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Best Practices for Nutrition Education in Wholesome Wave Georgia’s Fruit & Vegetable Prescription Programs

Introduction

Wholesome Wave Georgia’s Fruit & Vegetable Prescription (FVRx) Program promotes affordable access to fruits and vegetables and healthy eating in under-served communities through partnerships with healthcare providers, community organizations, and fresh produce retailers. Program participants attend nutrition education classes and receive prescriptions that can be spent on fruits and vegetables at participating farmers markets. Wholesome Wave Georgia currently has six FVRx sites providing different types of nutrition education. The purpose of this project is to develop recommendations for best practices for the nutrition education component of Wholesome Wave Georgia’s FVRx program.

Fruit and vegetable consumption and health

The benefits of a balanced diet including fruits and vegetables are well documented. Research shows that fruit and vegetable intake is associated with a reduced risk of many chronic diseases including cardiovascular disease and may be protective against some cancers.1,2 The 2015 U.S. Dietary Guidelines for America recommend that adults consume 2½ cup-equivalents of vegetables per day and 2 cup-equivalents of fruit per day.1 However, according to national surveys conducted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, in 2015, only 12.2% of adults met recommendations for fruit consumption, and only 9.3% met recommendations for the consumption of vegetables.3

Diet quality and health conditions associated with diet quality are not equally distributed across the population. Food insecurity, the inability to afford nutritionally adequate and safe foods, has been associated with characteristics of poor diet quality, including low intake of vegetables.4 In 2015, 11.4% of adults in the highest household income category met recommendations for vegetable intake as compared with 7.0% of adults below or close to the poverty level.3 Not surprisingly, food insecurity is also associated with chronic disease including hypertension, hyperlipidemia, and diabetes among adults.5 Racial and ethnic minority populations have high incidence, prevalence, and mortality from diet-related chronic diseases, and differences in dietary quality contribute to these disparities.6 Factors contributing to these disparities are multi-faceted, with education and income as key contributors.6 While overall diet quality in the U.S. improved from 1999 to 2010, improvements were greater for people of higher socioeconomic status, further increasing the disparities across income groups.7

Interventions to increase fruit and vegetable consumption

Social ecological models of health behavior acknowledge the influence of individual, interpersonal, community, and environmental factors on behavior.8 Individual factors include knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, and personal preferences, among others. Interpersonal factors include social networks and social support systems such as family, friends, and coworkers, as well as religious customs or traditions. Environmental factors include organizational and institutional policies as well as local, state, and federal laws and regulations.
Interventions to increase fruit and vegetable intake can target this range of influences on dietary behavior, and they can take place in a variety of settings including communities, schools, healthcare settings, and worksites. A review of the literature found that a variety of programs have been shown to be effective in increasing fruit and vegetable intake. Successful strategies included individual and group counseling, computer-based counseling, social marketing techniques, culturally-sensitive interventions, worksite interventions, and interventions in healthcare settings.

Strategies targeting environmental levels may also be successful in increasing fruit and vegetable intake. A review of environmental, policy, and pricing strategies for increasing consumption of fruits and vegetables found that interventions including point-of-purchase information, reduced prices and coupons, promotion and advertising, and increasing availability, variety and convenience showed moderate evidence of success. Another review of state-level policy interventions suggests that reducing price barriers can increase demand for fruits and vegetables. This review also suggested that supply-side policies such as expanding the use of Electronic Benefits Transfer to the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC) and farmers markets, incentivizing the purchase of locally grown produce, and assisting local farmers could positively impact fruit and vegetable consumption.

One strategy to increase fruit and vegetable consumption among participants of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) is to provide financial incentives for shopping at farmers’ markets. Wholesome Wave’s Double Value Coupon Program (DVCP) provides participants an incentive that matches the amount spent in federal nutrition benefits (such as SNAP or WIC) towards purchases at participating farmers markets. A study of the 2011 market season in New York, Boston, and San Diego found that DVCP participants’ fruit and vegetable consumption increased during market season, and their vegetable intake remained higher two months after the incentive program ended. Other farmers market incentive programs have also reported positive results. Philly Food Bucks, a bonus incentive program tied to SNAP, was associated with self-reported increases in fruit and vegetable consumption and increased SNAP sales at participating farmers markets in low-income communities. Participants in the Double-Up Food Bucks program in Utah received a dollar-per-dollar match up to $10 per week when using SNAP benefits at selected farmers markets and reported experiencing fewer food insecurity–related behaviors following program participation.

**Nutrition education interventions**

Nutrition education has been defined as “any combination of educational strategies, accompanied by environmental supports, designed to facilitate voluntary adoption of food choices and other food and nutrition-related behaviors conducive to health and well-being; nutrition education is delivered through multiple venues and involves activities at the individual, community, and policy levels.” A common strategy to attempt to influence dietary behavior, nutrition education has been shown to be effective in contributing to healthy eating. The effectiveness of nutrition education has been demonstrated in community settings, combined with cooking classes, and paired with incentive programs. In a study of dietary changes among participants of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (or EFNEP), a Federal
Extension outreach program in which paraprofessionals provide nutrition education in community settings, the mean number of servings of vegetables consumed per day increased from 2.8 to 3.7 servings. The effects of group education and individual education were compared in this study, and no significant differences were found between the two approaches.

Cooking Matters, a six-week nutrition education and hands-on cooking class, has demonstrated positive results in terms of knowledge, attitude, and behavior changes related to healthy eating across the various target audiences. In 2013, 88% of WIC parent graduates of a Cooking Matters course were very confident or completely confident in their ability to make the most of their WIC fruit and vegetable vouchers. Participants in the family course reported a 75% average increase in how often they prepared meals together. Seventy-one percent of adult course graduates reported eating more vegetables, and 66% of teen course graduates reported eating more fruit. Behavior changes were maintained following Cooking Matters courses, with positive changes reported at three months and six months after the class series.

Other programs have combined nutrition education with incentives. The Stellar Farmers Market provided free nutrition and cooking workshops to SNAP-eligible shoppers, along with $2 coupons for free produce to be used at the farmers market after workshop completion. Those who attended two or more classes consumed almost one-half cup more fruits and vegetables than those who attended only one or no classes. After adjusting for potentially confounding factors, class attendance remained a significant predictor of the amount of fruits and vegetables consumed per day, with every additional class attended correlating to a 19% increase in total cups consumed per day.

Other programs have tested the effects of nutrition education combined with incentives and have reported differing results. Researchers in Michigan studied the effects of an educational intervention and the distribution of farmers market coupons for fruits and vegetables. Participants receiving either education or coupons reported increases in fruit and vegetable consumption, and participants receiving both education and coupons reported the greatest increases in consumption. Another study of the effects of a 10-week nutrition education intervention, with and without the provision of fruits and vegetables, looked at changes in fruit and vegetable consumption among overweight and obese adults. Results of this study showed significant increases in reported fruit and vegetable consumption among both groups receiving nutrition education, but not in the control group. However, no additional increases were seen in the group receiving fruit and vegetables in addition to nutrition education.

Fruit and Vegetable Prescription Programs

Fruit and vegetable prescription programs (also called produce prescription programs) aim to increase access to fruits and vegetables by providing patients with prescription vouchers for free produce. Healthcare providers typically deliver some form of nutrition education along with the prescriptions. As the authors of the study on Chicago’s Food Rx intervention noted, these programs “leverage the symbolic nature of the prescription, to communicate that healthy eating is ‘doctor’s orders,’ part of a treatment plan.” Fruit and vegetable prescription programs differ in their implementation, but they typically target multiple levels of the social ecological model, providing individual education as part of provider visits, nutrition education and social support in group settings, and environmental change with increased access to fruits and vegetables in the
form of prescriptions.

Since 2010, the national Wholesome Wave program has supported Fruit and Vegetable Prescription (FVRx) programs across the country to increase access to fresh fruits and vegetables in under-served communities. Participants receive $1/day per household member in produce prescriptions which can be redeemed for fresh produce at participating markets and grocery stores. Wholesome Wave has served over 11,000 people in 10 states, and they distributed over 1.2 million dollars’ worth of produce prescriptions between 2014 and 2017.23

Participation in fruit and vegetable prescription programs has been associated with increases in fruit and vegetable consumption and with positive health outcomes. In 2016, Wholesome Wave participants reported a 206% increase in individual fruit and vegetable consumption, and 93% of participants met recommendations for fruit and vegetable consumption.23 In 2014, 47% of Wholesome Wave participants showed a decrease in body mass index (BMI).23 Participation has also been associated with improvements in blood glucose control. A significantly significant decrease in A1c, a measure of blood glucose control over time, was seen among adults with uncontrolled type II diabetes participating in the Fresh Rx program in Detroit.24 Participants in this program received up to $40 ($10 per week for up to four weeks) for the purchase of fresh fruits and vegetables at a local farmers market. Not all programs have demonstrated the same level of impact. For example, participants in a fruit and vegetable prescription program in the UK showed increases in knowledge of recommended servings of fruits and vegetables but did not show increases in purchasing or consumption.25

**Wholesome Wave Georgia’s FVRx program**

Wholesome Wave Georgia’s FVRx program began in 2015 with just one site. In 2016, the program expanded to three sites, and in 2017, Wholesome Wave Georgia operated six FVRx sites. All sites provide produce prescriptions of $1/day per household member, but nutrition education differs from site to site. The purpose of this project is to develop recommendations for best practices for the nutrition education component of Wholesome Wave Georgia’s FVRx program.

**Best practices**

Those planning and implementing nutrition education clearly want to select the most effective programs, yet research on the effectiveness of these programs can be limited, particularly for interventions that target environmental, policy, or systems changes.26 The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the World Health Organization, and many other organizations have identified the need for evidence-based practices to maximize the effectiveness and efficiency of health programs.27,28

A “best practice” is commonly defined as “a technique or methodology that, through experience and research, has proven reliably to lead to a desired result.”28 The World Health Organization’s Regional Office for Africa provides this practical definition of a “best practice” in the context of health programs: “knowledge about what works in specific situations and contexts, without using
inordinate resources to achieve the desired results, and which can be used to develop and implement solutions adapted to similar health problems in other situations and contexts.\textsuperscript{28} The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention convened a workgroup in 2013 to develop a working definition of “best practices” and a framework for planning and improving evidence-based practices for public health programs and strategies.\textsuperscript{29} The workgroup defined the term “best practice” as “a practice supported by a rigorous process of peer review and evaluation indicating effectiveness in improving health outcomes, generally demonstrated through systematic reviews.”\textsuperscript{29} Practices are evaluated in terms of public health impact (consisting of effectiveness, reach, feasibility, sustainability, and transferability) and quality of evidence.\textsuperscript{29} Using this framework, best practices are practices evaluated by rigorous assessments that demonstrate evidence of effectiveness as well as growing evidence of reach, feasibility, sustainability, and transferability.\textsuperscript{29}

**Best practices for nutrition education**

A comprehensive review of studies in 1995 found that “nutrition education was more likely to be effective if it focused on specific food- and nutrition-related behaviors or community and social practices and used appropriate theory and research evidence for designing interventions.”\textsuperscript{30} Following this review, many studies published in the *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior* used the social ecological model or other theoretical frameworks to emphasize the interactions between internal and external influences on nutrition behavior.\textsuperscript{30}

While there are no definitive best practices for nutrition education, several groups of researchers have proposed guidelines, recommendations, or best practices with similar components and characteristics. These best practices can be used to improve consistency and efficacy of program development, implementation, and evaluation.

Dollahite, Fitch, and Carroll suggest evaluating the following domains when selecting an intervention: evidence, content, audience, and implementing agency.\textsuperscript{26} Researchers should ask whether the intervention is effective, theory-driven, applicable to the program, and has an evaluation component. Content should be evaluated as to whether it supports a social ecological approach, is research-based, and has clear and measurable objectives. The target audience should be a good fit with the intervention, and practitioners should attempt to remove any potential barriers to success. The implementing agency should have adequate resources and qualified and capable staff.

The Washington State Department of Health created an assessment tool for selecting nutrition education curriculum based on the requirements of the Basic Food Nutrition Education Program/SNAP-Ed and supporting research.\textsuperscript{31} Curricula are assessed according to criteria including: research support for the curriculum, adherence to the current Dietary Guidelines for Americans, use of a variety of teaching methods, inclusion of clear objectives and instructions, and inclusion of an evaluation tool and instructional resources.\textsuperscript{31}

The National Institute of Food and Agriculture’s Nutrition and Health Planning and Guidance Committee developed a set of criteria to be used for the review and selection of Extension
curricula. According to these criteria, content, readability, utility, and evaluation should be reviewed. Effective high-quality curricula should: be theory and research-based; have clear and measurable objectives; identify a target audience which is appropriate for the curriculum; build on strengths, needs, and interests of the audience and reflect the diversity of this audience; actively engage the audience; use language appropriate for the audience; include clear instructions and any relevant resources; and include evaluation methods linked to learning objectives.

The most comprehensive of these recommendations may be from a group of Colorado State University researchers funded by the Food and Nutrition Service of the USDA to develop a set of best practices in nutrition education for low income audiences. Twenty-eight best practices were grouped into five domains: program design, program delivery, educator characteristics, educator training, and evaluation. Program design practices include: accurate and evidence-based nutrition content, inclusion of goal-setting, curriculum is appropriate for the audience, clearly stated goals and objectives that drive the intervention and the evaluation, and the curriculum has a theoretical basis and targets multiple levels of the social ecological model. Educator practices include: accommodation of a variety of learning styles, inclusion of experiential activities, and appropriate frequency and duration of activities to achieve objectives. Educator characteristics include relatability to target audience and expertise in content and teaching methods. Additionally, educators should be trained and observed regularly. Finally, evaluation of programs should include formative, process, outcome and impact evaluation; provide evidence of sustained behavior change; link evaluation measures to goals and objectives; and address all targeted levels of the social ecological model.

For this study, best practices for nutrition education in the literature will be compared with components and characteristics of the nutrition education found in Wholesome Wave Georgia’s FVRx programs to determine best practices for future FVRx nutrition education.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic / component of nutrition education</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Cohort 1</th>
<th>Cohort 2</th>
<th>Cohort 3</th>
<th>Cohort 4</th>
<th>Cohort 5</th>
<th>Cohort 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theory-based</td>
<td>Curriculum is based on behavior change theories that are used appropriately for the content and target audience.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Curriculum description cites Health Belief Model and adult learning theories as foundation; lessons include modeling (through cooking demos) and social support (through group discussions).</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Lessons include modeling (through cooking demos) and social support (through group discussions).</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Lessons include modeling (through cooking demos) and social support (through group discussions).</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Lessons include modeling (through cooking demos) and social support (through group discussions).</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Lessons include modeling (through cooking demos) and social support (through group discussions).</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Lessons include modeling (through cooking demos) and social support (through group discussions).</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Lessons include modeling (through cooking demos) and social support (through group discussions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-based</td>
<td>Core topics and content in curriculum are based on accurate, reliable, and current research. Intervention includes the current Dietary Guidelines for Americans.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Curriculum description cites evidence base; program staff mentioned evidence base; lesson goals and objectives.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Lessons are selected for knowledge and expertise in health topics; evidence-based; include educational messages.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Lessons include modeling (through cooking demos) and social support (through group discussions).</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Lessons include modeling (through cooking demos) and social support (through group discussions).</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Lessons include modeling (through cooking demos) and social support (through group discussions).</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Lessons include modeling (through cooking demos) and social support (through group discussions).</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Lessons include modeling (through cooking demos) and social support (through group discussions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets multiple levels of SEM</td>
<td>Programs are strengthened by the inclusion of multiple levels of the Social- Ecological Model (SEM) and enhanced by the inclusion of policy, systems, and environmental supports.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Programs for all lessons meet this characteristic since all include a component of community education as well as distribution of food to increase access.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Lessons incorporate Diet Counselor Guidelines, DASH diet, and other evidence-based sources.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Lessons incorporate Diet Counselor Guidelines, DASH diet, and other evidence-based sources.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Lessons incorporate Diet Counselor Guidelines, DASH diet, and other evidence-based sources.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Lessons incorporate Diet Counselor Guidelines, DASH diet, and other evidence-based sources.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Lessons incorporate Diet Counselor Guidelines, DASH diet, and other evidence-based sources.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Lessons incorporate Diet Counselor Guidelines, DASH diet, and other evidence-based sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear goals and objectives</td>
<td>Program has clearly stated goals and objectives that drive both the intervention and evaluation.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Clear state goals and objectives for lessons; not already included.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Clear state goals and objectives for lessons; not already included.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Clear state goals and objectives for lessons; not already included.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Clear state goals and objectives for lessons; not already included.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Clear state goals and objectives for lessons; not already included.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Clear state goals and objectives for lessons; not already included.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Clear state goals and objectives for lessons; not already included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate for audience</td>
<td>Available in languages appropriate for the target audience, visuals and activities are appropriate for the target audience, and recipes are consistent with program goals and appeal to the target audience.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Curriculum is developed for SNAP Ed and program staff are fluent; focus on using resources wisely; shopping and cooking on a budget; one cohort taught in Spanish.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Cooking classes addressed budget and time constraints of participants; classes that started midway through program were well attended and met needs of participants (community building as well as teaching cooking).</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Stated that learning how to cook with produce and how to substitute ingredients met needs of participants.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Stated that program is appropriate for audience in terms of educational level, financial situation, and medical issues of patient population.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Stated that program is patient-led to a degree, responds to their questions; appropriate for literacy levels.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Stated that lessons included component on &quot;culture&quot; related to participants' heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodates various learning styles</td>
<td>Program delivery accommodates visual, auditory, and kinesthetic (hands-on) learning styles.</td>
<td>Curriculum or lessons include hands-on activities and written materials in addition to verbal instruction</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Each session included a cooking class.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Hands-on cooking classes</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Lessons on physical activity and gardening - extenders&quot; - take home items to encourage use at home</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Included grocery store tour, active participation during class, and handouts</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Active participation during class and handouts or activities to take home</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: All sessions included hands-on cooking; one session included a quiz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td>Program is implemented as designed to maintain the theoretical basis and is delivered in its entirety.</td>
<td>Program staff talk about following curriculum/lessons / scripts</td>
<td>Program staff talk about ecological model so that it is implemented with fidelity</td>
<td>Program staff talk about ecological model so that it is implemented with fidelity</td>
<td>Program staff talk about ecological model so that it is implemented with fidelity</td>
<td>Program staff talk about ecological model so that it is implemented with fidelity</td>
<td>Program staff talk about ecological model so that it is implemented with fidelity</td>
<td>Program staff talk about ecological model so that it is implemented with fidelity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluation is designed to measure achievement of goals and objectives and to address each level of the Social Ecological Model included within program.</td>
<td>Not able to evaluate</td>
<td>Not able to evaluate</td>
<td>Not able to evaluate</td>
<td>Not able to evaluate</td>
<td>Not able to evaluate</td>
<td>Not able to evaluate</td>
<td>Not able to evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator characteristics</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Educators have expertise in content prior to delivering intervention.</td>
<td>Taught by RD or other qualified professional</td>
<td>Taught by RD or other qualified professional</td>
<td>Taught by RD or other qualified professional</td>
<td>Taught by RD or other qualified professional</td>
<td>Taught by RD or other qualified professional</td>
<td>Taught by RD or other qualified professional</td>
<td>Taught by RD or other qualified professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRENGTHS: Some lessons taught by health professionals (Alzheimer’s and heart healthy nutrition)</td>
<td>Taught by RD, qualified to teach nutrition content</td>
<td>Taught by RD, qualified to teach nutrition content</td>
<td>Taught by RD, qualified to teach nutrition content</td>
<td>Taught by RD, qualified to teach nutrition content</td>
<td>Taught by RD, qualified to teach nutrition content</td>
<td>Taught by RD, qualified to teach nutrition content</td>
<td>Taught by RD, qualified to teach nutrition content</td>
<td>Taught by RD, qualified to teach nutrition content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIMITATIONS: Nutrition education may have also been delivered by cooks and lay leaders who may not have expertise in nutrition content</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: All sessions included hands-on cooking; one session included a quiz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator characteristics</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Educators have expertise in teaching methods appropriate for the target audience prior to delivering intervention.</td>
<td>Program staff talk about qualifications or experience of instructor teaching similar classes or with this population.</td>
<td>Program staff talk about qualifications or experience of instructor teaching similar classes or with this population.</td>
<td>Program staff talk about qualifications or experience of instructor teaching similar classes or with this population.</td>
<td>Program staff talk about qualifications or experience of instructor teaching similar classes or with this population.</td>
<td>Program staff talk about qualifications or experience of instructor teaching similar classes or with this population.</td>
<td>Program staff talk about qualifications or experience of instructor teaching similar classes or with this population.</td>
<td>Program staff talk about qualifications or experience of instructor teaching similar classes or with this population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATOR CHARACTERISTICS</td>
<td>Educators possess the ability to relate well to the target audience.</td>
<td>Program staff talk about ability of instructor to relate to audience OR instructor is chosen because of status as peer / community member.</td>
<td>Program staff talk about ability of instructor to relate to audience OR instructor is chosen because of status as peer / community member.</td>
<td>Program staff talk about ability of instructor to relate to audience OR instructor is chosen because of status as peer / community member.</td>
<td>Program staff talk about ability of instructor to relate to audience OR instructor is chosen because of status as peer / community member.</td>
<td>Program staff talk about ability of instructor to relate to audience OR instructor is chosen because of status as peer / community member.</td>
<td>Program staff talk about ability of instructor to relate to audience OR instructor is chosen because of status as peer / community member.</td>
<td>Program staff talk about ability of instructor to relate to audience OR instructor is chosen because of status as peer / community member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIMITATIONS: Social support for participants was limited.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Social support for participants was limited.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATIONSHIP TO AUDIENCE</td>
<td>Educators possess the ability to relate well to the target audience.</td>
<td>Program staff talk about ability of instructor to relate to audience OR instructor is chosen because of status as peer / community member.</td>
<td>Program staff talk about ability of instructor to relate to audience OR instructor is chosen because of status as peer / community member.</td>
<td>Program staff talk about ability of instructor to relate to audience OR instructor is chosen because of status as peer / community member.</td>
<td>Program staff talk about ability of instructor to relate to audience OR instructor is chosen because of status as peer / community member.</td>
<td>Program staff talk about ability of instructor to relate to audience OR instructor is chosen because of status as peer / community member.</td>
<td>Program staff talk about ability of instructor to relate to audience OR instructor is chosen because of status as peer / community member.</td>
<td>Program staff talk about ability of instructor to relate to audience OR instructor is chosen because of status as peer / community member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIMITATIONS: Social support for participants was limited.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Social support for participants was limited.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Social support for participants was limited.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Social support for participants was limited.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Social support for participants was limited.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Social support for participants was limited.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Social support for participants was limited.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Social support for participants was limited.</td>
<td>STRENGTHS: Social support for participants was limited.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>