher ratings of children's behavior and demographic information were utilized. Since the comparison groups did not receive the ICPS program intervention, the program process and quality measures were not collected. Data was collected only on individual children for whom parent/guardian consent was received.

§ Demographic information – The race/ethnicity, gender, and birth date of participating children.

§ Child Interviews - OCES county educators met individually with each participating student twice, before and after the presentation of the ICPS program lessons. A series of ten scenarios and questions were provided for the OCES educators to use along with guidelines on conducting the interviews. Each item presents a hypothetical story or scenario of a problem will be read to the child. The child was asked how the characters in the story, or themselves, might handle the situation, ideas for solving the problem, or feelings they may have. The children were prompted to provide as many different solutions as possible, up to four, which were documented in writing.

§ Teacher Ratings of Child Behavior– Participating teachers were asked to complete a questionnaire pre- and post-program for each participating child in their classroom. The instrument is composed of 37 brief statements for which the teacher rates each item using a Likert scale.

§ Program Process and Quality– Three questionnaires assessed the use of the curriculum, program implementation, fidelity, and satisfaction. Teachers and county educators completed instruments mid-way through the intervention program and after conclusion of implementation.