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Goal

The goal of this project is to maximize the benefits and use of Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) boxes for participants through the provision of evidence-based, client-centered nutrition education and food preparation materials. This distribution, along with the CSA boxes, will increase nutrition knowledge and overall fruit and vegetable consumption in underserved participants of southeast Portland, Oregon.

Process Objectives

1. By November 2015, OHSU students will conduct a focus group to evaluate the effectiveness of the project's existing nutrition education materials, uncover gaps in the target population's nutrition knowledge and in the existing nutrition education materials that could be filled through further materials development.
2. By January 2016, OHSU students will develop CSA cooking skill sheets and other written nutrition education such as vegetable descriptions for newsletters for all Zenger Farm CSA members.

Outcome Objective

1. By March 2016, focus group participants will evaluate overall effectiveness and provide feedback on the education tools OHSU students created using a five-question survey.

Literature Review

CSA programs, along with farmers markets and roadside stands, are a type of farm-to-consumer approach that has been effective in improving the food environment in many regions of the United States. A recent study analyzed data from the National Cancer Institute's Food Attitudes and Behaviors (FAB) Survey, a population-level mail survey of US adults, to determine the current influence of farm-to-consumer efforts (1). The authors found that 27% of respondents purchased fruits and vegetables from farm-to-consumer venues at least weekly during the summer. While adults aged 35 years and older were more likely to use these venues compared with adults aged 34 years and younger, the study found no associations for sex, race/ethnicity, education, or income. The study concluded that farm-to-consumer programs have the capacity to improve the food environment of many Americans, are associated with increased fruit and vegetable consumption, and should be expanded through future public health initiatives. The authors acknowledge that as farm-to-consumer programs expand, there will be an increasing need to design evaluations that address their effectiveness.

A unique benefit of the CSA model is increased fruit- and vegetable-related knowledge and skills as a natural byproduct of program participation. Research has repeatedly shown that even without a farm component, such knowledge can lead to
fruit- and vegetable-related behavior change. For example, a recent study evaluated the
effectiveness of the Fruit, Vegetable, and Physical Activity Toolbox for Community
Educators (Toolbox) in increasing fruit and vegetable consumption, physical activity,
and psychosocial determinants of these behaviors (2). The Toolbox materials were
administered to low-income African-American women in California. Half the participants
attended Toolbox classes (treatment group), while the other half received no
intervention (control group). Each group completed pre- and post-intervention surveys.
The study employed health educators to lead six one-hour Toolbox lessons over six
weeks. The lessons aimed to address knowledge of fruit and vegetable
recommendations and the benefits of meeting these recommendations; increase
confidence and self-efficacy regarding buying, preparing, and meal-planning with fruits
and vegetables; increase empowerment, advocacy, and goal-setting; and other
measures. Participants in the treatment group showed statistically significant
improvements in nine of these measures. The authors concluded that the Toolbox was
successful in removing several barriers and improving knowledge, attitudes,
perceptions, and behaviors regarding fruit and vegetable consumption and physical
activity. The study also linked these successes to increased empowerment in the
participants’ social environment.

A separate, focus group-based study drew similar conclusions, with an emphasis
on cooking skills, knowledge of the nutrient content of foods, and knowledge of different
ways to use vegetables, and the effect of these variables on fruit and vegetable
consumption (3). The authors aimed to examine female consumers’ perceptions of baby
leafy green vegetables, and identify factors that affect their consumption. The
participants, 23 women ages 25-79 years, were divided into three age-related focus
groups. Three main themes, each with sub-themes, came out of the study, representing
barriers and contributors to a healthy diet. These themes are 1) the effect of time
limitations, convenience factors, and quality considerations on food selection; 2)
acceptability within households, familiarity, and cooking skills for a variety of vegetables;
and 3) how existing beliefs about vegetables and knowledge of their nutrient content
inform the connection people make with nutritional value. The study concluded that
having the cooking skills to confidently incorporate a greater variety of vegetables is a
notable factor that is likely to increase intake. Furthermore, the authors suggested that
future health promotion efforts include more of a focus on the nutrient quality and
versatility of leafy greens and other vegetables in order to increase total consumption.

Interestingly, it seems the more elements a particular nutrition education program
has, the more successful the outcomes. This idea is supported by a study that looked at
the varying effects of different levels of exposure to a garden-based intervention among
low-income, racially/ethnically diverse middle school students (4). Intervention
components included in-class lessons, an after-school gardening program,
farm-to-school programs, farmers’ visits to schools, taste testing, and field trips to farms.
The researchers wanted to measure the effects of different levels of exposure and the
separate effects of each intervention component on fruit and vegetable consumption.
The outcomes measured included fruit and vegetable consumption, motivation and
self-efficacy for eating fruit and vegetables, fruit and vegetable preference, preference
for unhealthy foods, and knowledge. Following the intervention, the participants took a
treatment-control posttest. While minimal exposure (defined as exposure to one intervention component) was enough to change knowledge, it was not enough to influence behavior. However, a moderate intervention of two or more components was enough to produce significant changes in behavior and psychosocial variables related to fruit and vegetable consumption. The authors concluded that successful garden-based interventions should be comprehensive and involve multiple components, and they recommend that future studies use larger samples sizes and more rigorous study designs.

It is worth noting that behavior change doesn’t happen in a vacuum. The studies discussed thus far all provided controlled settings in which the participants were able to learn about fruit and vegetables and demonstrate behavior change. By contrast, the home food environment is a very common, yet less-controlled, setting that significantly influences fruit- and vegetable-related behaviors. CSA programs tend to be family-oriented, and as such, are in a unique position to affect the home food environment. This notion was explored in a study that examined changes in parental report of the home food environment during a garden-based fruit and vegetable intervention (5). The intervention consisted of children planting, maintaining, and harvesting a vegetable garden, and after each intervention activity, children were encouraged to talk to their family about their activities, and to ask for fruit and vegetables to be purchased and served at home. Parents/caregivers completed pre- and post-intervention surveys that measured child asking behavior, fruit and vegetable availability and accessibility, parental encouragement, and household value of fruit and vegetable consumption.

Parents reported a significant post-intervention increase in their child asking for fruit and vegetables at home, as well as increased home availability and accessibility of fruit and vegetables. Parents noted that their children shared about their garden experiences when they got home, and consequently, the home food environment became increasingly supportive of fruit and vegetable consumption. The intervention also strengthened parents’ desires to expose their children to the “seed to table” experience of food and eating. A particular strength of this study was its ability to reach and influence parents via a child-focused intervention. The authors suggested that community-based interventions that involve both parents and children may be especially valuable in promoting a healthy home food environment.

**Significance**

There are well-documented socioeconomic disparities for fruit and vegetable consumption in the U.S. Recent literature offers several examples of fruit- and vegetable-related interventions that have successfully increased the knowledge and skills of participants, and have led to their behavior change. (1-5) Though many studies have focused on low-income adult populations and many studies have had a farm or garden component, it is difficult to find a recent study looking at low-income adults using a CSA program—or any farm-to-consumer venue—and fruit and vegetable knowledge and behavior outcomes. The studies discussed here suggest many ways to address factors influencing fruit and vegetable consumption (1-5). These include increasing
knowledge and familiarity of fruits and vegetables; increasing confidence and self-efficacy for cooking a variety of fruits and vegetables; taste testing; increasing familiarity with how food grows and the people who grow it; and including both parents and children in garden-based activities. Zenger Farm already addresses most of these factors in its education materials and food demonstrations. Moreover, Zenger’s CSA program has the capacity to not only revise its current education materials and activities, but to expand its focus to areas such as knife skills, nutrient content of foods, associations between foods and health outcomes, meal planning, goal setting, and making intentional efforts to improve participants’ home food environments.

In terms of best practices for educating the public about nutrition, it would be interesting to take as many components from the literature as feasible and incorporate them into Zenger Farm’s nutrition education efforts. Assuming appropriate program evaluation tools are designed and implemented, this would be a novel demonstration of the unique capacity of the CSA model to single-handedly deliver effective, multi-component education services that reflect current best practices for educating the public about nutrition and increasing fruit and vegetable consumption.

While the weekly CSA boxes provide participating underserved residents with increased access to fresh, local produce, the benefit of the nutrition program may be limited due to gaps in participants’ nutrition knowledge and food preparation skills, among other barriers. One of Zenger Farm’s second year goals aims to train farmers on how to make their CSA programs accessible for new CSA members who do not have the cooking skills and nutrition knowledge of a seasoned member.

Program Design

Activities

Education materials will be designed in the format of a skill sheet and newsletter, and information will be based on outcome objectives and data collected from the Zenger Farm focus group. Topics that will be covered in the skill sheets include health benefits and nutrient density of fruits and vegetables, as well as cooking methods like knife skills.

Target Audience

The target audience for the nutrition education skill sheet component of this project involves all Zenger Farm CSA participants. A 2015 sample size of 127 participants from a survey across five different pick-up locations had a range in education from below high school to graduate level. These CSA members were predominantly female and English-speaking. Ethnicity is unknown, however, around 25% of CSA Members who pick up at the Mid-County location speak Spanish (6). The SNAP participation among current CSA members who pick up at Zenger Farm is 50%. It is also estimated that only 80% of participants will actually pick up CSA boxes (6). The population group involved with the cooking and nutrition classes will be extracted from the total CSA participant group and selected based on criteria for previous cooking classes at Zenger Farm. It is also estimated that SNAP members pick up their CSA boxes about 80% of the time throughout the 23 week season (6).
population group involved with the **cooking and nutrition classes will be extracted from the total CSA participant group and selected based on criteria for previous cooking classes at Zenger Farm.**

**Methods of Engagement**

The skill sheets at Zenger Farm are used to indirectly engage CSA participants on cooking skills, share cooking techniques, increase nutrition knowledge, and empower them to incorporate CSA produce into meals. According to a 2013 Food and Nutrition Service evaluation of SNAP-Ed Interventions, indirect methods of engagement, including the material participants take home, reinforce material that is learned on site. Thus, skill sheets will promote participant learning, increase nutrition knowledge, and promote nutrition behavior change. In this same evaluation, researchers found that parents reported that they read more newsletters and other materials when they had more information about the program from the start (7).

**Logic Model**

The program logic model was developed to add and revise educational materials to Zenger Farm’s CSA program. It is based on an existing logic model from Zenger Farm (6). The logic model includes inputs, outputs, activities, and expected short- and long-term outcomes. In order to promote short and long term objectives in the program logic model (Appendix A), we will reach our target audience through both the newsletter and take-home materials. Other communication channels: the Zenger Farm website, a weekly newsletter, and signage at CSA pickup locations may also be used to notify audience of the program.

As a guide in the creation of our skill sheets, we will use the Best Practices in Nutrition Education for Low-income Audiences developed within the partnership of National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) and Colorado State University (CSU). Not only will skill sheets and nutrition materials be targeted to low-income audiences, they will be based on accurate, reliable, and current research and play into various adult learning styles including visual, auditory, and kinesthetic styles (8). As a program framework, we will use the Social-Ecological model (Appendix B) used in the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics practice paper, “The Role of Nutrition in Health Promotion and Chronic Disease Prevention” to include both intrapersonal and institutional in order to increase efficacy of education materials (9). We will address intrapersonal levels by using skill sheets/newsletters to increase nutrition knowledge of healthy cooking. The Zenger Farm and the CSA program inherently provides a support network of CSA members and facilitate families learning together. Additionally, Zenger Farm offers an institutional safety net by assisting members in the use of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits to purchase fresh and affordable produce in underserved communities.

**Work Plan**
A Gantt Chart is included in Appendix C. It describes the program’s tasks, who is responsible for completing each, and a timeline.

Evaluation

The evaluation is a three step process that will consist of a process evaluation and outcome evaluation. The process evaluation will focus on two main questions:

1. Do the education materials OHSU students create fill the gap in knowledge as defined by the Zenger Farm focus group participants?
2. How effective and appropriate were the Zenger Farm education materials for the target audience?

Question 1 will help us address our first process objective: by November 2015, OHSU students will conduct a focus group to evaluate the effectiveness of the project’s existing nutrition education materials, uncover gaps in the target population's nutrition knowledge and uncover gaps in the existing nutrition materials that could be filled through materials development. We will measure how well we met this objective by comparing the data from the focus group to our final product to ensure we have covered all of the gaps in knowledge.

Question 2 will help us address our second process objective: by January 2016, OHSU students will develop skill sheets appropriate education materials for all Zenger Farm CSA members (10). We will measure how well we met this objective using the following education assessment tools:

- Suitability of Materials (SAM) is a tool that was developed by Pritchett and Hull and uses reading level, artwork, cultural appropriateness, content, layout and learning stimulation to assess the effectiveness of education materials (11).

- Developing and Assessing Nutrition Education Handouts (DANEH) is a checklist created by the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics Foundation as part of the Future of Food project. DANEH helps screen nutrition education material to establish inclusion/exclusion of important quality components. Using these tools will measure the extent to which we achieved the second objective and proximal or short term goal of creating effective materials (12).

The outcome evaluation will focus on the following question:

1. How effective and helpful did the focus group participants find the education materials that OHSU students created?

This question will help us measure how well we reached our first outcome objective: by March 2016, focus group participants will evaluate the effectiveness and provide feedback on the education tools OHSU students created using a five-question survey. The survey (Appendix D) is adapted from the 2014 “Live Educational and
Enduring Materials Course Evaluation” from the Marin County Office of Education and will consist of qualitative and quantitative measurements. The qualitative measurements will include a comment section for participants to write their opinion of the materials we create, as well as any suggestions they have for improvement (13). Quantitative measurements will consist of Likert, 4 point scaled questions that go from strongly agree (4 points) to strongly disagree (0 points). Based on the scaled questions, there will be a total of 16 points that the educational materials can earn with 16 points being the highest score and 0 points being the lowest. A score of 11 or above is adequate and a score of 10 or below means that corrective action should be taken to make the educational materials more comprehensive (14).

Facilities & Personnel

The development of educational materials and skill sheets will be completed by OHSU students. Any other administrative tasks related to the addition of educational materials and skill sheets will be completed by Zenger Farm employees and volunteers in order to minimize increased personnel costs.

Budget

An itemized budget is included in Appendix E. The majority of costs come from materials and supplies which include curriculum materials and printing. Start-up costs related to marketing are very small, as Zenger Farms already has the existing infrastructure to cover marketing costs. Zenger Farm will not need to hire any additional employees because it already has a community involvement director, development director, farm educator, education director, program director, and program assistant (among other positions), as well as volunteers to lead any new activities. On-going infrastructure development will cover small increases in workload if existing employees must take on more work. 15% of direct program costs were added to the total budget to act as a buffer to account for any unforeseen costs.

Sustainability

Engagement

Zenger Farm has existing infrastructure, including 11 employees, over 900 volunteers, and multiple partners, sponsors, and farmers, as well as funding from several organizations (15). The main issue of sustainability is participant engagement. In order to maintain participant interest in educational materials, such materials and handouts will be seasonal, matching fruits and vegetables in the box at each pick-up. In addition, they will be updated on a yearly basis to include new tips and strategies to increase vegetable consumption and will reflect current, evidence-based nutrition guidelines. Through data obtained from the focus groups and through qualitative data from ongoing feedback, educational materials will be tailored to participants’ interests, backgrounds and educational level, which has been shown to increase engagement (16).
In order to ensure sustainability among Zenger Farm itself, program materials will be readily available and transferable among new staff staff. Program materials will include an orientation handout and training materials, curriculum, a detailed description of staff roles and responsibilities, and contact information for relevant partners, funders, and other resources. This will ensure that when staff does turnover, its impact is relatively small.

Community investment will continue to be developed through multiple outreach activities that already occur at Zenger Farm, including family cooking workshops, family garden days, field trips, and other family-based learning activities. Zenger Farm already has a strong volunteer base, which will continue to support educational and learning activities. In addition, Zenger Farm’s Outreach Ambassadors will continue to develop relationships with Portland-based food leaders to improve participation from local communities. Outreach Ambassadors commit at least eight hours per month for three months and are responsible for planning the implementation of outreach and fundraising activities, communicating with interested parties regarding the Zenger Farm’s mission and goals, and maintain communication with Zenger Farm staff (17).

Funding

Zenger Farm relies on grants, partnerships, and sponsors for funding. Foundation and government grants made up 42% of 2014 profits, with fees and product sales adding 27% and fundraising events adding an additional 14%. Overall profits in 2014 totaled $675,200 (17). Producing new educational materials and resources is a very small percentage of Zenger Farm’s budget. However, in order to ensure sustainability, it is important to maintain partnerships with current sponsors and partners while still seeking new grants and maintaining existing ones. In similar interventions, engaging partners throughout program implementation and garnering support from partners and funders have been identified as key components of successful program implementation (18).

Impacts and outcomes

The evaluation measures that are outlined also contribute to the sustainability of the program. Early and continuing data collection (both qualitative and quantitative) will ensure that Zenger Farm staff, as well as stakeholders, are informed regarding the progression and impacts of the program. Focus groups, as well as pre- and post-surveys, will provide information regarding the impacts and outcomes, whether positive or negative, as well as any changes that should be made to the educational materials to yield improved outcomes. Evaluation data will be disseminated to stakeholders, partners, funders, and participants in order to demonstrate the importance of added educational materials, in addition to continual funding, to increase community engagement. If the addition of educational materials and activities are deemed successful, a report will be disseminated publicly such that other farms and farmers markets can replicate our success nationally.
## Appendix A: Program Logic Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short-Term Outcomes</th>
<th>Long-Term Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knife skills skill sheet</td>
<td>Provide weekly skill sheet w/ CSA</td>
<td>Food boxes delivered w/ educational support</td>
<td>Increase knowledge of healthy cooking and prep skills</td>
<td>Decreased Weight/ BMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batch cooking skill sheet</td>
<td>Vegetable descriptions in newsletters</td>
<td>Support network among participants</td>
<td>Increase self-efficacy in kitchen</td>
<td>Decreased A1C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase interest in eating healthy food</td>
<td>Participants feel “healthier”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More diverse consumption of healthy food</td>
<td>Decreased hypertension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decreased polyopathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased healthy eating habits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2: Program Logic Model*

**Assumptions:**
- Clients will show up for CSA pick-up
- All members will receive skill sheets with weekly CSA
- All members will read skill sheets and implement practices while cooking
- Clients will eat the food provided by CSA

**Limitations:**
- Clients may not arrive for CSA pick-up
- If members do not pick up their CSA box, they will not receive skill sheets of weekly CSA boxes

*Adapted from Mid County CSA Pilot Logic Model made by Zanger Farm Staff*
Appendix B: Social Ecological Model

Model from “The Practice Paper of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics: The Role of Nutrition in Health Promotion and Chronic Disease Prevention” published on the Academy website at: www.eatright.org/positions
## Appendix C: Work Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Who is responsible</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff and Relationships</strong></td>
<td>zenger Farm staff, volunteers, community outreach members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue ongoing community outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to seek new partners and funding sources</td>
<td>zenger Farm staff, volunteers, community outreach members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop CSA education curriculum</td>
<td>OHSU students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print materials for education curriculum</td>
<td>Zenger Farm staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announce new nutrition education curriculum in Zenger Farm newsletter</td>
<td>Zenger Farm staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide weekly skill sheet along with CSA box</td>
<td>Zenger Farm staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet monthly to integrate feedback into nutrition curriculum</td>
<td>Zenger Farm staff, OHSU students as needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold first participant focus group</td>
<td>OHSU students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribute pre-survey to participants</td>
<td>Zenger Farm staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete pre-surveys</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribute and collect post-surveys</td>
<td>Zenger Farm staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze data from surveys and focus group</td>
<td>OHSU students, Zenger Farm staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create report with conclusions from analysis</td>
<td>Zenger Farm staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribute report to participants, partners, and funders</td>
<td>Zenger Farm staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D: Evaluation Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITY QUESTIONS</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The content or learning materials addressed a need or gap in my knowledge or skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If given an opportunity, I can apply the knowledge gained as a result of these education materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can identify (insert new skills based on created education materials here).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can identify (insert new skills based on created education materials here).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you disagree/ strongly disagree with any of the above statements, please explain your reasoning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please share your comments about the content/learning material and make suggestions to improve the quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Questions adapted from Marin County of Education- Participant Satisfaction Survey. (13)
# Appendix E: Budget

## Program Costs

### I. Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>%FTE</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No new employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Fringe Benefits (25% of Salaries)

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. Operating Costs

#### A. Consultant and Contract Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hourly</th>
<th>Number of</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational material development</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. Materials and Supplies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-going infrastructure development</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum materials and printing</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATING COSTS SUBTOTAL</th>
<th>$1,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM COSTS SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Indirect Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15% of Program Costs</th>
<th>$150</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TOTAL PROGRAM COST**

| $1150 |

## Program Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Unit Amount</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL PROGRAM REVENUE**

| $0                          |

**Program costs - program revenue**

| $0                          |

**TOTAL AMOUNT REQUESTED**

| $1,150                      |
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