

Introducing a Healthy Food Access Survey Webinar Transcript

Kathryn Colasanti: So welcome, my name is Kathryn Colasanti here at and I'm joined, virtually, by Courtney Pinard at the Gretchen Swanson Center for Nutrition Research Science, as well as, here, next to me in the office is Christian Scott, is an intern with us on the Shared Measurement Project right now, and he will be moderating the questions and the comments from all of you. So welcome. This is our fourth in this series of Shared Measurement Training, and we are here today to introduce a food access survey. So without further ado, all right, I will hit a button. So I imagine that many of you have been engaged, at some point, with the Shared Measurement Project or have seen some of our writing about it, but just wanted to start with the big picture of how this fits in with the larger collective impact framework that we've been working on there, and the gist of the impact framework as a way to think about how all of the different organizations that have overlapping and related goals can work together more synergistically and more effectively for greater impact, and shared measurement is one of the criteria in the collective impact framework, with the idea that if we can track our progress in a common way and identify shared measures, then we can be more effective in measuring the impact of our work and compare and contrast a crossed organizations, aggregate across organizations, and state a common language when we're talking about the results of our work. So Courtney is going to share just a little bit of background on the shared measurement project and how we got to where we are today with this webinar.

Courtney Pinard: Yeah, so not to go over into much, as many of you were aware of the process over the last year or so. There was a series of interviews and surveys we conducted with partners like yourself and found that areas of interest for shared measurement laid in economic impact of local food systems, institutional procurement, and access to healthy foods and related behaviors, and how we kind of narrowed our way to focus on how the food access for the pilot was just the landscape and existing programs going on, including Cultivate Michigan, really as a leader in institutional procurement and aligning well with shared measures, and then building capacity around economic impact is kind of where we were starting with that piece, and some of you are probably involved with the training, and just the Center for Regional Food Systems really started to build capacity in order to assess that more effectively across the state, and so then healthy food access really laid out there as an area that cross cut many different organizations, and also, kind of showed us a need for primary data collection. So, next slide. A quick reminder. Some of the original goals of the Shared Measures Project in working through this Collective Impact framework was to empower communities and organizations to really understand food access better able to address it in their work more effectively, as well as establishing these protocols for assessing healthy food access that can



be replicated again and again throughout the state otherwise and really pulling from those best practices as much as possible, and then building capacity for data collection in general is a really important piece, because the grassroots organizations out there do really great work in being able to demonstrate that impact, not only as a single organization, but then across multiple organizations, is a really effective tool for policy and gaining more funding. So next slide, we'll just give a quick outline. Okay, so then today we've already gone over a little bit of the background, but Kathryn will talk more about how we defined and how we typically measured food access, and then overview of what our pilot is going to look like over the next year or so, and this includes cognitive interviewing, which we're doing right now, and Christian's been leading that up, to establish the tools, as a really sound and powerful tool to measure what we're intending, as well as how we'll implement that survey tool through this RFA process that some of you might be aware of, and then we'll go through each of the scales and questions from the survey tool describing, you know why, we're being included, and what we hope to gain from it, and I'll mention a few additional scales and how we have flexibility built into this pilot. It's not just the questions that are in the core survey, but will have opportunities to measure things that are pertinent to various organizations, and then we'll provide just some basic tips for how we conduct surveys in communities and how we can find other survey tools if, you know, food access isn't our core focus, and then, like I mentioned, will go over the RFA and have some time for questions, and throughout, could you please use the question and answer or chat function, and Christian will keep an eye on that, and we'll try and loopback multiple times throughout the presentation. So I'll pass it back to Kathryn, and she'll go over some food access models.

Kathryn Colasanti: Okay, thank you, Courtney, and I did see one of our participants, Bridget Hope, it looks like you raise your hand. So if there's a question or comment, please put that in the chat box or the Q&A box, and we can respond accordingly. All right. So before we get into, like Courtney said, the specific survey tool and the details of the requests for applications, I wanted to just talk a little bit about the concept of food access. It's a term if you're in this work, you tend to use a lot. We tend to use a lot, and I think we tend to think of it as something simple, but it's actually quite complex. So I just wanted to spend a little bit of time talking about the different components of food access and different measurement approaches, and we'll pause again after this section for any questions or comments, and again, I want to say, this is a working model that we have been in the process of developing with our advisory committee for the Shared Measurement Project, but we really welcome any comments, questions, feedback on this model, healthy food access. But fundamentally, the idea of access has been defined as the ability to benefit from something. So I think we tend to think maybe of access and either having enough food to eat or as the presence of an adequate number of grocery stores in a given area, but either of those things alone aren't necessarily the full concept of access in terms of the actual ability to obtain, to purchase, to eat, and experience some of the



health outcomes from healthy food. So if we break down some of the dimensions, we can think first about just the availability of stores. So are there stores nearby? Is the number of stores adequate to serve the population? Is there an appropriate mix of store types? You'll see studies that look at the ratio of what might be termed healthy food retail outlets versus convenience stores, versus fast food restaurants. Common methodologies, use spatial analyses to look up the location of stores, versus population centers of census tracts or neighborhood, ratio of store types, they mentioned, and also utilize surveys, interviews, or focus groups to ask people their perceived store availability. So are they aware of stores in their neighborhood? Store adequacy, that goes beyond just the physical presence of the store to look at the characteristics of a store. So are there stores that are selling an appropriate variety of high-quality, healthy food at affordable prices, and again, even just that question embeds several concepts like variety, quality, affordability. Are the stores selling culturally appropriate food for residents of that area? Are residents comfortable shopping in the stores? What's the level of customer service? What are the relationships like between store customers and store owners? Are stores accepting food assistance benefits, SNAP, WIC, or other programs? Some methodologies here involve store assessments. So actually going into a store and looking at the variety, quality, or prices of foods being sold. You could look at just the number of SNAP or WIC licensed stores in a given area, and then, again, could talk to residents directly through surveys, interviews, or focus groups and ask them perceptions of the adequacy of stores. The next piece in this working model is on socio-demographics. So what are the characteristics of residents themselves? So assuming there are stores present, assuming the stores are adequate or are providing good, healthy options, do residents have the ability to get there, and do they have the resources to afford the food that is being sold? So what's the level of car ownership, for example? What's the level of food insecurity? Do residents just, in general, have the resources they need to access the available food? This could involve a secondary data analysis, poverty rates, food insecurity, car ownership; a lot of that data is found in the census, and then again, asking people on the perceived ease of accessing healthy food. It sounds like we have a question.

Christian Scott: Are food pantries, free food distribution sites, things like [inaudible] included when talking about stores?

Kathryn Colasanti: Yeah, so that's a good question, the question on food pantry sites, they absolutely could be included in looking at the availability of resources, and I don't mean that specifically in this model, but I think that's actually something that can and should be included, and then you can look at what are residents actually purchasing and what are the shopping patterns, or again, if you want to look at food pantries, food banks, to look at what are they acquiring through those types of sites? So where are residents shopping? How often, and what are residents purchasing? So here, again, you could look at what sales, volume, or category of specific items you see in stores from a given area. You can ask residents to self-report



shopping patterns or self-report what they're purchasing. These studies go so far as to collect receipts from all store purchases for a given time period. So that's a very labor-intensive method. Another question?

Christian Scott: So the request was for me to speak more clearly. The question was our food pantries, food distribution sites, and the like, included when talking about stores and food access, and Catherine indicated that it absolutely can and should be included.

Kathryn Colasanti: Okay, did you guys hear Christian's comment okay? Okay, okay, and then, finally, what are the ultimate, so looking at are stores available? Are they adequate? What are the socio-demographics? What are people buying? What are stores selling? Ultimately brings us to what the dietary behavior. So what are people eating, and what are the health outcomes as a result? So questions here, what are residents eating? What's the level of nutrition knowledge? What are obesity rates? What are rates of diet-related disease? What level of health disparities between different demographic groups? Methodologies can involve secondary data analysis, either at national or state levels. We have available databases on consumption. We have also a state-level data on obesity, diet related disease, and health disparities, but those databases are not detailed enough to look at more detailed geographic areas typically, and then you can also look at self-reported consumption patterns or nutrition knowledge, or health status. And then I also wanted to share this concept of food access, which was developed by Dr. Kareem Usher from Ohio State University, presented this model which drilled from the 1981 that I have referenced at the bottom of the slide there, which developed a concept of access as related to health care, and then Dr. Usher adapted that to fit to food access.

So this is a lot of a similar concept to what I just shared, but sliced and diced in a little bit different way, but fundamentally getting that the level of fit between the food acquisition sites, the food resources in the community, and what residents need and want. So thinking about accessibility, the relationship between residents and our associates, customer service. Accessibility relates to transportation resources, perceived burden of transportation time, the store locations. We could look to public transportation systems, accommodations, store hours, residents' ability to meet those hours, affordability, prices, the income of residents, acceptance of SNAP or other benefits, and then finally, availability. Volume, and variety of healthy food, and the consistency of that availability. So again, I just wanted to share some of these different ways of thinking about food access, just to give everyone a sense of all of the dimensions that are possible to look at, all the different ways that are possible to approach measuring food access, just to provide that understanding of how complex a concept it really is. So we can pause there for any further questions or comments on defining and measuring food access, and then I'll go into the survey tool itself. All right, do we have any other questions at this time? Okay, well, if something does occur to you, feel free to put that either in the chat box or in the



Q&A box. Oh, all right.

Christian Scott: So Heather Cole asks, "Will these slides be available after the webinar?"

Kathryn Colasanti: Yes, they will. Yeah, we can make both slides available and the recording. We are recording.

Christian Scott: And Cheryl Family asks, "Where is cultural appropriateness?"

Kathryn Colasanti: Yeah, thank you, cultural appropriateness is something that we address specifically in the survey tools, and we'll talk about that in a moment. In the model that I presented first. See if I can go back to that. I have that in this concept of store adequacy. So are stores selling culturally appropriate food is one of the possible questions you could look at, and then in the second model I would think that it would be under, you could put it either under availability. It looks like it would be the best fit there.

Courtney Pinard: And just to note, it's not in the core group of survey items that Kathryn's going to go through next, but it is an option for groups that are interested.

Kathryn Colasanti: Yeah, so the perceived availability of culturally appropriate food is not in the core group of questions, but it is something that we include in a question on what are the motivating factors that people take into account when deciding where to grocery shop?

Christian Scott: Another question is can you expand on acceptability? The relationship between residence and association?

Kathryn Colasanti: Yeah, so the question to expand on the concept of acceptability. So that is more the social dynamic, as I take it, and I haven't spoken with Dr. Usher about this model. I just read his article in the Journal [inaudible] Community Development, but the way he talks about it, my understanding is it's -- our customers, do they feel safe? Do they feel comfortable when shopping in a store? Do they feel like they're fairly treated by store owners and employees? Some of those concepts. Okay, well, I'm going to move onto an overview of the pilot and then talking about the survey tool itself, but again, happy to take additional questions on concept of food access and measurement approaches if there are two people. So we are in the process of developing a survey tool to assess perceived food access, and we'll again go into detail on the questions in just a moment, but the bigger picture process behind that, we've been already through a number of rounds of review of that tool with our Star Advisory Committee for the Shared Measurement Project with several expert reviewers in the field that Courtney had contact with, and now we're in the process of conducting cognitive interviews with the tool, and Christian Scott, who I introduced at the beginning is leading that process.



And what a cognitive interview is provides us an opportunity to sit down with somebody and walked through that tool and ask that person to share what they are thinking as they read the question and as they formulate their responses. So it's really a way to make sure that the survey tool is understandable by the target population, and also, going to provide us with the types of answers that we're really looking for. So we have now completed three of those cognitive interviews, and are ready made a number of changes to the questions to make them as clear as possible, to make them as simple and easy to read as possible, because part of this process is also about minimizing just the cognitive burden, if you will, on the respondents of the survey, so that we can make it really easy to understand, and then again, just honing in on what data we're going to glean from the tool.

So we will be completing at least a couple more rounds of cognitive interviews and making successive changes to the survey questions until we get to a place where we really feel like it's going to provide us with the data that we want, and it's going to be as understandable as possible, and then that will lead into the 2016 pilots, and then we'll be sharing more about our requests for applications to participate in those pilots here on this webinar today, and then concurrently, with those pilots, so we have resources to support up to three communities in 2016 to participate and implement the survey tool, but we're also happy to let others use the survey tool as well, whether they have their own resources to conduct a full-scale survey analogous to what the pilot communities will be doing, or whether they just want to use a few of the questions and incorporate those into another survey process that they may already have. Christian tells me somebody, I think Cheryl Family raised her hand.

So Cheryl if you have a question or comment, please type that in, and we can respond. So again, once we're comfortable with the final survey tool, we will make that available to anyone who wants to use that, and then in 2017, we anticipate that we all will have resources to support an additional three pilot communities, and at this point, our intention is to support piloting the tool in rural areas, and then we would also like to use a subset of questions from the survey tool at the state level, so that while we do a deeper dive in assessing food access and the pilot communities, we're also getting a bigger picture sense of food access, perceived food access, at the state level, and then, ultimately, the goal is for the tool, as Courtney said at the beginning, to be one that is adaptable for communities across the state that can be utilized when people are wanting to do an assessment of food access in their community, and can be incorporated into a lot of existing tools. Okay, so now moving on to the survey tool itself. So these are screenshots from the survey software, and we are planning to use Alltrax. So it starts with a yes or no question. "I do most of the food shopping in my household." Okay, Christian tells me we have a question.

Christian Scott: "What is the scale of a community, town, township, or county?"



Kathryn Colasanti: Yeah, okay, so the question was, "What is a scale of a community?" And that's a great question. We will work with the groups that are selected for the pilot to identify specifically a target neighborhood, but we are envisioning a sub-municipal level. So the target number of surveys 250 to 400, and in order to get a really representative sample of a given area. That's not going to be enough surveys to look at, let's say, all of the City of Lansing. So what we want to do is work with the selected communities to hone in on an area that we expect to see a high level of challenges around food access. So I don't have a perfect answer in terms of acres at this point, but that's what I can share. Courtney, anything to add on that?

Courtney Pinard: Yeah, in the RSA, didn't we define this first round, this pilot, the three communities would be at least 10,000?

Kathryn Colasanti: Yes, sorry, yeah. So there's two scales to think about. So we do want to work in this first round with communities that do have an urban core population of at least 10,000, and then within that community, the actual survey will be targeted at a smaller neighborhood.

Courtney Pinard: And like you mentioned, in 2017, then we'll start to think about more rural communities.

Kathryn Colasanti: Right. Okay, so, back to the survey tool. So asking people whether they do most of the food shopping in their household or not, just so that we understand the reference and the perspective of the respondent, and then asking people where they shop or where they get their food because this question does include food pantries, food banks sort of versus kitchens. So in the past month, "How often did you or your household get foods in the following place?" And then we list several categories of stores for food acquisition sites, and then this is essentially a continuation of the same question but the difference is that we are emphasizing during the growing season. Since seasonal availability affects these two sites, farmers markets or directly from a farm or household or community garden. So those are the questions on food acquisition patterns, and then we get into actual perceived food availability. So the ease that people perceive in their ability to access fruits and vegetables, and Michigan-grown foods. So asking specifically about is it easy to find fresh fruits and vegetables within my neighborhood, and we're defining that is the area that you can easily walk, bike, drive, or take the bus to, and whether fruits and vegetables in the neighborhood are high quality, and the selection of Michigan-grown foods. Do we have a question?

Christian Scott: Yes, "Have you looked into working with urban WIC offices, or are you currently piloting from there?"



Kathryn Colasanti: Question on have we looked into working with WIC offices? We've just released the request for applications, and we're open to piloting with anybody who's interested in applying. So we have not pursued specific partnerships beyond that, but one thing that I would like to do after we get the pilot applications rolling is work with specific groups who may have an interest or ability in conducting this survey or incorporating pieces of it with their own resources or with their own data collection philosophy. So the WIC offices might be one of those, and I don't know enough about their current data collection process or capacities, but if you do, I'd be happy to talk with you more offline about that, and then we move in the survey tool to asking about factors that influence shopping patterns. So here we ask what is most important to you in deciding where to grocery shop, and this was the question I was referring to when the question about culturally appropriate food came up, because that is one factor that we list. So there are I think it's nine different factors here, and then also an other option, and these are randomized automatically in the survey so the order is unduly influencing responses.

And then we ask agreement with the statement, "I have easy access to a store that meets my needs or that has, in other words, that have the characteristics indicated above as important." And again, thinking about a neighborhood as somewhere that you can easily walk, bike, drive, or take the bus to. And then we asked about transportation barriers specifically. So how often is transportation a problem for you on a scale of always to never, and how often does the distance from your home to a full-service grocery store make it difficult for you to buy fruits and vegetables you would like? And the same response scale. And then we get into dietary patterns. So these are a series of 10 questions asking about how often fruits and vegetables in these different categories are consumed. So juice and fruit, tomato products, and then green salads, potatoes, beans, and other vegetables. So they might seem like oddly specific questions, but they're trying to reflect how people tend to think about these different foods, and then ultimately, the goal in this series of questions is to translate into a cup equivalent level of consumption, and I will say this series of questions has been utilized in other tools, so it has been well vetted, but it is something that we are still considering in terms of incorporating this survey tool specifically because of it is 10 questions long. It's a large set of questions, and there's a lot of answer choices, and the wording of the questions is fairly lengthy. So during our cognitive interview process, we want to hone in on the ease that respondents have in being able to answer these questions, because I think we're still considering the possibility of paring down our questions about fruit and vegetable consumption to a smaller number of questions. Pausing for a question.

Christian Scott: So actually, this question's related to that.

Kathryn Colasanti: Okay.



Christian Scott: "What is the readability score of this survey? The questions seem a bit advanced for someone with limited literacy?"

Kathryn Colasanti: Yeah.

Christian Scott: And I have to say that during the cognitive interview process, I've noticed that too.

Kathryn Colasanti: Yeah, yeah, I mean, so that is really why would we wanted to do the cognitive interview process, and I'd have to say even just having done now three of these. Christian has led these, I'm really happy that we've taken the time to conduct the cognitive interviews before executing the pilot, because we do really want to make sure that they are readable, and then I will say also that the actual, when we get to the pilot phase and we are implementing the survey, we're envisioning a face-to-face interaction between the interviewer and the survey respondent, and in some cases, I think that could happen. The survey responded, we haven't talked about this process yet, but the survey will be administered via iPad, iPad minis. So in some cases, the respondent might just utilize the iPad and key in all of his or her responses individually, and other cases it could be that the interviewer or whoever is collecting the data, keys in the responses. So there is an opportunity for that person to help clarify questions as needed. Courtney, did you want to comment on that?

Courtney Pinard: Oh, I just wanted to reiterate that with the cognitive interviews, we're really honing in on simplifying the language, and as Kathryn mentioned, with the fruit and vegetable screener, although it's the standard that's out there, the two items that were looking at to replace these 10 items with are much more straightforward. So it's a really big priority to make it appropriate to a variety of literacy levels.

Kathryn Colasanti: Yeah, so assuming we stayed with the 10 questions that are on dietary patterns, the additional questions with the same response scale as the previous slide would be asking about consumption of Mexican-type made with tomato. Consumption of pizza and other tomato products such as spaghetti or foods mixed with like lasagna with sauce, and then the final set is on consumption of greens, salads, potatoes, beans, and other vegetables. So you can see those on the screen. I don't need to read all of those, and then the next set of questions on the survey asks about socio-demographics. So we have a question on have you received any of the following benefits currently or in the past two years? So we have a number of different benefits, and this is a way both to assess poverty level of the respondents but also to get a sense of participation level in benefits. So for communities who want to use this tool to assess possible interventions in response to the level of food access challenges. It's just having a sense of participation level and the different benefits, particularly WIC or SNAP, would be helpful, and then finally, these are more straightforward questions. I didn't type out



the specific language, but we are asking about age, gender, Hispanic, Latino and/or Spanish, background, race, household income by category, number of adults in the household, and number of children in the household, and having those figures, then we're asked to calculate the poverty level, and then also ZIP code, and we have that set up so that we could customize response options based on the community that the survey would be implemented in, and then finally, just an open-ended question. When I do surveys, I always like to throw in, especially if there are no other open-ended questions, something at the end just in case someone has a burning comment. In this case, I wouldn't expect that to be completed very often, not just to have that as an option, and then because I mentioned those two different options in terms of how the survey would be administered, we wanted to be able to document that. So whether the survey was completed by the respondent alone or the interviewer assistant. So those are the core questions, and now I'm going to turn it to Courtney to go over the questions that we would provide as potential optional additional questions, and I should say too that we're also open to working with the pilot communities to adding questions that are of specific interest to them.

Courtney Pinard: Right. So we're flexible with designing a survey, those core items. We really wanted to hone in on what was identified as the most central and important to a wide variety of potential organizations, so that we can have that shared aspect, and then these other options are potentially relevant, as well, and there might be others. So in a few slides, I will ask for ideas on other types of scales that other people are interested in, so that we can make sure we can address that with these optional scales. So the first one is pretty common. The USDA Food Security Module, and this is the six-item version shown here as a self-report format, usually. The module, if you downloaded from the USDA website is in an interview format, but this one will allow you to categorize the population into very low food security, low food security, and moderate-high food security. So that's kind of a standard used across the country, and especially surveillance-type data. So next slide. This is an example of a scale that we've been working on in Omaha for two years now, going on towards third year in the initiative, and it really is to complement this food security module, and it's to get at hunger coping. So this scale here is regarding trade-offs that people make when they're deciding how to pay for food, and then trade-offs they have to make in order to pay for it. So, you know, paying for food versus paying for utilities or medical costs, and then there are two additional scales that are I didn't include on the slide that are financial coping. So things like borrowing money to buy food or pawning items, loans to buy food, and then the third being rationing. So hiding food or stretching food in various ways. So those scales are available, and just a nice complement to the food security module, because we found it isn't as sensitive to change, and we really don't know a lot what's going on in households and communities on a more behavioral level. So next scale, and then this is the cultural relevancy item. It kind of gets at more of whether the foods available in the community



are relevant, culturally to those families. So in particular, this might be relevant to neighborhoods with particular underrepresented minority groups, and just really asking, do the stores in that community offer foods that are common to these cultures? And that also complements to that one item that Catherine highlighted before that's in the core survey that this is a driving factor to making food decisions. So next slide. So now, I'm not sure, and probably in the group chat, as people have ideas of scales that they think are important or things that we haven't really touched on yet related to food access, we'd love to hear these ideas if you want to take a minute to write those in. And then also feel free to type in. We can pause for questions now, as well, any questions about the core survey or the optional scales or how it will work in the pilot. Kathryn's going to go through the RFA in the process a little bit more, but if you have any questions specific to how this survey will be implemented, we'd be happy to talk some more right now. So if anyone has any other suggestions, you can follow up with us. Also as we, you know, start putting this out there, if there are things that you're looking at that are important, I think it's good to have that communication back and forth so that if we're recommending one scale to a group that can we can also recommend that same scale to another group so that there is that shared aspect if there was potential down the line to combine those.

Christian Scott: So we have another question. How have other programs dedicated bus, fresh produce in a convenience store, impacted your diet? So I think that's a suggested scale. Sorry.

Courtney Pinard: Okay. Okay, will feel free to answer ideas there, but we can keep moving forward here. Next slide. So this is a little bit of review. If you've been on previous webinars, but just a quick overview of how we go about conducting surveys in communities. So you may not be solely interested in food access, but you want to know how they can conduct these surveys with the same amount of rigor. So also thinking as a starting point before even getting you even get to step one is, you know, was there any qualitative data that was collected? So interviews and focus groups that you're building from, and that this survey could also complement. So we start by reviewing existing measures, and when possible, aligning with any national surveys, because then you can compare your sample in your community, to your county, to your state, to your national, which is a nice comparison when showing where the need is, and then considering who's used this survey before? Which communities has it been tested in. Is it valid in rural communities? Is it valid in different cultural and ethnic groups? And then we think about the wording level. We already talked about the important point of literacy level, understandability, interpretability, that's hopefully being addressed through the cognitive interviews at this point, with our survey, and just simple things like keeping the questions straightforward, asking one question at a time and providing the appropriate context, so we might have to change their frame of mind. Okay now we're going to be talking about what you



eat on a daily basis or what you typically eat. However the phrasing is, and then with response options, I see a lot of groups out there using yes/no questions, which can limit interpretation, depending on the type of scale it is, so you can sometimes get the bigger variety and ability to do more analyses and really understand what the population is with a Likert scale. So like a one to five.

Most yes/no questions can be converted really easily to a Likert. You know, how much do you agree with these statements, with one being just strongly disagree to five being strongly agree, and then just considering the future of the scale, or the survey, and how you will score things. What will the analyses mean? How do you want to report that out to your stakeholders? Because then you may think of other questions that you maybe wanted to ask that are important for the communication, and then this slide. I won't go through into much detail, but there are a number of sources out there that list and have searchable databases on survey tools that -- and they identify, you know, how they been used in the past and where they're available, and some of these ones that I've listed here are relevant to the food environment and specific to topics that are may be important to you, like farm to school or healthy food environments and communities, and I'll just show, as an example on the next slide, the NCCOR Measures Registry is a good example of you can really narrow down your search so if you wanted to look at a questionnaire that gets at the food environment that's relevant for adults and role, then you can go through some of these examples, and then at each of these pages would be links to it and more information on that scale, and so now Kathryn will provide an overview for the request for applications, the RFA, that we've been talking about.

Kathryn Colasanti: Thank you, Courtney. So if you haven't seen the RFA come through on email, you can find that on the Center for Regional Food Systems website. So that's foodsystems.msu.edu, and if you look on the news, it should be one of the first three on our list of news items. Or you can just email Courtney and I after this, and we can send that to you, but applications are due at the end of this month. So you have just over two weeks, and we hope to support three communities to each between 250 and 400 surveys, and again, we'll work with those communities to develop sampling plans that we would be looking for a balance of low income underrepresented minority groups in a high need area, and then we would be analyzing both the aggregate results across those highlight communities, as well as conducting community-specific analyses and working with those selective communities and what that analysis looks like and how those results are communicated in providing training throughout the whole process to, again, put back to the goals for the pilot that Courtney shared at the beginning really filled up capacity for participation in data collection like this and conducting surveys and analyzing them and reporting and communicating the results. So some of the key things in the RFA, again, and this year for 2016, we are looking to support implementation in a large or medium-sized city within urban core population of at least 10,000. We do need to work with people who are willing to share the data with the Center for Regional



Food systems. The platform that will be utilizing with Alltrax; it's a survey software, and we would be granting an account to that program to the selected communities but we also have an account. So basically, both the pilot communities and CRFS would have access to the raw data, and then if we can't find individuals, we would need to work with the US business entity that is located in Michigan. Christian says we have a question. No, sorry that was the no question. Sorry. And then the budget that we have allocated for the pilot is \$5800, and we designed that budget thinking that we really wanted to provide sufficient resources for the data collection itself. So for the staff time involved in going out and talking to people to conduct the survey for the mileage reimbursement for any travel involved and then for the survey incentive. So \$5 for anyone who completes the survey just as an immediate cash incentive. So those of the budget priorities, and then the basic process, again, working the Gretchen Swanson Center and Center for Regional Food Systems to plan using iPad minis that we would provide to administer the survey in person, and then again, we would work with you to analyze and report the data, and were also in the process of developing a contract with the University of Michigan, who is interested in supporting the selected communities to develop an infographic base to report. So we would have a visual way to share the results of the survey and provide some training on how to develop infographics for use in the future, and then on the application itself, we're looking for a max of six pages. It doesn't mean you have to write six pages. Brevity is always a good thing. We won't penalize those were shorter in their applications. So don't feel like you have to fill out six pages, and this is all spelled out in the RFA, but the first part of the application, we'll just be looking for a summary page with some of the basics. So what is the community of interest? What is the municipality?

If you have an idea of the neighborhood within that city or town, and in one sentence, what's your overarching objective or goal for participating in the pilot? Who would the actual grant recipient be? What would the organization be, and then who would be the people involved? Who can we be in touch with? And then what we're looking for. So the components of the application narrative are on the right-hand column, and on the left-hand column is what we will be reviewing when we're actually looking at the applications, and we have our review committee of four people set up to assess the applications that come in. So significance or background. So tell us about the community. Why is this a good community for looking at food access? What do you already know about your community, either from secondary data, from previously collected primary data, or just from your own experience? Capacity. We don't expect all of the participating organizations to have expertise in these things. Again, we want to provide any support that's needed throughout the process, but we do need an organization or group of people who at least have the ability and the commitment to see the project through, and we want it to be a success and to be completed. What's your approach? What are your strategies for taking on the project? And who do you plan to work with and what is your history of working with those partners? What's your history of working in the community? We want this to be really embedded in the community. It will certainly work best if this is not your first time



working in the community. We want the process and the results to be vetted and shared and discussed through community partnerships, through dialogue with other organizations who have a history in the community, who work with residents, who represent residents, so that it can really be a collaborative project, and so that that can be a home for guiding the process and for interpreting the results, and then we also, we want this tool to be useful for the participating communities and to provide information that can be acted on. So for our purposes, we do want to test out the tool, and as we said in the beginning, develop something that will be adaptable across the state and in different contexts but we really, for your sake, want it to be something that's useful. So how does conducting the survey fit into your longer-term vision for addressing food access or food systems development in the community? So the timeline, again, the application is due at the end of this month, and then we would review and announce recipients by April 15. So we envision a six-month timeline for the pilot, with the month of planning, four months or so of data collection, and then a month of analysis and reporting. And so that brings us to next steps. So depending on your level of interest, if you want to submit a pilot application, we would like to work with you to do that. Again, March 31 is the deadline. If you don't think you want to participate in the pilot, but you might be interested in utilizing the survey tool on another context or incorporating a few of the questions, stay tuned as we finalize that tool and we make that available for those who are interested, or if you just want to stay in the loop with what's happening, we'd love to, yeah, to keep you in the loop I guess is what I should say. So we will be continuing to report out through Food Speak. I have a specific database for people who just want to stay in the loop on a shared measurement project. So if you want to be in that list of people, feel free to email me and then also through that Michigan Food, that Michigan Good Food Charter Newsletter. We'll put out periodic updates there. So that brings us to the conclusion of our prepared comments. Here is important contact info for both Courtney and I, and I think we just have a few more minutes for questions.

Christian Scott: I have one.

Courtney Pinard: Okay.

Christian Scott: So could I ask -- so Kathryn and Courtney both touched -- or Kathryn touched on this a little bit and just immediately previous to this, but could I ask for both of you kind of the so what? What is the benefit to a community or the organization or individuals applying for this? Yeah, what's the benefit?

Kathryn Colasanti: Well, I'll take a stab at that, and then Courtney, you can also chime in. I think the benefit for a community is information is power, and I think can be motivating. So I hope this is an opportunity. I know it's not a lot of money, but I hope it is enough to provide an opportunity for a community to collect some information that is useful in terms of could be



planning-specific strategy to address food access or gathering that background data that would enable a community to seek a greater level of something. To go after larger grants, to look at food access and food system issues that will motivate the community, motivate other partners to build up relationships around this work. I hope that it can also be an opportunity to further establish relationships around food access, hunger, food insecurity, community food systems development. It might be a great opportunity to work with or galvanize a food council if there is one in the community already or maybe as a group of people who are interested in forming one. I think a lot of councils have started with some sort of an assessment. So I think this might be a good opportunity for that.

Courtney Pinard: That was well said. I'll just add just a really basic level, the resources for people to go out and collect data, because in the interviews and surveys, people were very interested in data and this particular topic and wanting to do more, but just operating on a shoestring budget typically. So an opportunity to really do that until launch into more food access work and then just collectively having a shared voice to advance food system work in general, especially in Michigan.

Christian Scott: Another question, "Would a pilot be accepted that included an initial survey and intervention and then a follow-up survey?"

Kathryn Colasanti: Yeah, that's a great question. So our immediate resources are just for the pilot survey, but if you identify your longer-term plans, I think that would really be an asset to an application, and, you know, I think I, at least for one, would like to continue to seek funding to support greater implementation of other either a survey to do either follow-up surveys or extend the number of communities that we're able to implement the survey in. So I guess the short answer is we don't have immediate resources for follow-up surveys, but we would love to work with you to identify resources to do that.

Courtney Pinard: And I guess it just depends on the timing. So, you know, like the little flowchart that Kathryn showed before. So when we [inaudible] your baseline or follow up, and maybe it could be either one of those, that would contribute towards the shared measured aspect as long as you know the sample was within the scope of the project, that 250 to 400, yeah.



Christian Scott: Another question is, "Can you expand on the criteria for a neighborhood within the target urban area? I have a couple neighborhoods in mind. However, Battle Creek is rather segregated, and I'm not sure we'd get a diverse group of surveys without scanning the entire city." Good question.

Kathryn Colasanti: Did you hear that, Courtney?

Courtney Pinard: Yeah, and I think that's short answer and that we understand these kind of complications and complexities rather, and that once awarded, we hope to work with the communities to really define that more specifically. So as long as you have an idea, you know, who you want to be assessing and why, the specifics on sampling and making sure that we have this representative sample, I think we can work with you on that. I don't have a good answer right off.

Christian Scott: I think that's it.

Kathryn Colasanti: Okay, well, it's just past three o'clock. So thank you all so much everyone for joining us on this webinar today. Again, feel free to get in touch with Courtney or I if you have further questions. As I said, we did record this webinar. We will post that to the CRFS website. There is a little bit of a lag in doing that. So if you are someone who wants to apply for this pilot, and you want to either review this webinar again yourself or pass it on to a colleague, one of you get in touch with me and I can send you a direct, unedited link to the recording, but otherwise, it will probably be a week or so before we get that posted to the center's website. Okay, well thank you everybody. Have a great afternoon.

