Shared Measurement Project Update Webinar Transcript

Rich Pirog: Alright. Well, I wish everybody good morning. We about 10 people that are joining us remotely and so for the folks in the room, we'll doing this presentation from the sitting position, so just so that we make sure we have good sound quality for the folks that are listening in. This session is going to be recorded. I'm Rich Pirog. I'm the acting director for the Center for Regional Food Systems here at MSU. I want to welcome everybody to this session, which is an update on the Good Food Charter Shared Measurement Pilot Project and this session is an opportunity for many of you that have expressed interest in-- In this Shared Measurement Project to learn more about how we've progressed since the project started this past fall. So, we will-- all of you that are joining us remotely, please, you are only joining us via sort of the-- visually so if you have questions please go ahead and type them in the Chat pod and our speaker will try to answer those as she goes. And we'll also have an opportunity at the end to have more of a robust question and answer session and I ask the folks in the room just to, again, because we have remote listeners as well, Courtney will, our speaker will repeat your question so that the folks that are listening in know what the question is before she responds to it. So, I ask you to just keep in mind that we've got two audiences here who, the audience in the room and the audience that is listening in. So, this past summer, late summer, early fall, the Center for Regional Food Systems engaged the Gretchen Swanson Center for nutrition after a request for proposal process and we've picked them to be our research partner for the Shared Measurement Project. A lot has happened since last October, since we had our first call with a group of interested partners that are interested in the work of the Good Food Charter and one or more of the goals of the charter. And so I want to-- we have both Courtney Pinard, who is the research scientist for Gretchen Swanson and we also have Amy Yaroch. Yarock is it?

Yaroch, who is the executive director. Courtney will be doing the presenting today, but Amy is on-hand also if there is any other questions, so again, if you have any sound quality issues, please write something in the Chat pod but the most simple thing to do if you have any sound quality issues is rerun your audio setup wizard on Adobe connect. We only have the one speaker here and we don't have multiple lines, people speaking from different places so we think sound quality will be good. So, with that I'm going to introduce Courtney who is going to, again, provide an update; go ahead and ask questions if you're remote as we move forward and then we'll have a question and answer at the end. So, Courtney I'm going to turn things over to you.

Courtney Pinard: Sure. Where's the mic? The mic.

Pirog: The mic.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY | Center for Regional Food Systems

Pinard: Oh, it's just, okay. Hi. Thanks for everyone for coming out today. So, I kind of work this presentation with the thought that some of you may have not been on the webinars and so, on a show of hands in the room just to get a sense who was, who has been engaged in listening in on the webinars, so most of you okay. So, hopefully it won't be too redundant but feel free to jump--

I think one person online too has been on webinars.

Okay. Feel free to jump in and ask any questions as we move through this. So, you probably know who we are. We're in Omaha, Nebraska a nonprofit nutrition research center and we really focus on the areas including food systems and food insecurity and child obesity prevention and we work with a lot of different partners and projects with an emphasis on measurement and evaluation, so Shared Measures is pretty exciting for us especially given all the work here in Michigan. So, today we'll go through a little bit review on Collective Impact and Shared Measures and what this project is all about and then we'll present the final findings really from the interviews and the surveys and discuss what's going to be happening next and how we've kind of narrowed the scope to be manageable moving forward. So, you're probably familiar with this. The five conditions for Collective Impact and Shared Measures being one of them but it's important kind of to note where we are with this in terms of having a common agenda. I'm usually reinforcing activities and I think that's what made the partners with the Good Food Charter prime for a project like this and for Collective Impact because you kind of have a lot of these conditions either currently or developing. And the backbone support really refers to that organization that is at the center of it all and that would be the Center of Regional Food Systems and Rich and colleagues. And so, oh that's supposed to be a checkmark over there, can't keep [inaudible], but I think that in terms of where you guys are at and where we're at with this planning phase and implementation, I think that this first phase has really been in the works for years since years past and really is complete. And now we're kind of in the middle of this phase, different phases here in terms of getting on the same page and having that common agenda and establishing these metrics, so I think it's really promising and really neat to see the progress here. And so just a reminder, the goal of the Shared Measures Project is really to build the case for collectively measuring statewide food systems in Michigan and that's really just to measure progress on the Good Food Charter goal. So there are, there were a lot of things that came out of the interviews and surveys that related to the goals but also a little bit outside and we always kind of keep our line of sight towards these goals and how we're measuring progress because this has been established, you know, and there's been consensus around these goals for a while. And so just to, some of the steps here involved, we've already been through a number of these phases including identifying currently collected data, identifying gaps and overlaps and where the need is and where we can have potential successes and challenges. And we're kind of at this bottom circle here in the bright green prioritizing a short list of key indicators and we'll talk a little bit more about that today and what

that means for the pilot and how we're engaging the advisory committee today later this afternoon. And that's really where we're establishing consensus, on what measures are most valuable and then there's going to be this training and support and implementation of a pilot, which we'll go through a little more in depth. But I think in terms of establishing consensus, I don't think it's, it's not like a "pie in the sky" kind of view that we're all just going to agree that this is what needs to happen. I think, well with the advisory committee and with you all, it's really, you don't have to agree to reach consensus. You can voice your opinion, you can you know stay engaged and that this is really just the first iteration of a Shared Measure System in the state and we're starting with, you know, what was coming out of the surveys and interviews and honing that down to a manageable chunk, but that's going to be expanded and growing over the years to come, so I think that's important to keep in mind. So, that-- the timeline kind of overlaps a bit with the steps I just went through but you can kind of see where we're at in terms of this sort of distinct project which is kind of sitting within this larger view of what's going to happen in years to come with Shared Measures it's like it doesn't end on December 15th, or December, this December 2015. It, you know, hopefully we will evolve and continue to grow and they'll be future iterations but you can kind of see where we want to start with training and capacity building and get a sense, better sense of where people are at in terms of that and then implement what would be the pilot. So, you can see here the results and many of you have probably participated in one or both of these components. So, we conducted interviews, some in-person and some over the phone and then we, with 44 individuals and representing their organizations. Some of them, multiple people at the same time from that organization and then we followed up, we thought it really-- we had a lot of good information from the interviews but a survey would allow us to kind of capture a wider view of what people were because we could only do so many interviews; there are only so many hours in the day. So the survey allowed us to kind of put that net out a little wider and we had about 71 responses and from our list, which was kind of waxing and waning as we went through, because some people on the list, you know, were out of state or, so we ended up with about a little over half of the respondents working on charter goals essentially and who had indicated interest in this project responding to the survey. And the overlap between the interviews and surveys you can see here 22 individuals who we interviewed also completed the survey, so that's, I think that's important to note. And so the emphasis of the location of work, many were statewide, they may be located in a particular city or region but their work really reaches statewide and then you can kind of see where it goes from there in terms of the interviews and the surveys. The East was represented well and going down from there. And then here, so we asked people in both survey and interview to indicate what Good Food Charter goals that their work relates to and they could check however many was applicable. And so this was just kind of a slice of the data here to see that in order who indicated work on these particular goals and then ranking them in order of the number, the top to the bottom. So the number one goal that was addressed by most stakeholders is that fourth goal is around food access and then you can kind of see the second, first, second and third, which is really about procurement and the producers in the

agri-food business and the production side of things, as well as, the sourcing and procurement side of things kind of falls in the middle. And then those last two are the school related goals that Ag Education and then nutrition standards. So, not to say that anything's less important than the other but this is what the partners are working on. So, to get into the interview results, I don't know if you can really see that but I can send a clearer copy of that but this is really-- you have themes and subthemes below and I'm not going to go through each one of them, there's just a mass amount of information that came from the interviews and hopefully the report will available for everyone if they want to review these in more depth, but--

Courtney, [audio cuts out here] report, recording and pdf of the slides will be available.

Pinard: Okay. So, both the report, the recording and the pdf of the slides will be available online, so currently we're still whittling down the report and making some edits and we'll have that up in the coming week. So that will be you know, a thick document that everyone can have some good nighttime reading. So, across the top just to give you a sense, so people generally mentioned some goals that they are addressing that might not be specifically related to charter goals. They talked about the measures that they're using and the populations that they're addressing, as well as, I broke down the constructs that they're measuring, the constructs of interest. And then considerations for Shared Measures are really kind of like people mentioning barriers or potential barriers or challenges that we may come up against and the capacity for Shared Measures that each of the organizations may have. And really then just challenges, general challenges with data collection that they have experienced and then perceived benefits, which all the people in the interviews and the surveys generally had a very positive view of venturing into the Shared Measures and that it was important and needed and saw all the benefits, so I think that's a good positive note to be working from. So, just quickly, the non-charter goals-- I mentioned at the beginning that we're really keeping that line of sight to the charter goals making sure what we're doing aligns with that and that we're measuring progress. But I think that some of these may be important as the work continues to grow but we'll keep our focus on the goals for now. But I think there are some nuances that may be within the charter but not explicit, so things around the types of agriculture, holistic approaches that go outside of food but are, you know, as we know everything's interrelated and like a holistic view to support in communities, as well as, policy work and specific dietary quality. And in terms of the measures and methods used, I think we've been through in depth on some of this before but people were mentioned quite a few qualitative methods. So interviews and focus groups were commonly used and I think that's pretty indicative of the type of work that we're doing here in food systems that it's fairly novel and we don't have a lot of understanding about food access and production and sourcing regionally that as qualitative data kind of builds a good base for us as we move forward and indicating what are the constructs. What's important to measure? What are people's challenges and interests really? And then, many of the groups we talked with or surveyed-- they're representing some grass roots organizations or

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY | Center for Regional Food Systems

other types of programming so they have either pre-post surveys or just, you know, completion of the a program type survey where "how did you like the program" kind of thing. And then along those lines there is "simple tracking" I call it but that's really, you know, just when people are doing programming they may be counting attendance, they may be tracking, they may also be tracking output of community gardens at attendance or labor tracking involvement with urban agriculture that sort of thing. Economic impact was somewhat touched on and we'll talk a little bit more about that later as a potential moving forward. But I think that there was more of a need and only a few people really touched on that they're measuring types, different types of economic impact especially if they're directly working with agri-food develop-- business development and jobs created and that sort of thing. And then software and technology is something important that we won't necessarily dive into as we move forward because Rich and others working on the Food Hub Feasibility Study are really considering this and the types of a software that food hubs and the food system need moving forward. So we won't spend a lot of time considering this but maybe in future iterations again that may come up. So I just wanted to mention then with the, again, with the qualitative information this could really build a good basis. But I think part of Shared Measures is not reinventing the wheel and not repeating what's already been done. so knowing who's done what, maybe borrowing interview guides asking some more questions in different locations but also building a survey that maybe gets at the things we already know that were reported in interviews.

Interviews and focus groups in some sense, some examples and as I mentioned we may have sufficient knowledge now and in the field more broadly to recommend key questions to ask about food access. So if people are continuing with interviews and surveys, maybe there's a particular way that we all want to ask, you know, about food access or whatever the issue may be. And many stakeholders report against sent their program surveys and I would kind of divide it out so you have this basic level where "what was your experience with the program or training." "How did you like it?" "What did you learn?" And then the more advanced level would be asking these questions pre and post and getting at more than just their response of the training but actual changes in behavior or attitude, whatever it may be. Typically we don't see changes in behavior that immediate but I think those other psychosocial constructs, attitude and all changes are important to track because they are kind of the first step towards behavior change. And then the observational tools in tracking, the stakeholder groups are really, really strong in this regard I think because given like urban agriculture and things like that, they have harvest logs and sales tracking, as well as, just attendance. And we got a lot of reports from people, a lot of good data has already been disseminated, so I feel like there could be a whole other study that simply does a content analysis of what's in those reports and making sure that-- Because I think one of the things that we'll talk about is secondary data and making use what's already there and I think that includes things that are primary data that groups already have and making sure that, you know, the stakeholders across the state are aware of what others are putting out there in these reports and otherwise. So, here again we'll, this is the

population level data that and the secondary data that is one of the specific types of information that really came out as a indication of what's to come and what's going to be important for partners. And I'll just read the quote on the side because I think it elaborates on what people are actually saying, so. "Where we require the capacity is more in the higher level and secondary collection data that is already out there. There's a place that I think that we can waste a lot-- that's a place that I think we can waste a lot of time on the state because the data is already out there and we are going to sit here and go looking for it. It would be terrific if that is the kind of stuff that was collected from the group and provided to us in a normalized fashion." And I think Rich is already on the path of figuring this out and we have some tools and things to come that there is a potential for some of stakeholders to provide data, that type of data to others that they can use as a resource. Because there isn't a lot of capacity especially with a lot of the grass roots organizations to be going out and collecting a lot of primary data, so having secondary data that is in a format that is useful and informational for people; so I don't know if you wanted to say anything else. Okay. So, and in terms of considerations for Shared Measures and the capacity, I'll just mention that there, the main thing is that informs what we're doing next just really that there was an interest and a need for further training in capacity building. And I think different stakeholders are at different place in terms of the complexity and other data collection, as well as, I would kind of divide it out in terms of capacity you have resources for staffing and just being able to physically go out and collect the data within, you know, a shoestring budget say. But then you also have capacity in terms of expertise to be able to collect the data that's meaningful or aligns with the other stakeholders. So I think that, that will be one of the, that's why we've kind of setup this first phase of the pilot to be more around training and capacity. So, the quote that elaborates on this is, "Whenever the specific indicators are identified, I think we definitely, we will definitely be training them. I think a lot of people could benefit from training about data collection more broadly. There are a lot of smaller food organizations that don't have someone for data collection and know what measures will be more relevant." So, in terms of some of the challenges that were indicated, I think this relates to what I've been saying and Rich has been saying about the fact that this is just a starting point and we're hoping to, you know, grow this over time and that we want to be inclusive but it has to be focused at some point. So I think one of the challenges then is that coordination and developing consistency across multiple groups who span different sectors and different types of organizations. So having those different voices at the table and continued involvement I think is going to be key moving forward. So hopefully, you know, everyone on the line and here and other stakeholders, you know, will just remain engaged and I think one way, I'm not sure so I'll mention this later, one way we kind of do that is acknowledging the backbone organization, the Center for Regional Food Systems. But constant communication that was one of the, you know, steps for collected impact, so being-- even if you're not involved in this first round of the pilot, being involved in terms of directing what's happening next. So maybe there's further data gathering and information and keeping people engaged and reporting out what's going on so that it's a larger

group effort than just what's happening in this little area that we're starting in. And so that kind of relates to, you know, difficulty in meeting multiple group demands especially when there's funding involved. And I think this was brought up in one of the interviews as, well we can have Shared Measures and, you know, things that are lining that's all well and good but we also have to report to our funder and these may be different types of reporting in variables that we're collecting so now we're doing double duty, it doesn't seem, you know, feasible. But I think that this is why we're collecting all this data and trying to align with what's already being done and it may not be initially that everything's, you know, perfectly streamlined but I think that's the goal over time. So that what the funders are asking for and what we're collecting for Shared Measures and for your own organization are really aligning really well. So I think that's something that is a goal, you know, ultimately, it's not to be redundant and have extra reporting but to actually streamline and make things easier for partners. And so, like I said the really positive aspect of it is the support and, you know, need that people really see for doing this. And so I think some of the things to keep in mind is it's not just about having that collective dataset and being able to communicate amongst ourselves, but being able to have a more stronger and more collective voice to speak outwards. And that could be to gather more funding for organizations, as well as, create policy change, so I think, you know, what's going on here in Michigan could be a really strong story for the rest of the country as well just within the state and communicating to various funders and continuing to grow what's happening with the Good Food work. So, then also just learning from each other and not being redundant and strengthening each of the organizations capacity for data and collecting and producing reports and so on. So, this is a nice quote that really just says, "Are collective capacity is greater together than it is as individuals. We will have a louder, larger voice at being impactful, in changing policy, bringing funds and bringing attention to a lot of the good work that is happening but also that we don't duplicate what's also happening in the region." So, and I will say, if this is your quote on the screen at any point in time it may be, so. Thank you for those. Some of the interview results for constructs of interest, so this is the areas that people were interested in for Shared Measures and their organizations moving forward. And I'll talk more about economics and food access but I think the last two yellow boxes there, so consumer behaviors, as well as, access and mapping, are kind of lumped within that food access category. And then we'll talk about economics and you might think economics; how does this fall within the Good Food Charter? I'll describe that a little bit more but I think it does relate to a lot of the goals as kind of umbrella metric. So, we have a willingness to share and mostly, we'll see the survey results mostly in aggregate form but we also-- we have various levels of capacity, so I think it's kind of this balance of training and building capacity but also developing trust and willingness to share with the larger group. So, a few points about the funders, so we interviewed a handful of funders in the state just to get a sense of what they thought of Shared Measures and some interesting things came out there. So currently they have, they didn't really mention a lot of measurement tools that they require any of their grantees to collect and there's really not a way that they're systematically aggregating reporting across their grantees.

So I think that's an area of opportunity but more importantly, I think that the role the funder can play at the table beside providing funding is convening people and having a powerful voice in terms of alignment. So there could be, you know, cooperation and collaboration across funders for co-funding, so that's all will kind of like direct where this work goes. So it's less on specific measurement tools and more about being involved and at the table and a powerful source. So they're really looking for a return on investment and that really, a lot of times, does align with what would be a Shared Measure, what's important to the organization. So I think over time there may be an opportunity to implement what the funders are asking for in terms of reporting and evaluation and what is happening with Shared Measures. So, survey results; any thoughts initially, just those are the-- that's the interviews and then we'll talk about surveys? Nothing here? Anyone on the line here feel free to ask any questions in the chat, we'll keep moving and have more time at the end for discussion. So, most of the organizations that completed the survey indicated that it had signed on to the Good Food Charter. They also indicated that they had a strong capacity and it think so 3.7 on a 5. Scale is pretty good. But how we're kind of picturing capacity is maybe a little different because we're thinking in terms of training. So we'll see later that there was a strong interest in training but they felt they also had a capacity. So that just may be an artifact there but I think that there is a strong capacity to carry out the work and to achieve these goals and we'll see that evolve over time. So, here you can see what the importance of the particular areas are that we could potentially assess in terms of the charter goals. Institutional purchasing and access came out on top along with economic impacts and the other ones aren't too far behind, so you can see that there. Other areas that were mentioned that may be just broader issues is around system wide coordination and we talked a little bit about that and how we kind of align the various organizations and the local supply chain infrastructure, consumers opinions and attitudes and increasing production to match access and food waste. And then just the different types of farms and infrastructure and measurement around that, so I think those may be kind of related to some of the broader issues here but was brought up in the open-ended responses. In terms of food access, since we heard a lot about that in the interviews we thought it would be important to narrow it down and say what kind of area within food access because that can be a very broad term. And even here these will pull apart a little bit more. But that first one capacity of retailers to increase good food in low-income communities, even that can be a little vague. So we'll go through that a little bit so each of these I'm going to go through will be in the green bubble on the left. And then potential constructs and then just what an example of a measure that would get at that. So in terms of this capacity of retailers to increase good food in low-income communities, I think we can look at food system assessments but also brining in that distribution piece. And then food environment assessments that monitor current offerings, so things that look at just monitoring the current health or healthier and non-healthy items that are available. And I think the capacity question really could be get at with more qualitative and interviews with store owners. So we've done a bit of that in Nebraska and we'll be doing that more and other projects in Northeast Michigan rural areas and understanding from the retailers what their

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY | Center for Regional Food Systems

capacity is. The food environment is another kind of blanket term that may cross some of these areas here. And some resources that we have one is this, from the national government, the National Cancer Institute has instruments online and then this other one from our center that we did a study on small stores and put together this measurement toolkit. So you can kind of see all the different assessments that get at just this one area. So thinking about food availability, pricing, marketing, store characteristics, so many of you probably heard of NEMS or the Nutrition Environment Monitoring Survey and that just is an observational tool where you check off and you get results that say it could be 1 through 5 in terms of healthy food access and the 5 categories being fruits, vegetables, lean meats, low-fat dairy and whole grains. But there are many other types of checklists and that may be more appropriate for their particular setting and NEMS doesn't necessarily get at everything that we need. So, then here I kind of lump these two together factors driving food purchasing decisions and consumer behaviors around, I think, the biggest thing is just an understanding of shopper science. So the grocery stores, the large chains and you know food companies, they got this down, they know this very well. Public Health and, you know, us at the table here may understand it a little less, so I think it's important that we tap into those things and things like the 4 Ps and I'll show on the next slide the pathway to purchase framework. But things that get at the promotional aspect and more of this all-encompassing environment in a store that may lead to purchasing decisions is this GroPromo tool and the FROST tool. And you'll-- those are if you need information on any of these many are on this toolkit that I mentioned or you can just email me but these are just examples, there's many others. So, this pathway to purchase was the kind of brought up in another project we were working on with Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and this is something that the industry side uses to understand how shoppers are behaving. So everything that is even from outside of the store to inside of the store what leads them to the purchasing decision and there you can see a number of different aspects in there including just placement and shelf placement and promotional aspects. So, dietary behaviors and patterns is kind of maybe the ultimate goal through healthy food access, but not necessarily measured as much. But I think we can look at fruit and vegetable consumption or junk food consumption as a proxy for healthy and unhealthy or overall dietary patterns. So this is one screener tool the National Cancer Institute Dietary Intake was actually reported by a number of the partners in the interviews as currently being used and I know it's being used elsewhere and it's a valid tool so something like that if you're interested in dietary patterns. Twenty-four hour recalls are pretty comprehensive and probably not appropriate for many of--much of the work going on here in terms of food systems but there is the free online version the ASA24, I forget what that stands for but it walks you through basically a 24-hour recall online. Perceptions of food access is sometimes more important than the actual food access, so having you know, culturally relevant foods and what you perceive is accessible because a lot of times people don't think food access is a problem and they say well, they're 2 miles from a grocery store what's the problem? You know, and I think we look at it more in terms of the social and the, you know, behavioral aspect of it, so that perceived barriers and things like that are really

important. And then the interest in regional food systems and I think that, you know, we've probably seen this grown in Michigan hence how you have-- Pure Michigan.

Pinard: Pure Michigan. Because of, you know, this growth in consumer interest you're able to have these food hubs and farmers markets and so on. So I think motivators to eating locally and the perceived benefits can really get at that. So, jumping to economics; we heard that a lot in the interviews, so the things that-- the sort of subtopics of economics that were of interest included jobs created, as well as, money generated through the Good Food work and I'll talk a little bit more in detail about this, so just a quick view of the results here. So we may want to look at new jobs or businesses or expansion of these jobs or businesses. We may want to look at financial liability for farms and which outlets are generating income. What are the drivers? And growth in the overall economy and this may be what I would consider a separate study that is kind of huge undertaking and looking at that multiplier effect and how, you know, dollars spent say through double-up food bucks and at farmers markets and the money that's retained in that region or state how that multiplies throughout the economy. And then purchasing power of institutions to buy locally and that may be driven by policies or grant funding and then the quality of the jobs created so it's not just about jobs but increase in quality of life and a living wage for many people working in the food industry. So, here this is no surprise, willing to share various forms of data. So that the top you kind of have your most covered and synthesized version in a report format, then aggregate, then de-identified, then non-aggregate raw data. So it's not to any fault to any of the partners it's some of the organizations have restrictions on what's able to be just shared openly with others and, you know, we have IRBs, the Institutional Review Board, that protects human subjects so we can't just share information a lot of times. so I think that's important; just consider for the types of data we're talking about, how it is going to be-- if it's the Center for Regional Food Systems as the backbone and we're all sending data on x, y or z, what is the format and are there identifiers which are, you know, names or other things that you could simply identify who responded? So, this kind of leads to the discussion of building trust and competence. So in an ideal world this first phase of capacity and training would kind of include this relationship building but I think that's going to take, and it already is happening, but it's just going to evolve over time. So but things that we can do to promote this trust and competence enable, that would allow us to share data more openly with each other is to have this transparency about what's happening and having a collaborative approach and having input from all stakeholders and that's not an easy task but I think it's something to strive for. There may be, you know, very clear outlines of what is data sharing, what are the agreements, what qualifies as data that's meeting the criteria not be exclusionary but to be clear on what's happening. And then just having standardized tools available for people to implement. So, this software alignment kind of did come out but I think we're going to leave it alone for now because there is a Food Hub Feasibility Study going on.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY | Center for Regional Food Systems

Pirog: Yes.

Pinard: Rich has something to say.

Pirog: Just, just from the-- when you look at this slide and show that people have responded that Excel was something that they used probably most often than anything else. If we were to come up with, this goes back to what I had shared with Courtney earlier before this presentation, if we were to come up with some kind of tool to help normalize secondary data making it available on something like an Excel format, would be, would make sense because people are used to using that kind of software.

Pinard: And I think the other point is alignment with people who are involved with the food supply chain in some capacity mainly food hubs and farmers markets. So I think that the feasibility study will lend itself to this project moving forward. Oh, and I will mention also about the capacity and the relationship building, there's also the network analysis that's going on now that I think might; would that relate to that aspect?

Pirog: Relate to software?

Pinard: No, no I'm sorry the relationships and the data sharing and capacity of just confidence and trust in each other?

Pirog: Sure. Yeah, I mean what we're trying to do.

Would you like to say something [audio cutting out here]. You don't have to.

Yeah, I don't feel that I, we don't have enough data yet.

Pinard: Okay.
But, yeah so what we're looking at right now is who is already sharing data.

Pinard: Okay, so Zach just mentioned that what they're looking at now is who is already sharing data. So I think understanding these networks and how stakeholders across the Good Food Charter are interacting and who's related to whom and that will be really important in this type of aspect that's on the slide now. So, not surprisingly, there is a strong interest from the people who participated in the survey. Over 40% said flat out, yes I'm interested, potentially interested in participating in a pilot and some thought they wanted some more information but, or would be able to participate in future iterations. So I think that's important to keep in mind that we'll keep engaged with people that maybe want to participate in the future and continue to provide information and provide opportunities for engagement. So, here's kind of a quick

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY | Center for Regional Food Systems

view on how the data and the partner's voices led to a narrowing of the focus to really think about secondary data, food access and potentially economics. So we really thought, you know, to be fair to the Good Food Charter work and just regional food systems here in Michigan, thinking across the food system and being all inclusive, but that we're going to have to start somewhere so this may be the goal down the road that we're hitting, you know, all these points. So both food access and economics were brought up as a strong point of interest and related to different. And institutional procurement, which I'll discuss a little bit more on the next slide how economics may relate to these aspects but it's kind of a starting point, you know, and it's going to grow over time. And then in terms of measurement thinking about the robustness and validity and reliability of the measure balanced with the feasibility like I showed you on the dietary intake slide, a full dietary 24-hour recall is the gold standard for self-report. but it's not feasible for many partners to do that economically time wise, resource wise, so the screener provides an option that kind of balances those two things. So, this is kind of a condensed version of a timeline, thinking about how the interviews and the surveys fed into an analysis, which you'll see the report in the coming weeks and then later today with the advisory committee having this consensus building workshop, which will hopeful generate a short list of key indicators for a potential pilot. And then moving forward we'll have this training capacity phase and then the implementation of a actual pilot. So, here I just think why economics? Well, it did come up as overriding interest in terms of what is the impact of-- understanding what is the impact of the Good Food work in the state but it can serve as an umbrella for institutional purchasing, supporting new agri-food businesses and other goals. So we'll keep those in mind, you know, those are the charter goals and those were indicated as, you know, areas that people are working on as we're kind of brainstorming.

Pirog: I think, I don't know if it's in your slide but we do want to probably also share with this group that because of the survey and the interviews as we go to next steps we probably-- we will not be emphasizing the 5th and 6th goals.

Pinard: Right.

Pirog: Well, you mention that?

Pinard: Yeah. No, but I.

Pirog: Yeah, it's important though, which are nutrition requirements and food system and Ag Education, although they are important goals for the charter, as we move forward they, because they showed up at the--

Pinard: Yeah.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY | Center for Regional Food Systems

Pirog: At the bottom of both the interviews and the surveys we're not going to emphasize them in the pilot for the first year.

Pinard: Right. We're looking for low-hanging for this year in those school related activities seemed, weren't as, you know, widely addressed by the partners or indicated as important, so they're still important and they're going to be considered in the future. Okay, so I think we talked a little bit about this developing relationship and trust. So things that can really promote that having the Center for Regional Food Systems as the backbone organization, partners that are you know recognized for their contributions. And I think continued involvement with an advisory committee of some sort so having, you know, broader reach and networks throughout the state would help move this forward. And really keeping the stakeholders, you all, involved as we move forward, so ongoing trainings perhaps, engagement through presenting of results or gathering further feedback and keeping people onboard. So, here I'll just touch on the first aspect of the first phase that we're thinking about is this training opportunities, so it may cross various topics of interest that would be beneficial to partners. And so you can see the types of things that people indicated interest done here using primary data or secondary data that's already existing, as well as, collecting their own primary data through survey, development or qualitative methodologies. And so I think with the secondary data piece, these are some of the things that we would consider to how they align with the charter goals, tapping into existing resources and complimenting what is ultimately brainstorm for our potential pilot. And then thinking who's going to analyze and disseminate so this really practical kind of considerations for how we can make use of resources that are already out there and many of which were already indicated in previous reports that you can see at this link here, we kind of pulled from there things that were identified as potentials. And so just to wrap up this discussion of the results and next steps, I think we saw that the surveys and interview results have really informed the direction of the pilot. And I think we're in this planning phase right now, you know, we're brainstorming and that's going to happen a lot today at this workshop with the advisory committee. And hopefully we'll develop a short list of key indicators and data sharing, potential data sharing solutions and thinking how those align with the charter goals, as well as, future capacity for data collection. And that we're going to have this initial training and capacity building phase and then the pilot may include a mixture of secondary measures or primary data collection and thinking mainly about food access, economics or institutional purchasing. So, I think I showed this one already, so you understand the two phases and how we're moving through this. So just to conclude it's really not the end like I showed you the timeline, it doesn't end December 2015 but it's going to be a continued iterative process. So, thank you for contributing and for listening today and hopefully you guys have some discussion points, anybody on the line have questions or comments feel free to type in the Chat pod.

I just have one clarifying question about the survey, so what was the population for data collection--

Pinard: Okay, so Zach asked what was-- how was the population identified for the survey of the stakeholders? And this really came from maybe Rich can tell more of the back-story, but it's more, those who indicated interest in Shared Measures, partners and stakeholders across the Good Food Charter work, so we were working with that list that was growing as people--

Pirog: That list was as we broadcasted that we were going to do this project on both with survs and at presentations and people sending to both myself and to Kathleen Rita [assumed spelling] a grad student associated with this project of their interests, so it's an interest-based list.

Pinard: Yeah. So, hopefully you know as others learn about this and the project grows, you know, we'll have that list growing. Any other thoughts or questions? I don't see any online so.

Pirog: This is Rich Pirog again. I just wanted to make sure that the folks that are on the webinar understand that this advisory committee plays a very key role in helping us identify the pilot and prioritizing. However, we do plan to use venues like this webinar to go back out to you all to not only update where we're heading but to, if we're missing some really important points, we want to make sure this larger group of stakeholders that have expressed interests in the Good Food Charter and Shared Measurements are still guiding in informing this process. It's not like "gee, I don't have any" for those of you that are on the webinar, you should not feel that your voice isn't being heard. We are going to try as best as possible to make this as broad because in the name "Shared Measurement" we can't have Shared Measurement if people don't build trust and confidence. Otherwise I think it's called "Isolated Measurement" or "Selfish Measurement" and that's not going to get us to where we want to go.

Pinard: Great, Michelle asked will the training pieces be through webinar or in person or a blended approach like today? That will be, we'll be brainstorming that later. My initial thought is mainly webinar just because of the feasibility of reaching across the state. It may involve other partners or experts besides, you know, the Gretchen Swanson Center or the Center for Regional Food Systems.

Pirog: Right.

Pinard: So, that's all up for discussion and anything that we can really do to help facilitate growth in that capacity but I think webinar will be the key mode.

Pirog: Likely, yes.

Pinard: Okay.
So, right now we're understanding patterns and thoughts--

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY | Center for Regional Food Systems

Pinard: It's a good question.

Pirog: Repeat it.

Pinard: Oh, sorry. The question was patterns of nonresponse, so do we have any idea of why the 70 or so from our initial list did not respond? We didn't analyze that in particular, but I would say, you know, at this point, those that responded were really those that have the strongest interest, but.

Pirog: I would add to that that they're-- just looking at the list if I had to make a speculation that the ones on the list are actively working on a goal of the charter. It's more likely that those folks are and I would say the non-responders are folks that may have just some general interest but they're not as active in a goal.

Pinard: And I think also, many may have chosen not to respond because someone else from their organization responded because we kind have been going at this as an organizational approach, so you know, with starting up the interviews, we didn't go for multiple interviews with the same organization, so maybe people were responding accordingly.

Pirog: So for example, MSU extension there's lots of MSU extension folks involved in the Good Food Charter and when you look at their interest in participating in the pilot, we've got MSU extension folks that said "yes I want to participate" but then you also have MSU extension with folks saying "I don't have time." So, they-- because extension is involved in and there's so many people involved you have that spectrum but if we just took one vote it wouldn't represent the whole organization.

I might also be possible to look at the kinds of non-responses between two groups together. I know-

Pirog: Yeah.

That the network survey and Shared Measurement survey went out about a week apart and we heard from many of our non-respondents; I didn't respond because I thought I already had.

Pinard: Oh.

So, they thought that our survey link [inaudible] survey link and vice versa, so there might be some overlapping [inaudible].

Pinard: So, the point brought up was the patterns of non-response, so the network analysis

survey went out about a similar time as our survey for the Shared Measures, and so people may have confused the two in thinking they had respond to one or the other, so that's something we can look at together for sure.

Pirog: Yeah. So, one last call for any typed in responses in the Chat pod or comments from the audience here in the room. You're either just totally riveted by what you or just we've answered all your questions already? Oh, we got-- somebody's typing.

Pinard: Were these slides shared via email? It's a lot to think about. Yeah, so the report, the slides and the recording will be available online. The report in the coming week, so you'll have this information at your fingertips.

Pirog: Right. As well as a brief update of what happens at the advisory committee.

Pinard: Yeah.

Pirog: For this list of where we're heading as far as those particular measures and the types of trainings that we might propose. We may even vent those a bit more to make sure people would actually come to those kind of trainings, you know, if so just make sure.

Excuse me. Sorry for this but--

Pirog: A shareholder.

Pinard: We included in our interviews but.

Pirog: Just ask the question, yeah.

Pinard: Oh, sorry. The question was about state agencies sharing data that, you know, that would be probably in the category of our secondary data sometimes it's open, sometimes it's not; it is kind of a tricky thing to get your hands on that data sometimes. We interviewed some people from-- that represent state agencies and they are very interested in this type of project and they still have, you know, the government regulations to abide by. And I think that secondary data piece will hopefully address that so that it is available to more partners because a lot of times you have to go through a process where you get approval based on how you're going to be using that data. So hopefully that answers you question but I think we'll be looking at that a little more carefully when we look at the specific sources for secondary data.

Okay, so--

Pinard: Yeah.

With all the revisions--

Pinard: Yeah.

Pirog: So, again there was another comment here about closing that loop with our state agency sponsors and I don't want to make this; I don't know if this is a complete answer to the question. But by one, by including a state agency rep on the advisory committee and also as we talk about these, the networks that already in place, Zach from MSU is doing this network analysis but as an example there is also an inner agency coordinating committee on food policy that represents multiple agencies that the steering committee for the Good Food Charter. And the Shared Measurement Project advisory committee represent a significant number of people on that food policy committee and we're also starting a network of local food policy councils. All of this is in the beginning stages but getting, getting more boundary standing people to work across those networks to be able to make sure that we use data more effectively at the state level and among the various organizations, in this case, around the frame of the goals of the Good Food Charter, is a extremely ambitious goal. But we're putting the design pieces in place to make that happen from a communication standpoint. Hopefully, to be more informed by researchers like Zach and hopefully being more informed as we move forward when this work with Gretchen Swanson, so.

Pinard: And I think that one other point is that I see an overlap between what you're saying about state agencies data and the funders, so having those kind of anchors involved will be important.

Pirog: Right. Any last? Thank you Caroline for your comments and we're-- this type of process is very emergent in that we have a lot of "experiments" going on at the same time to be able to find where all of us are in this forest. So--

Pinard: Yep.

Pirog: So, if there are no other; any other comment in the room? Okay. Folks are, just so you know, folks in the room are very riveted and very awake, so hopefully you are too out there in webinar land. So we, Courtney, I want to thank you and, again, just to repeat we've recorded this session. We had about a half a dozen requests for the recording, people couldn't make it this morning. We will have a pdf of the slides, as well as, a edited version of the report, as well as, an update of what happens in this afternoon's advisory committee for, not only for you folks on the line, but the other 120 people that have expressed interests in the Shared Measurement Project, as well as, the goals of the Good Food Charter. So Courtney unless you have any final

MICHIGAN STATE U N I V E R S I T Y | Center for Regional Food Systems

words of wisdom or anything, we'll go ahead and sign off.

Pinard: Just thank you all. Appreciate it.

Pirog: Okay. Thanks everybody for being on the call and stay tuned.