

**Department of Family Development
Research and Studies Committee Meeting
May 13, 2009 – 8:30 a.m. – WISLINE**

Committee Members Present: Jackie Carratini, Nancy Crevier, Julie Keown-Bomar (recorder), Patti Herman, Cyndy Jacoby

Authors Present: Angela Flickenger, Nancy Brooks, Molly Spaulding

Meeting Called to Order at 8:32

Certification of meeting posting - Recognized and approved.

Recap of decisions from May 12 meeting.

General comments

- UW-Extension or UW Cooperative Extension? What is the official title of the organizational for publication purposes? Committee will need to get clarification from the department and post on the DFD website.

Review of: **Building Strength of Aging Women in Wisconsin: The Strong Women™ Program by Angela Flickinger**

- See attached articles. Specific editorial changes are made in Microsoft word “track changes” editing software.
- General comments:
 - Abstract and paper: use third person (“the author”). Use of ultimately twice in the same sentence is repetitive.
 - Situation Statement: CDC is the acronym used but the Center for Disease Control and Prevention is the organization’s title. Clarify organizational title with acronym. Information about the history and development of Strong Women is appropriate for the methodology section . Explain earlier in the paper why the program was needed in Wisconsin. Need Wisconsin baseline—what existed before, where are the gaps, etc.
 - Objectives: Need baseline data or outcomes are difficult to measure. She can show output (how many women were trained), but cannot show the increase over preexisting participation rates. Explain what the author is measuring, program or participant wellness, or both? Great job pointing out research and evidence base of the program. If the goal is to develop/start a program, thereby increase the opportunity, and not increase the numbers, then the objective section is appropriate. Why are wellness standards not some of the objectives? Opportunity does not necessarily improve health outcomes. Rethink in terms of short, medium and long term goals—what is the purpose of this program and clarify in the revised paper. Is the purpose to increase opportunity or to improve health (show results in the participants), or both? Flickinger clarified that the goal is to increase availability of the programs. Goal of innovative nutrition and health education—has no reference in the results section of the paper. Objectives need to link with results. Leap or extrapolation made in the paper between national and state results.

- Program and Evaluation Methodology—two different methodologies are needed to measure the goals. Measuring programming (train the trainer and advancing the development of a program) is one sort of methodology and another evaluation methodology measures the health of the participants. Needs to be clearly stated from the beginning that the author is measuring two types of outcomes. Is there an opportunity for the participants to respond about their own perceptions of wellness? Author reports back to the committee that they do. Is there any way to show statewide impact using the senior fit test? How are middle age and elder defined by the author—be clear from the beginning of the paper. Do the participants provide the equipment or the host site? Flickinger said either one can provide the equipment. The year 2007 and ambassador status is repetitive in the program methodology section. In the last paragraph, author lists capacity building numbers which are more appropriate for results section.
- Map: list total numbers in this diagram. Are all these people trained by author? Point of clarification.
- Results and Findings: Numbers do not come together in the first paragraph—see track changes in the body of the paper. Depending on the objectives (program or participants), it may be appropriate to have more information about the evaluations. More antidotal information from participants may also be appropriate for this section. Chart on the senior fit test—decrease is a good thing, but readers may misinterpret. How many participants decreased their need for medication? The way this sentence reads implies that all the participants had less need of medication.
- General note on organization: the results that the participants incurred as a result of their participation in the program could be used as an incentive for more educators to adopt Strong Women. One set of results could generate interest for the program’s expansion (the main program goal)
- Conclusions: participant results from Rock County cannot be overstated to imply statewide impact. See the track changes in the document. Partnerships and collaborations deserve mentioning or state why they were not significant. What helps this program be successful? Expand the implications of wellness and savings through reduced health care costs—Extension’s contribution to the community. “Increased health status”--- is this positive or negative, explain. What are the implications for future programming—how will the program be disseminated throughout the state—clarify.

Notes on scholarship: program shows breadth in program development and promising directions for UW-Extension in local communities. The paper needs to be clearer in terms of objectives. The number of trainers that completed training and team interest and support shows value to others.

Carratini moved to accept paper with minor revisions. Herman seconds. Unanimous aye vote.

Next steps: Flickinger will get a copy of the notes and a copy of “track changes” within the document itself. Author can submit the paper back to the chair of the committee. Committee members do not recommend Flickinger submits any new data.

Review of: **The Impact of Adult Caregiving on County Government Employees** by
**Mary Brintnall-Peterson, Faye Malek, Kathryn Miller, Peggy Nordgren, Molly Spaulding,
Dianne Weber and Teri Zuege-Halvorsen**

- See attached document. Specific editorial changes and minor suggestions are made in Microsoft word “track changes” editing software.
- Front Page: Put in descending order from major to minor contributors and try to put all the authors on page. Spaulding should be the first author.
- Abstract: should not be centered—left align. Reviewers agree it is clearly written.
- Font size: recommend 12 point font. No department standards at this time.
- Titles: be consistent with capitalization of titles-- “extension educator” should be capitalized.
- Situation Statement: Who initiated the national pilot project? Spaulding will double check and clarify. Very well done.
- Objectives: authors state their hypothesis is to determine if the survey would lead to certain results, but the results are not clear. They do not refer to economic, emotional impact and greater support. “Increase” and “greater” are not really measurable. Need to link results to objectives. How will you measure greater support, increased awareness? The objective of their work is to assess. The listed objectives are subsets of what the authors expected to learn. Authors may be able to take the listed objectives and use them in the implications sections. Reviewers recommend taking hypothesis out. The authors are assessing caregiving, not proving or disproving a hypothesis.
- Methodology: Explicit reference to IRB approval is appreciated. Discuss the kind of questionnaires used: yes/no, scaled, open-ended etc. A hard copy of the questionnaire could be attached. The key is to match your methodology with your purpose—why was this kind of questionnaire used? What were the authors hoping to gain by using quantitative and qualitative data? Third paragraph—employed caregivers, working caregivers—revise wording. Lastly, explain how the survey results were shared with the partners—action or participatory research? This is applied research—take credit for giving something back to the county.
- Results and Findings: good response rate, good clarification of caregiving, reviewers appreciated the broad definition of caregiving.
- Summary and Implications: Authors should comment on objectives listed earlier here and clarify eXtension with a footnote. This section is very well written.
- References: double space, follow APA format.

Notes on Scholarship: useful tool for other counties, specialist was involved, local value was apparent. How was programming impacted?

Dissemination: how will others be able to access? Authors should explain future papers will explore...

Herman moved to accept paper with minor revisions. Crevier seconds. Unanimous “aye” vote.

Review of: **Developing an Extension Program in Aging: An Historical Perspective by Mary Brintnall-Peterson and Nancy Brooks.**

- Title Page: consider rewording title to a case-study. In the objectives section, the paper is referred to as a case-study.
- Situation Statement: easily read, provided historical information that was comprehensive.
 - Third paragraph: isn't this a national survey of state cooperative units? Add the word "national" to clarify.
 - First paragraph: remove period before the parenthesis reference, substitute comma for period in the reference.
 - No punctuation before parenthesis in references. Be consistent in citing references in text.
 - Who identified the "hot topics" (cite at the end of the sentence).
- Objectives: only suggestion is to use the word "lessons learned" in the objectives because this is what is used in the results section.
- Methodology: why did the authors interview these individuals?
 - Period after Appendix B.
- Results and Findings: well organized, chart is helpful. Put "see appendix A" in parenthesis instead of a stand alone sentence. Bottom of page 9, last sentence above summary and implications—missing words in the sentence. Words transposed in Appendix A in activities column. HCE reference should be consistent—don't use homemaker term. Addresses of websites should be added. Did the authors gain IRB approval for the interviews?
- Summary and Implications: well written and clear recommendations. Check with use of eXtension—explain what it is in a footnote.

Scholarship and General comments: well written, creative, captures history. Not sure who else has reviewed and valued. Helps us understand how UWEX programs have developed. History may be applicable to other states. Spell out acronyms in the chart. Single space in final copy.

Crevier moved to accept with minor revisions. Herman seconds. Unanimous "aye" vote.

Committee members discuss sharing scholarship workshops with Brooks. Some suggestions for workshops: use of websites as references, writing an abstract, literature reviews, research claims, and new databases for resources, etc. Members agree to explore how this committee can work with the scholarship committee. Jacoby agrees to talk more with Brooks about how this committee can collaborate.

Next meeting is August 11, 2009, 1-3 p.m. Marilyn Kooiker, Mary Wood and possibly one more colleague will join the committee. It was suggested that the group hold a July meeting to take care of logistics including voting in a new chair and discussing process with new colleagues. The end of July is preferable for this meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 3 p.m.

j:\uwx\dfd\research & studies\2009\5-13-09 minutes with brooks paper notes.doc