

# HFC Facilitation Guide and Tools: A Prioritization Framework

## Alliance to End Hunger 2017 National Sunshine Summit to End Hunger

Phyllis Hepp, MSW - Kalamazoo Loaves & Fishes

Elizabeth Yakes Jimenez, PhD, RDN, LD -  
Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, University of New Mexico

Alison Steiber, PhD, RDN - Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics

# LEARNING OUTCOMES

After this presentation, the participant will be able to:

- Describe a new interdisciplinary, evidence-based prioritization framework to optimize community food security
- Apply the prioritization framework in their communities
- Access and integrate new open-access tools and resources available for community food security assessment and interventions

# SESSION OUTLINE

- Speaker introductions (*~5 min*)
- Process of developing and validating the HFC Prioritization Framework (*~10 min*)
- Overview of Hunger Free Communities (HFC) prioritization framework (*~5 min*)
- Community experience with HFC Prioritization Framework – Kalamazoo Loaves & Fishes (*~15 min*)
- Experiential learning activity: Anywhere, USA (*~35 min*)
- Wrap-up and questions (*~5 min*)

# WHAT IS THE CHALLENGE?

- Multiple possible interventions for food and nutrition security, addressing a variety of objectives
- Multiple objectives, e.g. filling gaps in nutritional needs, emergency preparedness, addressing access issues, short-term versus long term
- **Each community has unique needs and existing programs and limited funding, time and resources**

# WHAT IS THE CHALLENGE?

- How do you decide how funding, resources, and effort should be allocated in a given location?
- Or, how do you decide what should be done next to better address food and nutrition insecurity in your community?

# HOW DO YOU USUALLY SEE PRIORITIZATION DECISIONS BEING MADE IN YOUR WORK SETTING?

*Snap or clap to vote for your choice (vote for all that apply)*

- A. Based on emotional reaction to proposed changes or new options/programs
- B. Based on requests for proposals that come out from funders
- C. Based on an on-going strategic planning process
- D. Based on the priorities of people in leadership positions
- E. Nothing changes because no one can make a decision (status quo is maintained)

# DEVELOPMENT OF THE HFC GUIDE AND TOOLS

- Funded by a grant from the General Mills Foundation to the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics Foundation
- Phase I
  - Examination of interest/needs and current prioritization tools and identification of appropriate framework
  - Development of facilitation guide and tools
  - Beginning of face and content validation with experts
- Phase II
  - Piloting with communities in Kalamazoo, MI; Mumbai, India; Bolingbrook, IL (next round of validation)
  - Work with communities in Tampa, FL and Santiago Sacatepéquez, Guatemala to identify and test modifications to the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics Health Informatics Infrastructure (ANDHII) for public health nutrition evaluation

# DEVELOPMENT OF HFC GUIDE AND TOOLS: PHASE I

Discussions with multiple groups to determine interest, needs and possible paths forward

- Participants at:
  - **General Mills Food Insecurity Insights Summit** (July 2016): Follow-up discussions with representatives from Share Our Strength/No Kid Hungry, Mission Measurement, the Global FoodBanking Network
  - **International Congress of Dietetics** (September 2016): Discussions with participants from Argentina, the United Kingdom, Spain, Israel, Malaysia, India and the United States
  - **Micronutrient Forum** (October 2016): Discussions with UC Davis MINIMOD and World Food Programme Nutrient Gap Analysis teams; beginning of extensive identification of assessment resources



# DEVELOPMENT OF HFC GUIDE AND TOOLS: PHASE I

## Gaps identified through discussions

- Needed a decision making tool appropriate for local level use
- That tool needed to be logical and rigorous, but pragmatic:
  - Able to be completed within a relatively short time frame
  - Understandable by people without extensive training in modeling (transparent)
  - Able to be implemented with minimal technology/software
  - Be able to proceed with data that is available at the time, and refine when additional data are available



# DEVELOPMENT OF HFC GUIDE AND TOOLS: PHASE I

Additional discussions to identify model/process that fit those criteria

- **Jim Lee, MS**, Altarum Institute, review of WHO-CHOICE and RWJF Community Health Advisor and analytical hierarchy process (AHP)
- AHP expert **Tomás Aragon, MD, DrPH** (San Francisco Department of Public Health/UC Berkeley School of Public Health) → PBMA  
(**Francois Dionne, PhD** and **Craig Mitton, PhD**, Prioritize Consulting)

# DEVELOPMENT OF HFC GUIDE AND TOOLS: PHASE I

## Start of face and content validation with experts

- E-mailed 52 expert reviewers from a variety of sectors (academia, nutrition, public health, nonprofit/community action, foundations, global health) to review facilitation guide and tools and complete an online survey to provide feedback
- 15 reviewers (29% response) provided feedback via survey; two additional reviewers provided written comments outside of the survey
- Made several substantive changes to guide and tools as a result of feedback

# FACILITATION GUIDE AND TOOLS DEVELOPED

## Guide and tools

- Step 1: Formation of the decision team (stakeholder assessment)
- Step 2: Food and Nutrition Security Assessment
  - **Community Assessment Tool**
  - **Intervention Inventory Tool**
- Step 3: Intervention Assessments
  - **Individual Intervention Assessment Tool**
- Step 4: Prioritization/Decision-Making
  - **Overall Intervention Scoring Tool**
- Appendices
  - Other nutrition-related decision resources
  - Sample stakeholder outreach letter
  - Potential sources of relevant, publicly available data for food and nutrition security assessment
  - Tool for collecting and analyzing food and nutrition security data

# DEVELOPMENT OF HFC GUIDE AND TOOLS – PHASE II

COMMUNITY EXPERIENCE:  
KALAMAZOO LOAVES & FISHES

# TRAVELING TO ANYWHERE, USA...

- Rural town in a county of ~74,000 people
- Have completed the community assessment and intervention inventory (highlights presented here)
  - 27.2% of people in the county are food insecure (20,150 out of ~74,000 people; Feeding America, Map the Meal Gap, 2015)
  - 34.8% of children in the county are food insecure (Feeding America, Map the Meal Gap, 2015)
  - An estimated 88% of food insecure households are income eligible for SNAP, WIC, free school meals, CSFP, TEFAP
    - Participation in school meals is suboptimal
  - The county has 12 grocery stores (0.16 grocery stores/1000 pop<sup>n</sup>) and 45 convenience stores (0.62 convenience stores/1000 pop<sup>n</sup>)
    - All census tracts in the county have a significant number of residents that are more than 10 miles from the nearest supermarket
    - Access to fresh produce is consistently identified as an issue by county residents

# TRAVELING TO ANYWHERE, USA...

- Community Hunger Free Communities coalition includes: church pantry manager, clinic nurse, mayor, tribal leader, health teacher, farmer, non-profit organization manager, WIC nutritionist, restaurant owner and a dad from a food insecure household
- Have identified **decreasing child hunger** as a top priority
- We will help them to complete and rank individual intervention assessments for *Breakfast In the Classroom* and *School Garden Development* as a simple example of the process

# A LITTLE MORE ABOUT...BREAKFAST IN THE CLASSROOM

- With breakfast in the classroom:
  - Breakfast is available to all students, no matter the income level.
  - It is eaten in the classroom, after the bell.
- Breakfast at the start of the school day is associated with better behavior, reduced absenteeism, better test scores and increased consumption of fruit and milk.
- Concerns discussed by coalition:
  - How many additional staff will be needed to smoothly facilitate the program?
  - To what extent will time be taken away from teaching/learning?
  - Who will clean up the mess that will be made in the classroom?
  - Would we have administrative support at the district and school levels?
  - Will we really be able to serve healthy breakfasts at this large of scale?
  - Might some students end up having two breakfasts?
  - How much food might we expect will go uneaten/disposed of through this type of program?



# IMPACT...BREAKFAST IN THE CLASSROOM

CRITERIA	DEFINITION	WEIGHT	RATING			
			0 No impact or negative impact	1	2	3 Significant impact
Positive impact on <b>quantity of food</b> available to families/households ( <b>severe food insecurity</b> )	Impact of the intervention on the prevalence of severe food insecurity as measured by: 1) magnitude of the problem, 2) evidence-base for impact and 3) existence, utilization and quality of existing interventions	11		1		
Positive impact on <b>quality and variety of food</b> available to families/households ( <b>mild/moderate food insecurity</b> )	Impact of the intervention on the prevalence of mild/moderate food insecurity as measured by: 1) magnitude of the problem, 2) evidence-base for impact and 3) existence, utilization and quality of existing interventions	15			2	
Positive impact on <b>obesity</b>	Impact of the intervention on the prevalence of obesity as measured by: 1) magnitude of the problem, 2) evidence-base for impact and 3) existence, utilization and quality of existing interventions	8		1		
Positive impact on <b>undernutrition</b>	Impact of the intervention on the prevalence of undernutrition as measured by: 1) magnitude of the problem, 2) evidence-base for impact and 3) existence, utilization and quality of existing interventions	3		1		
Positive impact on <b>micronutrient deficiency</b>	Impact of the intervention on the prevalence of micronutrient deficiency as measured by: 1) magnitude of the problem, 2) evidence-base for impact and 3) existence, utilization and quality of existing interventions	5			2	
Positive impact on <b>community preparedness for food emergencies resulting from natural and man-made disasters</b>	Impact of the intervention on the ability of the community to provide food in emergency (natural and man-made disaster) situations as measured by: 1) magnitude of the problem, 2) evidence-base for impact and 3) existence, utilization and quality of existing interventions	3	0			

# IMPACT...BREAKFAST IN THE CLASSROOM

CRITERIA	DEFINITION	WEIGHT	RATING			
			0	1	2	3
Positive impact on <b>equity</b>	Impact of the intervention on the social and economic needs of the local communities and marginalized populations and inequalities in access to food as measured by: 1) magnitude of the problem, 2) evidence-base for impact and 3) existence, utilization and quality of existing interventions	11	No impact or negative impact			Significant impact 3
Positive impact on <b>partnerships</b>	Impact of the intervention on the relationship with our local partners, including all local stakeholders	5	0			
Good alignment with <b>community priorities</b>	Degree of alignment of this intervention with stated community priorities	8	No alignment			Highly aligned 3
Good alignment with <b>funders' priorities</b>	Degree of alignment of this intervention with stated funder priorities	5	0			
Potential for <b>monitoring and evaluation</b>	Extent to which it will be possible to monitor progress in the implementation of this intervention and measure ongoing	6	Very difficult		2	Easy
Ease of <b>implementation</b>	Degree of expected resistance to the intervention; Degree of expected capacity challenges (personnel and community and political conditions); Feasibility of accomplishing all intervention tasks in the given timeframe	11		1		
<b>Sustainability</b> of intervention	Potential for medium and long-term sustainability of the intervention in the community (consider the likelihood of long term funding streams and potential for institutionalization through policy)	9	Very low		2	Very high

TOTAL SCORE: 160

# FINANCIAL ESTIMATE AND UNCERTAINTY ...BREAKFAST IN THE CLASSROOM

Estimated start-up/one time costs: \$2500 (district-level cost)

Estimated annual costs: \$43,680 (district-level cost)

Total: \$46,180

RISK FACTOR	DEFINITION	RATING			
		No risk 0	Minimal risk 1	Moderate risk 2	Significant risk 3
Impact on severe food insecurity	Assessment of the risk that the real impact on severe food insecurity will be significantly less than what is expected		1		
Impact on mild/moderate food insecurity	Assessment of the risk that the real impact on mild/moderate food insecurity will be significantly less than what is expected			2	
Impact on equity	Assessment of the risk that the real impact on equity will be significantly less than what is expected			2	
Ease of implementation	Assessment of the risk that it will turn out to be much more difficult to implement the intervention than what is expected		1		
Cost	Assessment of the risk that the real initial or operating costs will be significantly higher than what is expected			2	

TOTAL SCORE: 8

# A LITTLE MORE ABOUT...SCHOOL GARDEN DEVELOPMENT

- School gardens can:
  - Positively affect social/emotional health and interpersonal and cooperative skills
  - Engage children in moderate exercise
  - Increase exposure to new/different fruits and vegetables
  - Provide fresh produce and/or herbs for snacks and school meals
- Concerns discussed by coalition:
  - Where would we get the technical expertise for development and maintenance?
  - How much additional staff is needed for a successful school garden program?
  - Would administration and teachers be on board?
  - Is there sufficient space at the schools?
  - Liability concerns from would it be well-secured from outsiders (or also used as community garden?) to children's use of tools
  - Taking away from classroom time

# IMPACT...SCHOOL GARDEN

CRITERIA	DEFINITION	WEIGHT	RATING			
			0 No impact or negative impact	1	2	3 Significant impact
Positive impact on <b>quantity of food</b> available to families/households ( <b>severe food insecurity</b> )	Impact of the intervention on the prevalence of severe food insecurity as measured by: 1) magnitude of the problem, 2) evidence-base for impact and 3) existence, utilization and quality of existing interventions	11				
Positive impact on <b>quality and variety of food</b> available to families/households ( <b>mild/moderate food insecurity</b> )	Impact of the intervention on the prevalence of mild/moderate food insecurity as measured by: 1) magnitude of the problem, 2) evidence-base for impact and 3) existence, utilization and quality of existing interventions	15				
Positive impact on <b>obesity</b>	Impact of the intervention on the prevalence of obesity as measured by: 1) magnitude of the problem, 2) evidence-base for impact and 3) existence, utilization and quality of existing interventions	8				
Positive impact on <b>undernutrition</b>	Impact of the intervention on the prevalence of undernutrition as measured by: 1) magnitude of the problem, 2) evidence-base for impact and 3) existence, utilization and quality of existing interventions	3				
Positive impact on <b>micronutrient deficiency</b>	Impact of the intervention on the prevalence of micronutrient deficiency as measured by: 1) magnitude of the problem, 2) evidence-base for impact and 3) existence, utilization and quality of existing interventions	5				
Positive impact on <b>community preparedness for food emergencies resulting from natural and man-made disasters</b>	Impact of the intervention on the ability of the community to provide food in emergency (natural and man-made disaster) situations as measured by: 1) magnitude of the problem, 2) evidence-base for impact and 3) existence, utilization and quality of existing interventions	3				

# IMPACT...SCHOOL GARDEN

CRITERIA	DEFINITION	WEIGHT	RATING			
			0 No impact or negative impact	1	2	3 Significant impact
Positive impact on <b>equity</b>	Impact of the intervention on the social and economic needs of the local communities and marginalized populations and inequalities in access to food as measured by: 1) magnitude of the problem, 2) evidence-base for impact and 3) existence, utilization and quality of existing interventions	11				
Positive impact on <b>partnerships</b>	Impact of the intervention on the relationship with our local partners, including all local stakeholders	5				
Good alignment with <b>community priorities</b>	Degree of alignment of this intervention with stated community priorities	8	No alignment			Highly aligned
Good alignment with <b>funders' priorities</b>	Degree of alignment of this intervention with stated funder priorities	5				
Potential for <b>monitoring and evaluation</b>	Extent to which it will be possible to monitor progress in the implementation of this intervention and measure ongoing	6	Very difficult			Easy
Ease of <b>implementation</b>	Degree of expected resistance to the intervention; Degree of expected capacity challenges (personnel and community and political conditions); Feasibility of accomplishing all intervention tasks in the given timeframe	11				
<b>Sustainability</b> of intervention	Potential for medium and long-term sustainability of the intervention in the community (consider the likelihood of long term funding streams and potential for institutionalization through policy)	9	Very low			Very high

TOTAL SCORE:

# FINANCIAL ESTIMATE AND UNCERTAINTY ...SCHOOL GARDEN

Estimated start-up/one time costs: \$1500/school

Estimated contributions: \$400

Estimated annual costs: \$3500/school

Estimated indirect costs: \$1000/school

Total: \$6000/school \* 6 schools = \$36,000

RISK FACTOR	DEFINITION	RATING			
		No risk 0	Minimal risk 1	Moderate risk 2	Significant risk 3
Impact on severe food insecurity	Assessment of the risk that the real impact on severe food insecurity will be significantly less than what is expected				
Impact on mild/moderate food insecurity	Assessment of the risk that the real impact on mild/moderate food insecurity will be significantly less than what is expected				
Impact on equity	Assessment of the risk that the real impact on equity will be significantly less than what is expected				
Ease of implementation	Assessment of the risk that it will turn out to be much more difficult to implement the intervention than what is expected				
Cost	Assessment of the risk that the real initial or operating costs will be significantly higher than what is expected				

# PRIORITIZATION

TITLE OF INTERVENTION	ESTIMATED TOTAL COST FOR ONE YEAR	ESTIMATED CONTRIBUTIONS	IMPACT SCORE	UNCERTAINTY SCORE
Breakfast in the Classroom	\$43,680	-	160	8
School Gardens	\$36,000	\$400		



QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS?

# CONTACT US!

Please contact us at [DPBRN@eatright.org](mailto:DPBRN@eatright.org) if you are interested in accessing a copy of the Hunger Free Communities facilitation guide and tools to use with your community coalition

- Beta version currently available
- Version with feedback from pilot communities incorporated available in Fall 2018