

# Board Vision Exchange

## Houston

May 26, 2017



# Food for Change

# Agenda

**Non-traditional Partnerships**

**Case Study # 1 – Wesley Community Center**

**Scholarship Pantry Network**

**Case Study # 2 – San Jacinto College**

**Measuring Impact**

# Non-traditional Partnerships



## Recruitment

### Challenges

- Identifying prospective partners
- Learning sector priorities and terminology
- Alignment with Food for Change objectives
- Establishing agreements



## Setting Expectations

- HFB's role and limitations
- Program integration and staff involvement
- Client experience
- Data sharing and reporting



## Communication

- With program partners
- With program participants
- Marketing to potential participants

# Wesley Community Center

## Key Aspects

- Financial Capability & Workforce Development program
- Evaluation conducted by Children at Risk
- Modified food scholarship distribution
- Recruitment
- Logistics & food quality
- Utilization
- Focus group
- Best practices & lessons learned

## Pros:

- Natural alignment with client self-sufficiency
- Easy access to historical and current data
- Strong relationships between Wesley & participants
- Proximity of pantry

## Cons:

- Pantry capacity / not fully client choice
- Shelf life of produce
- Participants don't want to take from those in need
- Steep learning curve

# Scholarship Pantry Network



## Recruitment

- Identifying scholarship pantries
- Coordination with Agency Services
- Incentives



## Capacity Building

- Scholarship pantry build-outs
- Operating a scholarship pantry
- Hours of operation
- Volunteer capacity



## Setting Expectations

- HFB's role and limitations
- Client choice and required space
- Food delivered, quantities, and value
- Customer service and client experience



## Communication

- With scholarship pantries
- With program participants

# San Jacinto College

## Key Aspects

- Applied technology and health occupations programs
- Evaluation conducted by Rice University professors of economics
- Pantry established on campus
- Recruitment
- Logistics & food quality
- Utilization





## Pros:

- Natural alignment with client self-sufficiency
- Access to data through IRB
- Strong relationships between school and students
- Proximity of pantry

## Cons:

- Pantry capacity & volunteers
- Shelf life of produce
- Low utilization
- IRB process to access data
- Evaluation methodology different from Children at Risk

# Measuring Impact

	Key Aspects	Challenges
	<b>CHILDREN AT RISK Research &amp; Thought Partner</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• C@R role and capacity</li></ul>
	<b>Research Methods &amp; Metrics</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Identifying method for evaluation of unique partnerships &amp; FFC overall</li><li>• Partner outcome measures, available data</li></ul>
	<b>Data Collection &amp; Sharing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Data collection uniformly</li><li>• Access to individual data? Aggregate data?</li><li>• Data sharing agreement</li></ul>
	<b>External Evaluators &amp; Academic Partners</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Extensive time &amp; financial commitment</li><li>• Need to align portions of evaluations</li><li>• Academics don't always see eye to eye</li></ul>



# Considerations

- ① Organizational capacity to engage in this work
- ② Working with researchers adds credibility to work, but as experts in hunger relief and logistics food banks must also assert their expertise in to partnerships
- ③ More work needs to be done throughout the Network to increase peer to peer learnings and advance this work

# Board Vision Exchange

## Houston

May 26, 2017

