

**AzNN Evaluation Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**FINAL: 8/17/2017**

AGENDA ITEM	DETAILS/DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Welcome (Laurel)</b></p>	<p><b>Roll Call</b>  <b>UA AzNN Evaluation:</b> Laurel Jacobs, Bete Jones, Kay Orzech, Vern Hartz  <b>AzNN:</b> Ryan Lang, Amanda White  <b>UANN Apache/Navajo:</b> Margine Bawden  <b>UANN Maricopa:</b> Traci Armstrong Florian, Cristina Guterman  <b>City of Tempe:</b> Patty Russell, Brandon Hernandez  <b>Maricopa Health Department:</b> Julie Scholer, David Dube, Deni Gains, Linda Mohr-Strecker, Marina Celaya  <b>Coconino Co Public Health Services District:</b> Theresa Kulpinski, Sharon Sifling</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Debrief: PARA (Kay)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Who is participating in the FY17 PARA assessment?  MCDPH, Tempe Kids Zone, UANN Maricopa, UANN Navajo/  Apache, Coconino PHSD</li> <p>For those who are, have you collected/submitted all the PARAs you planned to? Why not, if not?</p> <p>No comments.</p> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. How was the evaluation training process for you? Did you rely on:  Attending the online training when it was offered in February?  Taking the training at a later time? Calling on Kay or your  evaluation support person, other resources?</li> <p><b>MCDPH:</b> The training was easy to follow, good visual examples and rubric. We have looked back at it several times with webinar notes and found it to be adequate. We also used Kay as a resource.</p> <p><b>Tempe Kids Zone:</b> The training was satisfactory. The actual assessment was not intense.</p> </ol>	

3. How was the process of doing a PARA assessment in your county? Did you have questions when you were out at a PARA site? How did you get them answered?

**MCDPH:** Questions posed to Kay:

- How are the results going to be compiled, aggregated and returned to contractors, beyond just determining strengths and weaknesses?
- How suitable is the tool for assessing non-park resources like trails?
- Which access points should be considered in the assessment when there are multiple points? We found that just being able to get into the park does not mean that the park has good accessibility; it might not have wheelchair access.

**UANN Navajo/Apache:** Question posed to Kay:

How do you score a biking/running path that was in good shape, but had no signage? Also, knowing how to score a combined resource (such as park + pool) was confusing at first.

These are good points of clarification that will be considered in future revisions of the PARA for SNAP-Ed use in Arizona.

4. Did you speak to anyone at your sites about what you were doing? What was their reaction?

**MCDPH:** We encountered several community members. People asked what we were doing and gave good feedback on things that were wrong with the park or concerns they had. We ran into several situations looking at access related to wheelchairs and encountered safety issues in vulnerable areas that led us to question whether we should proceed with the assessment. Prior to the doing the assessments, we had started to develop our own general safety tips for work in the community and research issues related to accommodating people with disabilities.

5. Did you do anything with the PARA results other than send them in to Kay or your evaluation liaison (i.e., make a copy, make a note of the thing you thought was most amenable/necessary to change, write down notes to share with Parks & Rec or another authority controlling a PA resource?)

**MCDPH:** The City of Phoenix Parks and Recreation expressed concern about receiving negative feedback because they only have the resources to change some things. We did the PARA without knowing how we were going to be able to use the results to provide them with recommendations.

**Tempe Kids Zone:** Most of our parks were in good shape, so the results are positive and easier to pass along. For the section where you name one thing to change, it was hard to single just one item out. We are creating a positive message to present to neighborhood associations. We have also thought about the installation of senior playground equipment (e.g. exercise stations, but more geared to senior physical and mental exercise) and are in the process of identifying partners to explore that option.

**Coconino PHSD:** We have not brought results to the city/town, but we want to start the conversation with the coalition to see what changes can be made. We also identified the issue with restricted access for people with disabilities.

6. Is there anything about PARA beyond sites assessed and scores given *that would be especially useful* for you to receive back as part of the FY17 Report to contractors next Jan/Feb? (probe - area in need of most improvement for each site? Site score compared to similar site types around the state?)

**MCDPH:** We have been looking at City of Phoenix parks specifically and they have a classification system – mini, neighborhood, community, district parks. It could be helpful to look at parks with the same classification and how the amenities differ according to the sizes of the parks. We have many parks in the 30-50 acre range

	<p>that are destination parks. What people are expecting to do at that type of park is different from a neighborhood park. The size of park is not a specific element of the PARA, but maybe could be included?</p> <p><b>Coconino PHSD:</b> Our goal is to make the park handicap accessible and multi-age use. We do not have the expertise on how to do that, but maybe the PARA could include some suggestions on how to make a small park a multi-use park? It is important to be able to suggest these attributes to the cities we are working with, and have done homework. It would also be important to know the city ordinances/requirements regarding these issues? For example, do they require handicap access?</p> <p>7. Has doing the PARA increased your own knowledge of the parks in your backyards?  <b>MCDPH:</b> It has broadened staff awareness of safety conditions and homelessness in our parks and the importance of assessing those factors to increase accessibility.</p>	
<p><b>1305 School Health Assessment Project (Laurel)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1305 School Health Assessment Project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This is a school health focused project funded by the CDC that the Evaluation Team has been contracted to work on over the next six months. Our focus will be assessing school health through focus groups, surveys and one-on-one interviews with stakeholders in a variety of different schools – middle, high and non-SNAP eligible. The project results will be relevant to SNAP-Ed and the work you are doing in your schools.</li> <li>○ Theresa LeGros is our project lead and <u>may</u> contact you for information regarding potential project participants at SNAP-Ed eligible schools.</li> <li>○ If you have a school that you think would be interested in participating, please contact Theresa or your evaluation liaison.</li> <li>○ We are offering a gift card incentive for school-based employees to participate in the project.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contact Theresa or your evaluation liaison if you have a school that you think would be interested in participating.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>MCDPH Question:</b> What kind of questions are being asked and how different is it from the assessments already done this year?</p> <p><i>This year, we have looked at nutrition and PA through the NHSAC, a qualitative exploration of needs related to improving the school environment. Thematic topics for the focus group and interviews will emphasize nutrition and PA, but questions will cast a wider net to get perceptions on overall school environment vs. quantitative assessments like the LWP and NHSAC.</i></p> <p><i>Postscript (LJ): Also, at least some of the previous school health assessments have focused on one county or area only, whereas this will be a statewide assessment, within the parameters of time and resources that are available.</i></p>	
<p><b>Updates &amp; Reminders (Laurel)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are approaching the end of the grant year. Please send in completed assessments as soon as possible.</li> <li>• All evaluation assessments on your work plan are due at the end of September and no extensions will be granted.</li> <li>• The optional SFSP Checklist is open for your use and the link is available on the evaluation website. It is not required for Strategy 4, but you will be provided with a data summary if you fill one out.</li> <li>• American Public Health Association Conference (APHA), November 2017: Laurel is presenting how information on SNAP-Ed evaluation has been shared to stakeholders at local, state, and national levels. If any of you have a story about a unique and interesting way that you have shared data and would like her to include it in the presentation, please contact her.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contact Laurel re: case study for the APHA Conference presentation.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Next Meeting</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9/21 from 1:00pm-2:00pm; NHSAC debrief. Please invite any of your team that has been working on the NHSAC this year. We would love to hear about your experience.</li> </ul>	