The Nova Scotia Participatory Food Costing Projects (2001-2011): Evaluative Learning from Ten Years of Participatory Research

Prepared by:
Patricia Williams, Barbara Anderson, Heather Hunter, and Cynthia Watt

March 11, 2013
Acknowledgements

This decade of work would not have been possible without the support of a highly committed group of women and a few men who undertook data collection as food costers and who shared their experiences and insights from living with food insecurity in all stages of the research. It would also not have been possible without support from many people and organizational partners with a shared vision and commitment to capacity building for healthy and food secure communities in Nova Scotia. This includes but is not limited to the Food Costing Working Group of the Nova Scotia Food Security Network Coordinating Committee, the original Research Working Group of the Nova Scotia Nutrition Council and many champions working within and outside of systems – notably Michelle Amero, Lynn Langille, Michelle Murton with the Nova Scotia Department of Health and Wellness (and formally Cathy Chenhall with the Department of Health Promotion and Protection); Trudy Reid, Shelley Moran and Rita MacAulay with Public Health Services; Donna Malone and Sophie Pitre-Arseneault with the Public Health Agency of Canada, and Executive Directors with collaborating Family Resource Centres in Nova Scotia. We gratefully acknowledge the work of Kim Barro (2002-2005), Christine Johnson (2004-2005), Lesley Frank (2007-2008), and Michelle Florence (2008-2009), former project coordinators, for their invaluable roles. We appreciate the many contributions of Cynthia Watt, current coordinator and Heather Hunter, research associate to the project. We are also grateful to Christine Johnson, Doris Gillis, Lynn Langille, Mary-Anne Finlayson, Jessie Harrold, Rayna Preston, Wendy Knowlton, Shelley Moran, and Irena Knezevic for their assistance with reviewing the draft. Thanks also to Valerie Blair for getting this report “off the ground” through her work on an earlier draft. Finally, we gratefully acknowledge the funding provided by the Nova Scotia Department of Health and Wellness from 2004 to present and from 2001 to 2003 from Health Canada to support Participatory Food Costing.

Sincerely,

Patty Williams
Principal Investigator and Evaluation Co-lead

Barb Anderson
Evaluation Co-lead

Address correspondence to Patricia L. Williams, Department of Applied Human Nutrition, FoodARC, Mount Saint Vincent University, 166 Bedford Highway, Halifax, NS, B3M 2J6, Canada. E-mail: patty.williams@msvu.ca
Summary

The partners of Nova Scotia Participatory Food Costing (PFC) Projects (PFCPs) (2001-present) have incorporated participatory action research (PAR) as a foundation. This participatory approach to food costing has resulted in strengthened relationships, different ways of knowing related to, and understanding of, food insecurity, and enhanced capacity to build food security in NS. The evidence generated through the PFCPs, and the emergent participatory processes have influenced policy and built capacity for action and knowledge sharing at individual, organizational, community and systems levels in NS. A participatory approach within the PFCPs has meant that people, mainly women, affected by food insecurity are involved in all stages of the research. A shared governance approach, involving the staff and participants of federally-funded family resource centres and projects, university researchers, and representatives from government departments and civil society organizations, has been used to guide the work of the PFCPs.

In the period covered in this report (2001-2011) PFC has undergone five independently funded food costing cycles, each of which can be conceptualized as a separate, but related, with every cycle building on the previous one. Each project cycle has involved research planning and the training of food costers, data collection and analysis as well as knowledge sharing, communication, capacity building and evaluation activities. Knowledge sharing and communication strategies such as PFC reports, publications, presentations, press releases and media coverage have focused on advocacy for improved food security, and have been shared at local, provincial, national and international levels. In total, over 200 food costers (community partners involved in all stages of the research with significant involvement in data collection) have participated in training sessions and food costing data collection cycles. By building on the research, knowledge sharing strategies and community relationships of the previous food costing cycle, capacity has been built over these ten years to enhance and sustain participation in food costing across the province.

Recognizing the importance of ongoing process and outcome evaluation, food costing evaluation is being framed by a developmental evaluation process. Developmental evaluation differs from traditional approaches to evaluation in that it is an ongoing process to support learning and evaluation in complex and constantly changing situations (1). Food security aligns with this approach as it is a complex, multifaceted issue that requires seeing the system as a whole, engaging a variety of actors across the system from producer to consumer/citizen and growing new “next practice solutions” to address ever emerging challenges (2). One process for understanding this complex public health and socio-economic issue is PFC, an intervention which applies innovative approaches to effect social change by examining and addressing the accessibility of a healthy, sustainable food system by all citizens. It consequently aligns well with developmental evaluation.

Building on and extending beyond traditional approaches to evaluating aspects of PFC activities which have been evolving over a decade, this report aims to provide a retrospective roadmap and analysis of PFCP activities from 2001-2011. This report will inform the upcoming application of a developmental evaluation approach in order to better understand the nuances of PFC as an intervention. This includes the range of partners and interrelated factors influencing the further
development of this innovative approach to strengthen capacity for addressing this complex public health issue.

This synthesis was based on the access and analysis of selected documentation including internal evaluation materials and reports, student theses that included an evaluation component, PFC reports, project newsletters, publications, meeting minutes and other documents such as the Principal Investigator’s (PI) CV and Canada Research Chair renewal application. Corresponding to the key areas of activity in the most recent PFC Logic Model updated in 2008, this report is organized into findings related to: Partnerships and Participation, Capacity Building, and Knowledge Sharing and Uptake. Where appropriate, the findings are considered at Individual, Organizational, Community and Systems categories of reach. In doing so, the goal of this synthesis paper was to examine the ways and the extent to which the PFCPs achieved the objectives outlined in the 2008 PFC Logic Model, identify gaps, and establish guideposts that will inform future evaluations and project planning.

In line with the 2008 PFC Logic Model, findings from this synthesis show successful outcomes in terms of enhanced partnerships and extent of participation, capacity building, and knowledge sharing and uptake. The PFC is seen to be a springboard to engage professionals, community organizations, policy-makers and individuals with experience of food insecurity in generating practice-based evidence relevant to the issue. Findings have been used to engage other stakeholders in broader conversations about food security and policy solutions. This research has informed: policy and practice at the provincial government level; approaches to food costing across Canada; and approaches to addressing the complex issue of food security locally, provincially and nationally. To a large extent, capacity for policy change has been developed through sharing and use of knowledge mobilization tools developed as part of the PFCPs that are used across Canada.

Summary of Achievements, Gaps and Recommendations for Future Evaluation

Partnerships and Participation

Achievements

- Evidence of strong and enduring partnerships and trust with food costers, support people and family resource centres has been documented. This has laid strong foundations for community and systems level changes.
- Aligned with placing inclusion as a priority, support for the participation of food costers and community partners has been provided.
- Partnerships have been formed with various levels of government, with emphasis on provincial and district governments.
- Wide dissemination of the food costing model has led to partnerships with provincial governments, other food security networks and coalitions across Canada, and national organizations.

Gaps

- We recognize that we could augment existing data with more direct, formal feedback from partners currently and previously involved, as well as from current and former students and project staff.
Capacity Building

Achievements

• There is evidence of significant individual-level capacity building among food costers and support people and of the valuable role they play in PFC.
• There is evidence of food coster engagement for change (i.e. sharing food costing information, contacting MLAs, joining community health boards, etc.).
• There is evidence of the strengthening of systems level capacity with provincial government partners helping to develop PFC resources, advising our work, and incorporating findings into their policy and program initiatives. Government level policy initiatives have been informed and supported by PFC research findings and personnel.

Gaps

• There has been limited formal evaluation of capacity building efforts and outcomes among students, project staff and current university partners.
• At an organizations level, some evidence suggests that being involved with PFC has impacted organizations’ (especially family resource centre’s) policies. More effort is needed to formally capture the extent and significance of this impact.

Knowledge Sharing and Uptake

Achievements and Gaps

• There is evidence of PFC knowledge sharing at various levels (individual, organizational, community, systems) and dissemination of PFC information in national and international venues.
• Whereas some evidence shows how PFC research has impacted policy, especially at NS government level (e.g. Healthy Eating Nova Scotia, Chronic Disease Prevention Strategy, Daycare Food and Nutrition Policy, Public Health Innovation Support/Stewards Teams, Income Assistance Reviews, and others), uptake of PFC knowledge could be investigated more systematically.

Recommendations for future PFC evaluation:

Using developmental evaluation and participatory processes, we will

• seek ways to understand how PFC reach has been amplified through various partnerships;
• place more emphasis on measuring how individual capacity building has led to capacity building at organizational, community and systems levels;
• further examine the uptake of knowledge sharing at organizational, community and systems levels and identify factors that might increase uptake of PFC information from the perspective of policy makers.

Next Steps

Building on the lessons learned from the analysis presented in this report, we will

• Engage PFC partners in a reflection and visioning process and together develop a plan for a developmental participatory evaluation;
• Undertake a comprehensive developmental participatory evaluation and secure funding to support this evaluation;
• Share lessons learned from this synthesis of work with those who have participated over the last ten years, and others interested in building capacity for addressing food security through innovative means such as PFC.
Background

What is food costing?
Across Canada, food costing has been used to monitor the cost and affordability of a basic, nutritious diet and to critically examine policies and programs related to the adequacy of income (3).

To conduct food costing, Health Canada’s National Nutritious Food Basket (NNFB) is used, and has been adapted to include a local foods component.

“The NNFB describes the quantity (and purchase units) of approximately 60 foods that represent a nutritious diet for individuals in various age and gender groups. Stakeholders use this information to collect the price of the items and determine the cost of the basket for each age and gender group.” (4)

The estimated cost of the NNFB can then be factored into affordability scenarios to determine if families of various sizes and income-levels can afford to purchase a nutritious diet. Consistently, food costing results have indicated an increase from year to year in the cost of a basic nutritious diet. For example, the cost of the NNFB in NS has increased 35% from 2002 to 2010, a trend consistent elsewhere in Canada (3). Findings from our food costing research in NS has provided compelling evidence that low-income groups such as individuals/families who rely on minimum wage (5, 6), social assistance (7) or public pensions (8) cannot afford to purchase a nutritious diet, and may be at risk of food insecurity.

With increasing recognition of the impacts of income inequalities, poverty and food insecurity on health, inclusion and social well-being (9-11) there has been a growing demand from professionals, community-based organizations and policy-makers across Canada for current, local data on the cost of a NNFB for use in program planning, policy development and advocacy for food security (12).

What does Participatory Food Costing in NS involve?

Unique to NS, food costing uses a participatory action research approach. Participatory action research (PAR) is a specific methodological approach that is an excellent fit for achieving public health and health promotion objectives. Participatory action research is defined as "systematic investigation, with the collaboration of those affected by the issue being studied, for the purposes of education and taking action or effecting social change” (13, p.1). It is believed that involving people with firsthand experience of food insecurity in data collection, knowledge sharing and project decision-making provides a “sense of ownership” over the information and increases the likelihood of taking action to effect social change (14).

In terms of PFC, this means that people, primarily women, impacted by food insecurity, as well as the family resource centres which support them, and organizations with similar mandates, are invited to participate in all aspects of the research process. Individuals who take on the role of food costers are trained and supported to work with others in their communities to collect data from their local grocery stores. Together, they gather data from across NS on the cost of foods
that make up a basic nutritious diet along with the availability and relative cost of locally produced foods.

In PFC, raw data on the costs of the items in the NNFB are not only collected by food costers, but also analyzed and interpreted by them as part of a team of people, including the PI and project coordinator, Food Costing Working Group, a research assistant/associate, and students. Through iterative processes including consultations with government\(^1\) and community partners, the results are interpreted and formatted into a report called *Can Nova Scotians Afford to Eat Healthy?*. This report “paints a picture” of the cost and affordability of a nutritious diet for families of various sizes and income sources in NS, including families who rely on minimum wage, Income Assistance and public pensions. Findings from *Can Nova Scotians Afford to Eat Healthy?* are formally released and communicated through a number of channels (academic, community, and government) with the support of project partners. The knowledge produced through PFC has been shared through a variety of communication strategies such as reports, academic and community publications and presentations, social networking, media coverage and partner websites at local, provincial, national and international levels. This evidence forms the foundation of advocacy efforts with the goal for improved food security for all Nova Scotians.

### Participatory Approaches, Leadership and Participatory Food Costing Governance

In the PFCPs, participatory approaches are used to build relationships and develop capacity at individual, organizational, community and systems levels for enhanced food security in Nova Scotia. We use the term participatory approaches as an umbrella term for techniques, methods, and methodologies that aim to support meaningful participation recognizing that people define participatory research using varying degrees of participation across a broad spectrum (15). Participatory approaches share principles consistent with those of capacity building, and as a method, are thought to serve as means for building capacity (15).

Participatory leadership and governance is applied throughout PFCPs because it is viewed as an integral part of building capacity, sharing knowledge and creating networks to impact food security in NS.

“The participatory leadership paradigm is based on respect and engagement. It constructively focuses energy in every human to human encounter. A more advanced, more democratic and more effective model of leadership, it harnesses diversity, builds community, and creates shared responsibility for action. It deepens individual and collective learning yielding real development and growth” (16).

Participatory leadership within the PFCPs has involved consensus based decision-making and ongoing dialogues where food costers, family resource centre partners (and other partner organizations) as well as university researchers and representatives from various levels of government have been highly involved in project planning, decision-making, capacity building, knowledge sharing and communication activities. Through funding and in-kind contributions,

---

\(^1\) Primarily the NS Departments of Health and Wellness and Community Services
all of the above mentioned partners are essential to PFC governance and functioning. For more information on estimates on funding and in-kind contributions, please see Appendix A.

Leadership of the PFCPs is currently held by the Food Costing Working Group (FCWG) of the Nova Scotia Food Security Network, which currently includes representatives from family resource centres, universities, government and other organizations. In the past, the FCWG has also included representation community organizations such as, ACORN, Nova Scotia Fruit Growers Association, and First Nations Inuit Health Branch of Health Canada. In the latest “Terms of Reference” (2011) the purpose and objectives of the Food Costing Working Group are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>To help build capacity for food security for all Nova Scotians by using participatory approaches in examining and addressing the accessibility of a nutritious diet.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objectives:</td>
<td>1) To facilitate the engagement of citizens, as individuals and collectively, in knowledge and skill development to improve food security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) To collect and critically analyze evidence about factors that affect the accessibility of a nutritious diet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) To share the evidence by creating effective communications mechanisms to reach intended audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) To inform and support healthy public policy development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a list of Food Costing Working Group members and the organizations they represent from the period 2001-2011, please see Appendix B.

**Key Outputs and Achievements**

From 2001-2011, over 200 food costers have participated in training sessions and food costing data collection cycles.\(^2\) The PFCPs have also employed over 60 highly qualified personnel,\(^3\) including at least 25 students, one post-doctoral fellow and 3 former food costers, and provided learning experiences for more than 20 dietetic interns and 9 practicum placements. Over 180 examples of PFC knowledge sharing efforts have been documented (including conference presentations, refereed publications, invited addresses, reports and resources, media releases and media coverage). Participatory Food Costing findings and partner reflections have been shared and cited at the local, regional, national, and international levels (for example, *Canada’s Fourth Progress Report on Food Security* (17)). As a result of this work, recommendations for government, community and individual action have been developed and acted upon, for example, in 2004 the Progressive Conservative Party which was subsequently elected, included as part of their election platform *Blue Book II*, a promise to “work with the Atlantic Health Promotion Research Centre to implement recommendations based on food security research to ensure healthy food choices are more accessible to all Nova Scotians.” (18) To see other examples of recommendations from past reports and consultations, please see Appendix C.

The PFCPs have also had success in influencing organizational and public policies at provincial and local levels. This has included informing the development of the provincial *Healthy Eating*  

\( ^2\) This number includes food costers who have participated in multiple cycles  
\( ^3\) Highly qualified personnel are defined as individuals with university degrees at the bachelors' level and above
Nova Scotia strategy (19) where food security is named as one of four priority action areas and is also embedded in the other three priority action areas (breastfeeding, fruit and vegetable consumption, and children and youth). Participatory Food Costing has similarly informed the development of the Food and Nutrition Policy for Nova Scotia Public Schools⁴, the Manual for Food and Nutrition in Regulated Daycare Settings in NS, and the vegetables and fruit social marketing campaign Goodness in Many Ways⁵ in NS, PFC has informed increases to Income Assistance rates in NS (Janet Rathbun, Personal Communication, December 2011) and advocacy for minimum wage reviews. The partnerships formed through PFC also resulted in the formation of the Nova Scotia Food Security Network in 2005.⁶ The research and policy change success of the PFCPs directly contributed to Patty Williams being named Canada Research Chair in Food Security and Policy Change (awarded 2007, renewed 2012), and helped build the credibility needed for her to be awarded funds from the Canadian Foundation for Innovation to develop FoodARC (2009).

Developmental Evaluation: A priority for the Participatory Food Costing Projects

Through all cycles, the PFCPs have been engaged in what can be described as a Developmental Evaluation process. Developmental Evaluation differs from traditional approaches to evaluation in that it is an ongoing process to support learning and evaluation in complex and constantly changing situations (1). “It is used in situations where the end goals may be unclear, adaptation to changing conditions is required, real-time feedback is needed, embracing uncertainty and dealing with complex and dynamic systems” (20).

Food security is a complex, multifaceted issue requiring seeing the systems as a whole, the engagement of a variety of actors across the system and growing new “next practice solutions”(2). One process for understanding and addressing this complex public health issue is PFC, an intervention which applies such innovative approaches to examining and addressing the accessibility of a healthy, sustainable food system, and consequently aligns with developmental evaluation.

Building on traditional approaches to evaluating aspects of PFC activities that have been evolving over a decade, an aim of this report is to provide a retrospective roadmap and analysis of PFCP activities from 2001-2011. This report will inform the application of a developmental evaluation in order to better understand the nuances of PFC as an intervention, including the range of partners and interrelated factors influencing the development of this innovative approach to building capacity for addressing this complex public health issue.

In the earlier PFC cycles, importance was placed on evaluation to inform, monitor and improve food costing processes and outcomes. Previous food costing grants incorporated focused

---

⁵ The project is led by the Heart and Stroke Foundation of Canada in partnership with the Canadian Cancer Society - Nova Scotia Division, and the Nova Scotia Department of Health and Wellness.
⁶ Officially launched in 2007, the NS Food Security Network is a provincial network of partner organizations and individuals that supports collaboration and linkage with representatives working at a systems level. It has held two provincial gatherings in 2007 and 2009 (each with over 100 attendees) to discuss and address policy related initiatives.
evaluation projects, resulting in several reports and theses and evaluation matrixes (See Table 1). Two project logic models (2004/05 and 2008) have also been developed. In all prior evaluations and logic model iterations, partner participation and consultations have been critical.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Data Sources</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honours thesis (Monteith, 2011) “Impact on medium-term individual capacity building for involvement in participatory food costing”</td>
<td>7 in depth interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate internship project report (Chard, 2010) “Pre-assessment of food costing training workshops and data collection”</td>
<td>6 interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Spring 2002 food costing evaluation report (Johnson &amp; Williams, 2005) “The value of participatory food costing: Views of the participants and support people, post spring 2002 food costing”</td>
<td>4 focus groups, 3 in depth interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation report (Heath and Pyra, 2004) “Enhancing the Capacity of Community Groups to Build Food Security Through Healthy Public Policy: Final Evaluation Report”</td>
<td>2 focus groups (n=15), 4 in depth interviews, questionnaire (n=7), document review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For these studies, ethical approval was obtained from the Research Ethics Board at Dalhousie (Johnson 2004; Heath and Pyra, 2004; Williams and Johnson, 2008), Acadia (Monteith, 2011), and Mount Saint Vincent (Johnson, 2004; Heath and Pyra, 2004; Chard, 2010; Monteith, 2011) universities. These studies are the principal data sources for this synthesis.

Due to the grant dependent nature of PFC since 2001 that includes six separate cycles of PFC and several related projects, a comprehensive evaluation of PFC in its entirety has never been undertaken. Notably, evaluation was not a funded component of the PFC Model as submitted to the provincial government in 2006. Recognizing this gap the Food Costing Working Group formed an evaluation sub-committee in the summer 2008. Initially, leadership was provided by the PFC coordinator and PI and later by the evaluation co-leads. With the assistance of a graduate student intern placed with the Department of Health and Wellness, the evaluation subcommittee updated a project logic model which was confirmed by the project partners at a partner gathering in April 2009. To view the 2008 Logic Model, please see Appendix D.

As a first step to supporting the development of a comprehensive developmental evaluation, this synthesis project was initiated with some limited start-up funds from one of the Evaluation Co-leads in 2010. In April 2011, additional funding from the Department of Health and Wellness was secured to begin the initial phases of a comprehensive food costing evaluation. This phase included supporting the review and synthesis of existing food costing evaluation materials and
reports (this report), hosting an Outcome Mapping\textsuperscript{7} workshop at MSVU (occurred in May, 2011), and pilot testing innovative data collection methods, including photovoice and videovoice methods.\textsuperscript{8}

Funding was also secured from the Nova Scotia Health Research Foundation to augment the early phases of evaluation by supporting activities to build a collaborative evaluation team with expertise in innovative evaluative methods; conduct an environmental scan of participatory intervention evaluation approaches; consolidate and build upon knowledge and skills from the Outcome Mapping workshop; critically examine and adapt photovoice or videovoice methods so they are compatible with participatory, developmental evaluative approaches, and augment other methods that can be applied in a larger scale evaluation; and, host a team gathering to plan a comprehensive PFC evaluation plan.

With combined sources of funding and adequate time to explore relevant research methods and engage partners in participatory developmental evaluation processes, our goal was to apply for funding to support a comprehensive evaluation of the PFC logic model and its outcomes related to population health by spring 2013\textsuperscript{9}.

**Purpose of the Evaluation Synthesis Report**

The goal of this synthesis is to examine the ways in which the PFCPs are achieving the objectives outlined in the 2008 Logic Model, identify achievement and gaps, and form recommendations for ongoing developmental evaluation and project planning. This report represents one step in our developmental evaluation plan, providing a retrospective roadmap and analysis of the PFCPs that involved intentionally synthesizing selected sources of documentation (n=83)\textsuperscript{10} from 2001-2011 which aligned with the PFC logic model.

\textsuperscript{7} Designed by the International Development Research Centre, Outcome Mapping is a method used to measure a project’s progress. It differs from traditional approaches in that it does not focus on measuring products of a program (e.g., policy change, poverty alleviation) and its effects on primary beneficiaries but on the changes in behaviours, relationships, actions, and/or activities of the people and organizations with whom a development program works directly (Earl, Carden, Smutylo, 2001).

\textsuperscript{8} Photovoice and videovoice are PAR methods. Through photography and video, individuals produce visual and/or audio narratives of their experiences regarding a phenomenon (Barnidge, Baker, Motton, Rose, Fitzgerald, 2010; Valera, Gallin, Schuk, Davis, 2009.) These methods have the potential to contribute to broad and creative knowledge dissemination and social action (Carlson, Engebretson, Chamberlain, 2006; Foster-Fishman, Law, Lichty, Aoun, 2010).

\textsuperscript{9} We applied for funds through SSHRC’s Partnership Development Grant competition, unfortunately the proposal was not successful.

\textsuperscript{10} The reviewed documents do not include all available materials. For a list of other materials that may be included in future evaluations, please see Appendix H.
Methods

1) Gather materials for document review
Eighty three documents directly related to the PFCPs were selected to be reviewed. These documents included meeting minutes (n=49), PFC Reports from 2002, 2004/05, 2007, 2008, and 2010 (n=5), reports to organizations/funders (n= 4), project newsletters and updates (n = 13), internal evaluations/reports including those prepared by student interns, project staff, and external evaluation consultants (n= 5), student theses and research projects (n=3), published/submitted research articles (n= 2), as well as the PI's 2011 CV and 2011 Canada Research Chair Renewal application. These documents were uploaded and organized in the qualitative data analysis software, NVivo 8.

2) Use PFC Logic Model (2008) as a framework for data analysis
The 2008 Logic Model was used as a framework for data analysis to code documented project activities. As seen in Figure 1, there are three broad components of the Logic Model consisting of Partnerships and Participation, Capacity Building, and Knowledge Sharing and Uptake. These components encompass four categories of intended reach: Individuals, Communities, Organizations, and Systems. The short-term, medium-term and long-term outcomes outlined in the Logic Model were used as further coding guides (see Appendix D). Initially, documents were coded using NVivo 8 Software and an initial draft report prepared by a single qualitative data analyst who has a background in public health, with previous experience in qualitative and food security research. Later, a second qualitative researcher (HH) reviewed the initial coding and assisted with further coding and development of a final report.

Figure 1: Key Components of 2008 Participatory Food Costing Logic Model
Organization of the Report

This report is organized into three major themes corresponding to the 2008 PFC Logic Model components: Partnerships and Participation, Capacity Building, and Knowledge Sharing and Uptake. Briefly, Partnerships and Participation speaks to the various partnerships which have been formed through the PFCPs and how these partners have participated in the project. The Capacity Building section describes the ways in which people/organizations/systems have been impacted as a result of being involved with PFC, specifically connected to skill development. Knowledge Sharing and Uptake presents the various types of knowledge sharing that have occurred throughout the PFCPs and identify areas of knowledge uptake.

In the following sections, the three major themes are defined and discussed, and quotes and figures are included to support evaluation findings. Where possible, the themes are divided into categories of reach, outlining the manifestation of each theme related to individuals, organizations, communities and systems involved with the PFCPs. The report also includes a discussion on the gaps that were identified through the synthesis as well as recommendations for future PFCPs evaluations and day-to-day project practices.
Defining Individual, Community, Organizational, Systems Categories of Reach

**Individual-level:** focuses on individual human actors, their roles, decisions and actions.\(^1,2\) For this report, ‘individuals’ include project leadership (PI and FCWG members), food costers and supporters, as well as project staff and students.

**Community-level:** Capacity for change at the community level includes: a community history of collective action; broad stakeholder participation; a shared vision or common goal; expanded citizen participation; improved resource utilization; strengthened linkages with other organizations; leadership; working with other sectors to identify opportunities and methods for collaboration; generating information or data; communicating issues; assessing the impacts of policy; and, combining strategies to influence policy.\(^3\) For the purposes of this synthesis report, a community is defined by “geographic boundaries, political boundaries, or demographic characteristics. A community can be a neighbourhood, a township, a city, or even defined within a particular setting such as the school system, worksites, or healthcare delivery system.”\(^1\)

**Organizational-level:** focuses on roles, decisions and actions of organizations. Recognizes that an organization is deliberately created and the power of individuals is magnified when they become the leaders and members of large organizations.\(^1\) Organizations often provide the links between individuals within communities and the broader political, socio-cultural and economic conditions within societies. Capacities required by organizations focused on community and system change include: strong leadership; the development of new work processes; and, a “continuous learning orientation.”\(^3\) Many different organizations have been involved in the PFCPs; however, for the purpose of this report, ‘Organizations’ was limited to family resource centres, universities, Nova Scotia Nutrition Council, Nova Scotia Food Security Network, Ecology Action Centre, ACT for CFS and District Health Authorities.

**System-level:** refers to the social-economic-political-geographic environment.\(^3\) At the systems level, capacity for change can be conceptualized in terms of the ability of health and other systems to respond to research and other external sources of information. This is strengthened through partnerships, links to champions and other resources, and the presence of cultural norms that support innovation and can manage change.\(^4\) In this report, ‘Systems’ primarily refers to various levels of government, with a particular focus on the NS provincial government, as they have the most capacity to impact food security through policy change in NS.

All of the actors within these levels are essential to PFC functioning and are all part of the solutions to addressing food insecurity and building food security.

---

1. [http://www.ghaned.org/HEALRT/S1_defining_community.htm](http://www.ghaned.org/HEALRT/S1_defining_community.htm)
Partnerships and Participation

Overview
The purpose of this section is to identify the partnerships that have been formed, describe how the Logic Model theme related to “partnership and participation” outcomes are being met, and identify where further research or action may be needed. Examples of partners’ feedback related to their participation in PFC have been provided.

Partners and Participation
Table 2 provides a brief descriptive profile of participants in the five food costing cycles from 2001-2010.

Table 2: Partners in PFC Cycles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Food costers and support people</th>
<th>Partner organizations directly involved</th>
<th>Partners included:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001-2003</td>
<td>54 food costers 18 support people</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Universities and academic centres, family resource centres, other community-based organizations, multiple government departments and policy makers, public health services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>41 food costers 8 support people</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>43 food costers 20 support people</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>40 food costers 12 support people</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>42 food costers 12 support people</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes family resource centre staff, public health nutritionists, and dietetic interns who were trained to support PFC
*Although 2011 is considered in this report, the 2011-2013 cycle is not listed here as food costers, support people and partner organizations who will be directly involved in food costing data collection were not confirmed until spring 2012.

Meeting “Partnerships and Participation” Logic Model Outcomes

“Enhanced Partnerships and Participation between and among of multi-sectors and levels” is the major finding for this section of the report. Here, the different levels/types of partners and their roles in PFC will be described, along with sections that describe findings related to the logic model outcomes of “increased support for food costers” and “student partners, “Enhanced Capacity to facilitate community development and population health approach”, and “Enhanced support for participatory processes”\(^\text{11}\)

\(^{11}\) In the 2008 Logic Model, “improved decision-making skills”, “increased willingness to partner with communities” and “increased interdepartmental collaboration” are identified as outcomes. Findings related to these outcomes are not included in this report, but these and other themes/findings may be explored in future evaluations.
Enhanced Partnerships and Participation Between and Among of Multi-sectors and Levels

In this finding, partners are divided into several sub-groups: (a) Food costers, support people and family resource centres; (b) nutrition or food security related organizations; (c) other community-based social justice organizations; (d) Universities and research centres (includes students); and (e) government partners.

a) Enhanced Partnerships with Food Costers, Support People and Family Resource Centres

Food Costers
Food costers play critical roles in PFC related to data collection, data analysis, decision-making, and planning and advocacy. Generally, food costers are women whose lives have been impacted by food insecurity, and have become involved with PFC through connection with their local family resource centres.

In total, from 2001-2011, over 200 food costers have attended food costing training sessions and/or conducted food costing. Through the retrospective examination of food costing report appendices and other documents we can see that approximately 30 food costers and support people have been involved with PFC for more than 4 years, while 7 have been involved for as long as nine years. For a number of the longer-term participants, their roles within the PFCPs have changed over time. For example some participants who started as food costers have become trainers and supporters, and some have become involved in food security projects in other ways, for example as members of the Food Costing Working Group, or becoming committee members with the Activating Change Together for Community Food Security (ACT for CFS) community-university research alliance. Others have taken a leadership role in addressing food insecurity in their local community.

Support People and Family Resource Centres
Family resource centre partners have helped recruit and support the participation of food costers, provided space for regional training sessions and gatherings, provided support people to assist with food costing data collection, appointed representatives to sit on the Food Costing Working Group and Nova Scotia Food Security Network Coordinating Committee, provided feedback on the PFC report, and have assisted with all areas of the development of the PFC Model (21) and 2008 PFC Logic Model (Appendix D). There has been some turn-over in participating family resource centres, but overall, family resource centre involvement in the PFCPs has been stable from 2001-2011. In all, during this period, 22 family resource centres have participated with the PFCPs. Of these, 11 have participated in at least three PFC cycles.

---

12 Across all food costing cycles, only three food costers have been men.
13 While there have been a few male food costers, and men have never been excluded from this role, the vast majority of food costers from 2001-2011 have been women. This may speak to the particular relevance and impact of food insecurity on women, and the role they play in relation to food for their families; their participation in PFC may indicate that women are interested and looking for ways to be part of the solution to food insecurity.
14 ACT for CFS is a community university research alliance (CURA) that aims to enhance community food security for all Nova Scotians using participatory action research and participatory leadership approaches. The project brings together collaborators from the academic, government, and grassroots sectors in a 5-year partnership (2010-2015) to create policy change at multiple levels. The project aims to strengthen the capacity of individuals and communities to affect policy change, by engaging partners in dialogue and research, and creating education and policy tools.
Through provincial and regional gatherings and through other feedback processes, food costers and supporters from family resource centres and other community organizations have provided input to PFC reports, and helped determine priorities for knowledge sharing and communication activities. Many have also provided feedback on their role and involvement in the project through evaluation mechanisms, including post-training workshop surveys and evaluation forms. Some have also provided more in-depth feedback in focus groups or interviews for internal evaluations and student research projects (three Master’s thesis and one Honours thesis).

As evidence of the strong partnerships formed, some food costers have described how they felt supported to participate and how being directly involved in research that addresses food insecurity, has helped them to feel valued and part of a worthwhile initiative.

“Being involved later on, not just part of the food costing but doing the other parts too and being invited to that [e.g. story sharing project, Lake Banook dissemination workshop] um really made me feel a part of it...not that I was just collecting data but I was also actually being involved in the process afterwards too um and also again just that that support and certainly all of the people who have worked on the project have always been so wonderful and uh always there when you need them with questions or whatever, everybody was so open and um and just being very giving with it so I guess that was the biggest part of it for me” (cited in Monteith, 2011, p.60, lines 1736-1746).

“So what has my involvement meant for me? This gives me the ability to do something for myself, my family, and my province. It's, and just by doing that it's built up my self esteem” (Twelfth Interview) (cited in Johnson, Master’s thesis, 2004, p. 68, lines 3133-3136).

“To some degree even though I know it's the hardest job in the world being a stay-at-home mom, you feel kind of unproductive and under-valued and that kind of stuff. And to be involved in a project like this that it's so important to so many people and providing it does effect some change. Umm... It could benefit a lot of people and to know that I took part in that... That I guess... I don't know... Call it an ego booster or, you know, a self-esteem improvement, whatever... But, it's been interesting and I've enjoyed and it makes me feel like I'm actually doing something that matters” (First Interview) (cited in Johnson, 2004, p. 68, lines 3151-3160).

Similarly, Johnson (2004) describes how the 2001-2003 PFCP benefitted from the involvement of food costers:

People affected by the issue are believed to have an integral understanding of food insecurity through their personal experience. It was felt that if professionals were the only ones involved in the Project then this understanding would be lacking. Participants believed that a personal experience with food insecurity is necessary in order to truly understand the phenomenon. Having people with a true understanding participate was thought to bring a greater reality to the Project and the evidence collected. This was also felt to contribute to a greater commitment for continued involvement because individuals with personal experience with food insecurity have a vested interest in working towards change (Johnson, 2004, p.66-67, lines 3024-3038).

Overall, food costers have expressed a sense of belonging through their participation, and felt their perspectives were valued. In turn, the research has gained credibility within communities, government and academic settings and by funding agencies and peer review panels due to community participation.
Increased support for food costers

From the beginning of the PFCPs, increasing support for food costers to participate in research was a priority. As previous components of the evaluation identified, key facilitating factors to food coster participation include reimbursement of transportation and childcare costs, and providing honoraria to each food coster to recognize their time to contribute to data collection:

“And the fact that they [project team] had transportation available made it really nice too. It would have been hard for me to provide that” (cited in Williams & Johnson, 2005, p. 11, lines 658-660).

“Knowing that you don't need to take money out of your own pocket is a big benefit. That you can help and not... Like that you can do something and not have to worry about paying for a babysitter to do it” (cited in Johnson, Masters thesis, 2004, p.93, lines 4371-4374)

“With a paid babysitter? You got a paid babysitter. Even being able to be reimbursed for travel helped a lot. Because it just reduces the stress when you’re on a very tight income” (cited in Johnson and Williams, 2005, p.11, lines 662 - 664).

“...um being recognized with the honorarium was very, um just ah it made you feel honoured that you were doing it...um and recognized that you were doing a valuable piece of work um. (cited in Monteith, Honours thesis, 2011, p.60, lines 1735-1736).

In terms of emotional support, food costers have expressed that being part of PFC helped them to feel understood, and has given them a sense that ‘we are all in this together’ which brought many a sense of belonging and has helped them to feel more connected to people in their communities.

“...just coming from a background um where we have had food insecurity issues ourselves um it was kind of nice to see that people were recognizing that and um that it is a huge issue in our society so um I guess it was just the feeling of um that there were people out there that understood” (cited in Monteith, 2011, p.46, lines 1291-1294).

“...you realize that you're not alone and that there are people out there that are really working to try and fix this problem and uh just to know that there's people there on your side and that they get it...you know they aren't pointing fingers at you because you're struggling with this kind of stuff, and also like when I say this to the families I'm working with now and I'm saying you know you're not the only ones that are going through this and this is why, and I guess it just, it takes a little bit of guilt away...that may be attached to the food insecurity issue” (cited in Monteith, 2011, p.46-7, lines1299-1306)

As evidence of enhanced partnerships, representatives from family resource centres have also described how their organizations have benefitted from partnering with PFC. One partner explained (from Johnson, 2004) that involvement in PFC has been beneficial to strengthen relationships between different family resource centres:

At the organizational level discussions provided evidence that linking occurred between different family resource centres who had participated in this Project across the province. Links between Centres was beneficial as it encouraged the formation of new connections, building stronger existing connections, and sharing resources.
"Well actually I strengthened a lot of relationships. I've always talked to people on the phone, like the different resource centres and I actually got to meet and put names to faces. Different times you know we would call up on what each others centre is doing and I've got different programs from like Dartmouth that I met through here [the project]. Down in Yarmouth I can call them up and say ok you mentioned this program at the last meeting we were at, tell me about it. Right so I've got some new stuff for the [family resource] centre because of that. And I just because I've actually met them and done something with them I'm just more likely to call them and say you know what's this, what's that." (Johnson, Masters thesis, 2004, p.74, lines 3428-3445)

Likewise, many food costers have commented that meeting and making connections with new people has been a benefit of involvement:

"...what did you like best about the project?...yea it was going out and doing the food costing, I think and um you know and teaming up with another participant" (cited in Monteith, 2011, p.48, lines 1369-1371).

"yea I met a lot of people, I've gotten, I've really enjoyed the training sessions um and the interactions with other organizations in the area...” (cited in Monteith, 2011, p.48, lines 1373-1374).

Together, the trust and relationships formed with family resource centres and food costers have laid strong foundations for community and systems level changes. In future evaluations we will explore in more detail how these relationships are contributing to organizational, community and systems-level change for improved food security.

b) Enhanced partnerships with nutrition or food security related organizations

In addition to the family resource centres, other community and organizational partners include the Nova Scotia Nutrition Council, the Nova Scotia Food Security Network, and more recently, ACT for CFS, which are all engaged in food security or nutrition related projects in NS.

In many ways, the relationship between these organizations goes beyond the ‘partnership’ level, as their histories and paths are intertwined. In the beginning, relationships between the Nova Scotia Nutrition Council, family resource centres, and the Atlantic Health Promotion Research Centre are essentially what supported the emergence of PFC. Later, PFC successes would help to establish the first ever provincial food security network in NS (the Nova Scotia Food Security Network), along with the ACT for CFS project and over 30 other research and knowledge mobilization projects (Williams, CRC Renewal, 2011). The relationships and PFC research results also allowed the PI to develop the necessary credentials and capacity to obtain a Canada Research Chair in Food Security and Policy Change and funding from the Canadian Foundation of Innovation, which helped to establish FoodARC. It is evident that without PFC, the Nova Scotia Food Security Network, FoodARC and ACT for CFS would not have come into existence.

Evidence of partnership success:
The recent (2011) “CIHR Partnership Award” shared between FoodARC (which houses PFC and ACT for CFS projects) and the Nova Scotia Food Security Network provides evidence of
successful partnerships. The CIHR Partnership Award recognizes “…partnerships between organizations that exemplify excellence by bringing health research communities together to create innovative approaches to research, develop research agendas that are responsive to the health needs of Canadians and/or accelerate the translation of knowledge for the benefit of Canadians. The emphasis of the award is on innovative cross-sectoral partnerships that promote excellence.” This award recognizes partnership success which, in large part, grew out of PFC.

c) Enhanced Partnerships with other community-based social justice organizations
Other organizations that have participated with PFC include the Ecology Action Centre, Canadian Diabetes Association, NS HIV/AIDS Coalition, NS/Dalhousie Legal Aid, community health boards, and District Health Authorities across NS. Since the inception of PFC in NS, there have been over 30 organizational partners. For a complete list of partners and collaborators from 2001-2011, please see Appendix E. As described earlier, many of these organizations are represented on the Food Costing Working Group and therefore play significant leadership roles in the PFCPs.

Examples of participation:
- Ecology Action Centre: involved in helping to develop, update and disseminate the local foods component of PFC (2005-present)
- Canadian Diabetes Association and the NS HIV/AIDS Coalition: involved in helping to develop reports and academic papers on the cost and affordability of a nutritious diet for members of communities they serve.
  - Ongoing consultation with partners at the Canadian Diabetes Association for their input on the paper “Can Individuals with Diabetes in Nova Scotia Afford a Nutritious Diet?”
  - Consultation with NS HIV/AIDS Coalition on the manuscript “The Cost and Affordability of a Basic Nutritious Diet for Persons Living with HIV/AIDS” (Report to DHPP, 2009-2010, lines 112-115)
- NS and Dalhousie Legal Aid: In 2007 the Principal Investigator (PI) worked with NS Legal Aid and participated as an expert witness for a challenge to Utility Review Board on the increase in power rates for individuals living in poverty. PFC and story sharing reports and related publications on the inadequacy of minimum wage and public pensions in NS were used as primary evidence.
- First Nations organizations, including Caring Connections Truro: Native Council of Nova Scotia has also been involved, including presenting to government in 2001 and participation on the Food Costing Working Group. While these partners are no longer involved in PFC, PFC has been exploring opportunities for partnering with First Nations and Inuit Health and Pictou Landing First Nations.

In future evaluations, feedback will be sought from food security-related and other social justice organizations relevant to their partnerships and participation with PFC.

15 http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/27367.html
d) Partnerships with Universities and Research Centres

Throughout the history of the PFCPs, there have been rich and evolving partnerships with universities and research centres in NS. Participatory food costing was initiated in 2001 with significant support from the Atlantic Health Promotion Research Centre, Dalhousie University, as a result of the Dr. P. Williams’ (PI) CIHR supported post-doctoral fellowship. During this time the PI also held a faculty position at MSVU and was Chair of the Nova Scotia Nutrition Council research working group. Significant support from the Atlantic Health Promotion Research Centre (including housing PFC) was provided until 2006 when Dr. Williams moved her research program to a temporary research facility at MSVU. In 2009, with support from MSVU and a Canadian Foundation for Innovation infrastructure grant Dr. Williams established a research centre at MSVU. Participatory Food Costing has also benefitted from strong partnerships between researchers (and research offices) at MSVU, Acadia University, and St. Francis Xavier University nutrition departments.

Universities participating in PFC generally provide research space for faculty and students, and support from research offices to obtain funding. Researchers at universities have played significant roles in data analysis, collaborative work on reports, publications and funding proposals. For the comprehensive evaluation, feedback will be sought from partner universities on the relationships and objectives achieved in collaboration with the PFC. The relationship between university partners and the PFCPs has been mutually beneficial; the PFCPs have benefitted from the infrastructure, leveraged funding and supports provided by university partners, and university partners have benefitted from partnership with PFC as it has enhanced connections to the community, provided innovative training opportunities for students, publications and positive media and political attention.

Student Partners and Project Staff

Universities have also had relationships with PFC through student training and mentorship opportunities. Students have been involved primarily with PFC through dietetic internships (at both undergraduate and graduate levels), some as volunteers, and several have been involved through thesis work, directed studies courses, co-op placements, practicum placements and community service learning (see Appendix F). As PFC project staff have been housed at universities and research centres, and many former and current project staff have been students, they are considered in the “University and Research Centre” partnership category.

Interns (and volunteers)

Since 2001, approximately 20 dietetic interns have contributed to PFC. The majority have been dietetic interns from MSVU, but dietetic interns and co-op students from St.FX and Acadia have also been involved. Dietetic internships are usually periods of short-term student involvement (typically 13-16 weeks) where interns work on PFC projects. Volunteers (mostly students) are also involved in helping with short-term tasks. Other students in programs such as social work and capital health dietetic placements have been involved through PFC partners. Their contributions have included assisting with PFC training sessions and data collection, preparing reports, conducting independent research related to PFC, preparing organizational materials for the PFC, meeting preparation and facilitation, and other tasks as needed.
Thesis Students
Masters and Honours students who complete a thesis have much longer-term investments with PFC, and some have provided major contributions to proliferating food security work and contributing to program evaluation. In particular, Christine Johnson’s 2004 MScAHN (MSVU) thesis “Evaluating Capacity Building for Food Security: An Assessment of a Participatory Food Costing Project” and Hilary Monteith’s BSc Nutrition with Honours (Acadia University) thesis “Impact on Medium-Term Individual Capacity Building from Involvement in Participatory Food Costing” have made significant contributions to evaluating capacity building outcomes of the PFCP.

Other students have undertaken thesis work which complements the PFCPs including research related to exploring food security issues among seniors in NS (Green, 2008), pregnant and breastfeeding women (Amero, 2008), individuals living with celiac disease (Neil, 2013), ethics associated with PAR as it relates to food security (Cohen, 2012) and the cost and affordability of local foods in NS and evaluation of this specific component of food costing (Noseworthy, 2012).

Ongoing partnerships with former students involved with PFC and/or other food security related initiatives (who now work in universities, communities or government) suggests that students’ involvement in PFC has increased their awareness of food insecurity. As these students have moved into other positions, PFC partnerships with universities, communities and government, have most likely been enhanced; however, further investigation is needed to test this assumption of impact.

Project Staff
Project Coordinator
Over the ten years of PFC examined in this report, the part-time (3 days/week) coordinator role has included a variety of organizational and other roles including: planning and conducting training sessions, regional gatherings and media releases; overseeing food costing data collection; organizing and chairing/co-chairing Food Costing Working Group meetings; overseeing the project budget; supervising research assistants, administrative support staff and interns; preparing annual reports to funders; overseeing preparation of the bi-annual Food Costing Report and other publications and funding proposals. Since 2001, there have been seven different part-time PFC coordinators (See Appendix F). Reasons for the high turnover are unclear; however, the coordinator position has been part-time and contract-based, which may limit the sustainability of people in the position. Other potential reasons for the turnover, such as the high demand of the position, need to be investigated.

Research Assistants/Associates
Early in the PFCPs, a dedicated research assistant position was not funded; instead, students and others were hired for short periods of time, i.e. to help with development of the PFCPs reports and other project activities. In 2008, while funding stayed the same, a part-time (2 days/week) research assistant position was included in the project budget through reprioritization of project commitments. Primary activities of the PFC research assistant have included data analysis and report writing, helping to organize meetings, training sessions and other events, aiding in the preparation of presentations and papers for publication, and assisting with grant proposal writing. Since 2001, 13 people have occupied this position. However, in some years, there have been
multiple research assistants working on the project simultaneously. Most research assistants were students at the time of their involvement in PFC and moved on once their degree was completed.

**Administrative Support**

Early in the PFCPs, administrative duties were carried out solely by the coordinator and PI. In 2008, the PFCPs began to budget for part-time administrative support (seven hours per week), again through reprioritization. In total, six people have held this position. This degree of turnover is likely because most administrative support staff have been students, who are likely to move on once they have completed their degree, and due to the limited hours of the position.

Similarly to students, ongoing partnerships with past and current project staff may provide evidence of enhanced multi-sectoral partnerships and participation. While internal performance evaluations with students and project staff have taken place, the data are not available for this synthesis as it is confidential. In the next stages of evaluation, reflective feedback from former and current students and project staff will be sought and capacity building and other impacts of ongoing relationships with former students and staff may be explored.

**e) Government (systems) level partnerships and participation**

The systems category of reach largely refers to various levels of the provincial and federal government, but primarily the NS provincial government, and in particular the Department of Health and Wellness.\(^{16}\) The PI, Coordinator and Food Costing Working Group have worked closely with the NS Department of Community Services to obtain input on the affordability assessments for analysis and reporting and sharing findings, which has helped to strengthen linkages between these stakeholders.

In terms of systems-level partnerships, various levels of government have played supportive roles as funders of PFC have sat on advisory boards and have informed PFC resource and workbook-development. From 2001-2003 PFC was funded through a Population Health Fund award from Health Canada, Atlantic Regional Office. In 2004, the NS Government funded PFC as part of a larger project that included developing an ongoing model for food costing in NS(21) and a *Food Security Policy Lens and Backgrounder*(22). Currently, the NS Department of Health and Wellness is the principal funder for PFC; recently additional funding has been secured by the Nova Scotia Health Research Foundation to support evaluation. Government partners have also been collaborators for specific projects and think tanks, have played advisory roles on the Food Costing Working Group and Nova Scotia Food Security Network, and have been involved with policy change initiatives including the Policy Working Group of PFC. For additional evidence of new government partners/different levels of government becoming involved over time please see Appendix E: Food Costing Partners and Collaborators: 2001-2011.

“Enhanced Partnerships and Participation between and among of multi-sectors and levels” is the major finding for this section of the report. Here, the different levels/types of partners and their roles in PFC will be described, along with sections that describe findings related to the logic model outcomes of “increased support for food costers” and “student partners, “Enhanced

\(^{16}\) Formerly the Department of Health Promotion and Protection (2006-2011) and Office of Health Promotion (2002-2006)
The next section in the Partnerships and Participation theme is “Enhanced Capacity to facilitate community development and population health approach”. Taken directly from the 2008 Logic Model, this subtheme refers to the ability of PFCPs to strengthen community initiatives to address food insecurity, and spread awareness and understanding that food insecurity is not an individual, but public health problem.

Enhanced capacity to facilitate community development and population health approach

Community Development
In prior evaluations, family resource centre staff (referred to as Community Champions in a 2004 project report) felt very strongly that they had increased their awareness and knowledge of food security issues and policy processes, which has enhanced their ability to facilitate community development. Their knowledge on the issue is respected by other members of their communities.

I think within a family resource centre these tools and the data that they’ve collected, it makes us all like the experts in the whole subject in the community, so that when the papers hear [about issues like food security], they’re calling the family resource centre and asking ‘what can you tell us about that?’ So now we’re the experts in our communities to deal with food insecurity.
(Community Champion) (Heath & Pyra, 2004, p.25)

There is also evidence to support how food coster participation has led to new partnerships and change in communities.

“...so you know we took it to our local, you know committees and stuff and they just hopped on the band wagon and right away we said we need transportation which unfortunately we’re still working on um trying to get that um but we do have you know farmers markets starting and um you know we’re trying to help people who are working with the food banks and how to cook the foods that they get because often times they don't know how to” (cited in Monteith, Honours thesis, 2011, p.57, lines 1642-1648).

In future evaluations, gathering more information on these types of partnerships and subsequent community-level changes will be a priority.

Population Health Approach
Throughout the last decade, the PFCPs have been active in working with various partners (especially government partners) to develop resources that promote a population health approach. Examples include development of ongoing model for food costing in NS, Food Security Policy Lens and Backgrounder (2006) and bilingual national resources, Thought About Food? A Workbook on Food Security and Influencing Policy (2005) and accompanying DVD Food Security: Its Everybody’s Business (2006).

17 In the 2008 Logic Model, “improved decision-making skills”, “increased willingness to partner with communities” and “increased interdepartmental collaboration” are identified as outcomes. Findings related to these outcomes are not included in this report, but these and other themes/findings may be explored in future evaluations.
Enhanced support for participatory processes

In prior evaluations, respondents commented on the value of participatory, inclusive processes which were critical for learning, relationship building and in moving the project forward.

[The project] has listened along the way and made revisions and now we have the fruits of it...a good resource, a good communications plan, good relations and good findings to tell people about. (Provincial Steering Committee) (cited in Heath & Pyra, 2004, p.18)

That’s the one thing about this whole project right from the beginning is they’ve always been known to take our ideas and our input and revise it and put it in exactly the way we want to see it. (Community Champion) (cited in Heath & Pyra, 2004, p.18)

And that's the whole main thing to me with this project is giving people the power and voice. It’s not just professors or students, it’s people who are actually living in this type of circumstance (cited in Johnson, Masters thesis, 2004, p.67, lines 3061-3067).

As noted by a Provincial Steering Committee member in Heath and Pyra’s 2004 evaluation, the participatory processes have helped to ensure buy-in from various project partners and has been integral to PFC success as “the level of commitment has been very high throughout the project and I think it’s due to honoring those participatory approaches all the way along.” (p.18)

Increased willingness to collaborate with communities and across sectors:

A particularly important outcome of PFC work is increased collaboration among different communities and sectors to address food insecurity in NS. The following quotes from PFC partners are example of collaboration success:

I learned much from this project, particularly about the development of personal and community capacity and the role that this can potentially play in changing policy – also about how those who are actively experiencing food insecurity can participate in research and planning for change. (National Advisory Committee member) (cited in Heath & Pyra, 2004, page 26)

I think the linkages and relationships…I think that’s come through the project…that a key benefit that people receive from being involved…more linkages and giving people the opportunity to talk about the issue with others…I think it has been really valuable to people that way. (Provincial Steering Committee) (Heath & Pyra, 2004, pg 28)

Well, one of our accomplishments is that we brought together university researchers, government representatives, community partners, non-profit organizations, etc. to work on a specific social issue. I think that's an accomplishment. (Provincial Steering Committee) (Heath & Pyra, 2004, pg 28)

Summary: Partnerships and Participation

Since its inception, the PFCPs have been guided by a participatory approach to leadership wherein community, university and government partners share responsibility for project decision-making and governance. PFC is supported by diverse interest groups and the evidence suggests that strong partnerships have been formed. The diversity in PFC partnerships and collaboration would suggest an enhanced capacity to influence change. In the next stages of evaluation we will seek ways to measure how the reach of PFC has been amplified through the various partnerships.
Capacity Building

Overview
This section examines the ways in which people, organizations, and systems involved in PFC have built capacities for influencing food security-related policy. Consistent with previous PFC evaluations (23), we use the definition of capacity building as gaining “new skills, organizational structures, resources and commitment to health in health and other sectors” (24, p.6) as a result of their involvement in PFC.

Devon Dodd & Boyd (2000) describe how capacity can be built at different levels including personal/individual, community, and system. Personal capacity is the ability to use personal resources to achieve goals which include such facets as attitudes, skills, and knowledge. Community capacity can be thought of as a community’s ability to identify, assess, mobilize, and address social and health issues. Community capacity building is increasingly being viewed as a strategy for enabling a greater degree of public participation in the development of public policy, particularly among communities typically excluded from such processes (25). This capacity is linked to the community’s ability to engage policy makers in dialogue and effectively influence change. Building capacity at the personal and community level is often aimed at influencing change at the systems level. Building system capacity is seen as the ability of an entire system to monitor and address public problems (26).

In this synthesis, organizational capacity building is considered an indicator of community capacity building. For practical purposes it is difficult, if not impossible, to find evidence (a quote, a figure) that would be able to represent changes within a community; no one perspective can represent an entire community which is made up of individuals and organizations and structured within systems. For the purpose of this report, organizational capacity building among organizations associated with PFCPs (family resource centres, universities, nutrition and food security related networks, other community organizations) will be considered, and capacity building at individual and organizational levels will be used to reflect upon processes and outcomes of capacity building at a community level.

In the following excerpt, Johnson and Williams (2005) draw from literature to describe how capacity building is both a means and an end within the context of PFC, and how capacity building contributes to long-term success of health promotion programs and the enhancement of communities involved:

Capacity building can be thought of as both a means and an end. Conceptualized as a means, capacity building can be viewed as a part of community development and empowerment processes and also as an approach to more efficient program delivery and sustainability. Not exclusive from its role as a means, capacity building is often a goal of health promotion programs, with strengthened individual and organizational capacities being proposed program outcomes (24, 27, 28). Regardless if viewed as a means or an outcome, when social and health programs involve capacity building, there is the potential to increase the community’s ability to address not only the current issue of focus by the program, but other issues affecting the community as well. Strengthened capacities among program participants can be considered an investment in long term success of both the program and the participants’ ability to invest in the program and community (24). (Johnson and Williams, 2005, p6, lines 337-351).
This understanding of capacity building helped to form the PFC Logic Model (2008) (See Appendix D) which specifies short, intermediate and long term capacity building outcomes. Consistent with the previous section, Capacity Building is described at Individual, Organizational and Systems levels.

**Individual Level**

1) Food Costers

At the individual category of reach, and particularly for food costers, capacity building outcomes have been organized into four broad domains based on the 2008 PFC Logic Model\(^\text{18}\): a) PFC-specific and research-related capacity building; b) capacity building related to knowledge/understanding of food security issues and causes; c) personal skill development to facilitate community/collaborative action for food security; and d) other, or unanticipated capacity building.

**A) PFC-specific and research-related capacity building:**

As specified in the 2008 PFC Logic Model, short-term PFC specific and research-related capacity building outcomes include: “increased understanding of research and participatory approach to food costing and its method”; “increased understanding of research in general” and “increased support for food costing initiative”. Intermediate outcomes include: “Improved support for local coordinators/supporters and community members to participate in the food costing initiative”, which are presented here as capacity building findings.

**Increased understanding of research and participatory approach to food costing and its methods**

Johnson (2004) illustrates how PFC participants perceived the inclusion of people affected by the issue of food insecurity as giving ownership and a voice to the participants, by providing a venue for them to express their views and be listened to.

> What I liked best is using parents as participants. That's definitely what I liked best. Using people, you know, who understand where you're coming from. If, and like I don't mean to offend anybody by saying this, but if it was all university professors or you know what I mean..., but... If they've never experienced food insecurity then they don't understand. Like they don't understand. So using parents who, you know, know all about it, it just gives it the whole different perspective. It's people who really want to make a change... I think by using participants and building on their capacity that you are going to get more passionate people who want to see this go places (cited in Johnson, Masters thesis, 2004, p.67, lines 3042-3056).

> And that's the whole main thing to me with this project is giving people the power and voice. It's not just professors or students, it's people who are actually living in this type of circumstance (cited in Johnson, Masters thesis, 2004, p.67, lines 3061-3067).

\(^{18}\)While these domains were not specified within the PFC Logic Model, capacity building outcomes have been grouped into domains to enhance clarity and organization for this report.
The above quotes, collected just after the first year of food costing data collection in 2002, show that participants appreciated the participatory methods, and saw these as a novel and exciting way to do research. In the following quotes from food costers and support people in 2010, we can see that many people still appreciate being involved with the PFCPs for similar reasons described above, but in 2010, the participants have incorporated the term ‘participatory’ into their descriptions.

“one of the things that I loved about it and still love about it is that it is participatory” (cited in Monteith, Honours thesis, 2011, p.47, lines 1332-1333).

“well definitely you know for any um for anybody involved with the project I really think that the participatory aspect of it has to stay the same...” (cited in Monteith, Honours thesis, p.48, 2011, lines 1340-1341).

*I ok, um, the next question is what did you like best about the project? 
*P that it is participatory. 
*I ok, did you want to explain that? 
*P that we actually have people that are food insecure involved in this...I don't think it could be, it could be done any other way (cited in Monteith, Honours thesis, 2011, p.48, lines 1347-1351).

The difference in the language used from 2003-2010 may be indicative that participants no longer treat the participatory approach as novel, but rather they have a deep understanding of what participatory research is, and that it is an essential aspect of the PFCPs.

Increased support for the food costing initiative as a whole
One participant who has been involved in PFC for over four years described why she has supported and stayed involved with PFC:

“It's been easy to stay involved because I, I live what they are trying to change” (cited in Monteith, 2011, p.50, lines 1421-1422, Sixth interview).

“Staying involved has helped me see that there is a constant within the project of wanting to make, to make the difference...wanting to make it so that people see that there needs to be changes made” (cited in Monteith, 2011, p.63, lines 1840-1842, Sixth interview).

Another participant felt that the continuity of the project over ten years led to an increased ability to do advocacy work with politicians:

“...the fact that it is not something that has sat on the shelf um so often um family resource centers get approached by groups, organizations, universities. We wanna do a study on this, we wanna do a study on that and they do the study and we never hear anything more about it or you find out that yes they did the study, here's the data so what. This has been an ongoing project for the past ten years for sure and I've been able to take the information that we have discovered, you know, and we have been able to talk to the politicians about, you know, lowering the cost of food, and raising um minimum wage and raising social service rates, so it's, it's real.” (cited in Monteith, 2011, p.63, lines 1854-1862).
Improved support for local coordinators/supporters and community members to participate in the food costing initiative

Several participants expressed that keeping family resource centres involved in the PFCPs was seen as an important component, and indicates individuals’ support and commitment to the PFCPs:

“I would hate to see me not be able to be involved in this [PFC]. Um I’ve been involved since the beginning but I just find that it needs to be addressed with Health Canada representatives with CAPC, CPNP, hugely...They need to be told that the, that they, they [CAPC and CPNP national office] need to tell the family resource centers that we need to be involved in this, needs to be part of our, their [CAPC and CPNP] agenda for what we do...because we [CAPC AND CPNP] are getting away from that” (cited in Monteith, 2011, p.49, lines 1391-1396).

B) Capacity building related to knowledge/understanding of food security issues and causes:

As described in the 2008 Logic Model, short term capacity building related to knowledge/understanding of food security issues and causes include: “Increased awareness of food security determinants” (and desire to share this information), “Increased capacity to identify root causes of food insecurity”, “Enhanced awareness of the relationship between food security and population health”, “Increased understanding of the public policy impacts on food security”, “Reduced misconceptions of self-blame and victim-blame associated with people earning a low income” and “Commitment to change through action on food security”; findings in relation to each of these indicators are presented.

Increased awareness of food security determinants

Some participants spoke to increased awareness of food security as being eye-opening and an important first step to effecting change. For example, Johnson and Williams, 2005 write:

Participants also reported that their participation in the Project raised their awareness of the issue of food security, the impact it has on people, and how it can be addressed. Awareness was also raised in terms of the usefulness of food costing studies and examining the cost of purchasing a healthy diet, as well as the actual results of the food costing (, p.15, lines 882-886).

Johnson (2004) also cites the following quotes as examples of increased awareness:

“It's made me more aware of the food costing issue. By putting my attention to some of these things... My attention is now keen to it” (cited in Johnson, Masters thesis, 2004, p.76, lines 3496-4398).

“This project means for food security well that, well the Project is bringing up the issue and making a point that it is an issue, a very important issue and trying to do something about it by listening to people's stories so that it can be used in a way hopefully to change something to improve the situation” (cited in Johnson, Masters thesis, 2004, p.76, lines 3419-3524).
As well, Johnson (2004) also reported increased awareness related to the prevalence of food insecurity in NS:

“Umm, when we were down in [at story sharing], I didn't realize how bad it really was. Number wise... Umm... It's... All around, it's frightening” (cited in Johnson, Masters thesis, 2004, p.76, lines 3500-3502).

Increased awareness about the costs of a nutritious diet was also reported:

“Well, it's been very interesting and eye opening type of thing. Umm...Let's see... Well, the food costing I found was pretty interesting cause it opened my eyes to like how much it really does cost to eat healthy and stuff like that.” (cited in Johnson, Masters thesis, 2004, p.80, lines 3700-3704)

“It's been worthwhile for us because of the impact of making us aware of how much the government says Canada's Food Guide says everybody should eat and if that's their rule they should help out more” (cited in Johnson, Masters thesis, 2004, p.80, lines 3708-3711).

“I was amazed by the price that it cost for a family of four to eat healthy” (cited in Johnson and Williams, 2005, p.16, lines 910-911).

Similarly, a participant in Johnson and Williams (2005) study also reported increased awareness of food insecurity in Canada, and organizations working to make a difference as an important capacity building outcome for food costers and support people:

“I didn’t even know there was organizations working to address food security. When you think of food security, you think of third world countries. You don't think of countries like Canada is in trouble. But after this you realize there are.” (Johnson and Williams, 2005, p.15, lines 888-891).

Increased capacity to identify root causes of food insecurity

Indicative of capacity to identify root causes of food insecurity, participants spoke about the impact that policies can have on food insecurity:

“Incentives and like the thing about community services trying to get people back to work. Well... that's great that people are going back to work, but like... their children are going into second... like poor quality childcare because... if you think about it? If a single mother with two children wants to go back to work and unless she has a good education... they're just forcing her back to a low paying job... She's gonna be paying how much for childcare??” (cited in Johnson, Masters thesis, 2004, p.77, lines 3588-3596).

“They [social services] give you just enough rope to hang yourself” (cited in Johnson and Williams, 2005, p.20, line 1174).

They recognized that food insecurity is a societal issue, and that one avenue to address it is through policy change:

“I'm always sharing that info with people and trying to get them to see that that uh this isn't just one person’s issue” (cited in Monteith, Honours thesis, 2011, p. 45, lines 1270-1271).

“Like uh they may say oh it's our policy well that policy didn't come down from god almighty. Man made the policy so if man made the policy then man can break his policy and simply make
another one you know this policy but when it comes to the issue of food” (cited in Johnson, Masters thesis, 2004, p.78, lines3640-3644).

They added that solutions to food insecurity include the need for increased income and supports for families on social assistance:

...we certainly have to realize that uh you know the families that are on assistance are definitely not being given enough money um to eat healthy... (cited in Monteith, Honours thesis, 2011, p.55, lines 1595-1596).

I think towards the government to show them that we need extra income...they need to start giving us extra money...so we can cover to eat better... (cited in Monteith, Honours thesis, 2011, p.55, lines 1599-1601).

Participants also felt that solutions to food insecurity should include consideration of prices of foods, and that local foods should be accessible to promote sustainable food security.

...our local stores and stuff you know to make those policies that ah you know they have to carry more local stuff you know um you know that our healthy foods aren't the most expensive foods in the store and uh you know just that it's available to everybody...you know, whether it's a matter of a making sure, you know, people have guaranteed incomes...but I think right now the thing is to get people to really buy into it and listen to it [messages from food costing] (cited in Monteith, 2011, p.56, lines 1605-1610).

Enhanced awareness of the relationship between food security and population health
Participants were able to go beyond their personal health and speak of the relationship between food insecurity and population health. They recognize the broad range of benefits that reducing health and social inequities could have for all of society:

Like, food is a necessity. It's not... It's not a gift or it's not...You have to have it. It's a right. ...And I think if that if family eats better they will be less sick. (cited in Williams and Johnson, 2005, p.21, lines 1190-1194).

Increased understanding of the public policy impacts on food security
Participants also indicated an increased understanding of the impacts of public policy on food security, and the importance of policy as part of action on food insecurity.

To me, I guess I sort of see a room rented somewhere with the media and the politicians present and to, umm, have all the ministers present that are responsible for everything that affects your income status, your tax status, your housing status... umm, finances... The whole... That's probably half the province. And have it open to the public as well. It really needs to be something that is brought out to everybody and have not just people that were involved with the project but other people from the community... all the communities. Educate them as to what we're trying to accomplish and give them an opportunity to have their voices heard too (cited in Johnson, Masters thesis, 2004, p.81, lines 3800-3814).

And I think that... If I, as a parent, go and say to my MP [Member of Parliament] well, you know, this is what I have for groceries and this is what the Nova Scotia Nutrition Council says I should be spending on groceries. Now, what are you going to do to help me? (cited in Johnson and Williams, 2005, p.12-13, lines 742-749).
Participants expressed interest in understanding the overall strategy of PFC for using the data to influence policy. They also felt that any actions taken to use the evidence should be based on coordinated efforts of many throughout the province (Johnson and Williams, 2005, p. 18, lines 1059-1062).

“I know myself I want to know where they're going to go with it. Exactly. And, you know, how I can take it and apply that to help develop some policies in my area, especially related to the food bank. Yep. This is me as a participant speaking” (cited in Johnson and Williams, 2005, p.19, lines 1068-1071).

“If you have everybody working together and you have everybody doing the same all across the province then your voice is gonna be heard” (cited in Johnson and Williams, 2005, p.19, lines 1089-1091).

Some felt that policymakers need to know about the food security issues and that these ‘right people’ do not yet understand the importance of solving these complex issues.

“... I think it's going to be a long struggle to get people in places to recognize this um you know it just feels like we are taking baby steps all the time which is better than nothing but um I just I don't know, I don't know that we've got the right people to listen yet” (cited in Monteith, Honours thesis, 2011, p.56, lines 1616-1619).

“You are giving a voice to the people who are living it. Yep. And it's not that they haven't been saying it for a long time, it's just nobody has really been listening” (Johnson, 2004, Masters thesis, lines 3102-3105)

“it's just to get the real local politicians to hear it, our local stores and stuff you know to make those policies that ah you know they have to carry more local stuff you know um you know that our healthy foods aren't the most expensive foods in the store and uh you know just that it's available to everybody” (cited in Monteith, Honours thesis, 2011, p.44, lines 1233-1237).

As the information on food insecurity is shared, it is anticipated by participants that policymakers will understand why people are food insecure, resulting in appropriate policy changes. When people are made aware of food security, it is more likely they will understand the issue and then seek to address it.

*I: ok um now what do you think are the next steps to take for food security and policy change in Nova Scotia and at large?
*P: well we need to make people aware, more people aware of what the information is...so they have to find some way to get it out there so it's not um you know, so we're not using it to blame anybody...um it's just this is the way it is, now what can we do (cited in Monteith, 2011, p.44, lines 1256-1261).

**Reduced misconceptions of self-blame and victim-blame associated with people earning a low income**

For food costers, a particularly important aspect of capacity building was reduced misconceptions of self-blame and victim-blame associated with people earning a low income:
I've suffered food insecurity myself and years ago I used to think that it was me, that it was my bad budgeting, that I wasn't a good parent because I couldn't stretch my food dollars and, and with all the information that I've learned over the past ten years [from PFC], it's not me at all...you know, it's the fact that, you know, is, is I'm paid pretty good um but being the only income for four or five people family um you know um we don't do it right um...so it's not me, it's, it's you know, society, it's food. (cited in Monteith, Honours thesis, 2011, p.61, lines 1774-1780).

For some, reduced self-blame has led to hope for the future and an increased ability to educate and comfort others dealing with food insecurity.

For some, reduced self-blame has led to hope for the future and an increased ability to educate and comfort others dealing with food insecurity.

yup, and we were on the system and lived on the system and, you know, I was ashamed of that years ago and now I’m not. I tell people and I tell moms that I work with that, you know, there is a light at the end of tunnel. (cited in Monteith, Honours thesis, 2011, p.58, lines 1679-1681).

...I’m able to be right there, giving people [ex] samples and then they’re talking and they’re saying you know well I'm here because you know whatever and I can't afford food and you know what, guess what you're not the only one, there are x number of people in Nova Scotia and the reason they can't is because of this and you know this is what, haha anyways so that, I don't know that it actually brightens their day...but it makes them feel better (cited in Monteith, Honours thesis, 2011, p.58, lines 1684-1690).

**Commitment to change**

As a result of being involved with PFC, participants have made a commitment and been driven to make a difference related to food security, demonstrating passion and readiness for change.

“but I've got my hand and my head in there, along with my heart trying to make sure there is a difference made somewhere” (cited in Monteith, 2011, p.54, lines 1564-1565)

“there has to be an answer...if we don’t get involved and help out then we are never going to find an answer” (cited in Monteith, 2011, p.55, lines 1569-1570).

**C) Increased personal leadership, advocacy, and other skills that facilitate community/collaborative action on food security**

As specified in the 2008 Logic Model, short-term outcomes related to the development of personal skills to facilitate collaborative action include: “increased leadership skills”, “increased advocacy skills”, “increased empowerment”, “increased support for inclusion”, “improved collaboration skills” and “improved ability to work across a variety of sectors and levels”; which are presented here as findings.

**Leadership skills**

For some food costers, participating in the training session and other PFC activities was the first opportunity they had to take on leadership roles.

“Well... The only thing that I can think is during the story sharing when I, umm, started it out and told my story. I thought that was pretty brave of me... I guess that was my strong point. Kind of got everybody else going I guess” (cited in Johnson, Masters thesis, 2004, p.65, lines 2943-2946).
For others, for whom leadership comes more naturally, participating with PFC was an opportunity to use and further develop these skills.

“Okay. Umm ... I will toot my own horn a little bit. I find I have a little bit of leadership skills. So in our little food costing group I kind of oversee what was... like who was gonna go where and when... You know what I mean. Like who was going to partner up and stuff like that” (cited in Johnson, Masters thesis, 2004, p.65, lines 2936-2940).

Others found that as a result of participating in PFC, they were able to take on leadership roles in their communities, and were better able to comfort others struggling with food insecurity.

“But, umm, I am just a very social and outgoing person, and like I said straightforward so I don't mind saying like well, you know, this is what happened to me and this is how I dealt with it, or... This happened and I didn't know how to deal with it so I felt overwhelmed or... I just... I've always been a very verbal person and... I guess that's my thing. I guess is to be involved in something like this and say this really needs some attention and this is why and here's the proof of why? So, sometimes I hope that I can maybe motivate other people to say okay well you know what I've been there too. And since you were comfortable with sharing that. I don't feel uncomfortable sharing” (cited in Johnson, Masters thesis, 2004, p.70, lines 3200-3211).

Food costers who had been involved in PFC for at least four years explained that they had been able to further develop leadership skills, such as public speaking, as a result of their involvement.

“what I have learned, well um the thing I guess especially with the public speaking is, is to not be afraid, that people are people...basically to me um it, it helps, on a personal level, like I have built my own capacity up, so you know I can publicly speak...” (cited in Monteith, Honours thesis, 2011, p.53, lines 1509-1512).

Another participant explained that as her role within PFC has evolved over time, she has been able to take on more of a leadership position in the project, and has become more comfortable in this role.

“especially more so at the beginning when I wasn’t really doing much of that stuff, cause now it’s a little bit different, now I’m part of the organization, and now, like this past time I was more, um like I just went with them as support, do you know what I mean, but more at the beginning it was more, um yea out of my comfort level to do the leadership like that and I think it was good, good for me” (cited in Monteith, Honours thesis, 2011, p.53, lines 1524-1529).

**Advocacy skills**

Participants also reported that having evidence about the cost of food equips people with valuable information when trying to explain food insecurity to other people.

“…And I have [heard] people say, well people on social assistance don't know how to get groceries. So, when I come...they are not buying the right food. Or they are not healthy. Well, if I said, well, listen they have a cheque of $700 or $800, and really no money... They should spend $500 just for the basic food” (cited in Johnson and Williams, 2005, p.14, lines 815-822)
Longer-term food costers also spoke about how participants have implemented strategies in their communities that influence others’ lives, demonstrating increased advocacy skills as a result of being involved with PFC.

“...so you know we took it to our local, you know committees and stuff and they just hopped on the band wagon and right away we said we need transportation which unfortunately we’re still working on um trying to get that um but we do have you know farmers markets starting and um you know we’re trying to help people who are working with the food banks and how to cook the foods that they get because often times they don’t know how to” (cited in Monteith, Honours thesis, 2011, p.57, lines 1642-1648).

Food costers have also indicated a desire to further develop advocacy skills. For example, in May, 2010, 43 food costers and supporters participated in five regional training workshops, after which all participants completed an evaluation. The research team was interested to learn from the completed evaluations what skills food costers wanted to develop or learn more about. A list of possible topics for food costers to choose from was developed, and items listed included increased capacity for leadership and advocacy, media training, using food costing results in your local community, and skill building related to facilitation and influencing policy. From the report:

“73.2% said they would like to learn ways to use food costing results within their communities, 58.5% wanted to learn skills related to facilitation, and 43.9% were interested in media training, as well as advocacy and influencing policy. A space was also left for participants to make suggestions for learning activities. Some of these included label reading, story sharing sessions (as done in 2002) and a focus on how to support local farmers” (Regional Training Workshop Evaluation Report, 2010, lines 312-316)

**Increased empowerment**

‘Increased empowerment’ is taken here to mean increased desire and/or action to share stories or information about food insecurity, become more involved with changing policy and an overall, feeling that participants can make a difference in their communities. Consistently, food costers expressed excitement about continuing their involvement in PFC and participating in other food security initiatives.

“I know being involved in this wants to get me involved in other things like... I want to get involved in other things too” (cited in Johnson, Masters thesis, 2004, p.69, lines 3139-3141).

“It's been a very powerful feeling to be involved in this project. I'm actually doing something that uh something to make lives better that affects me too” (cited in Johnson, Masters thesis, 2004, p.69, lines 3130-3132).

Several project participants became more involved in other food security initiatives, including the ACT for CFS.

“I'm hoping that within everything that, because I'm also involved with the CURA [ACT for CFS]...I'm hoping that there will be a difference made...” (cited in Monteith, Honours thesis, 2011, p.57, lines 1634-1635).
One participant also described feeling more empowered to make a difference in her community as a result of being involved with PFC.

“...it's always very exciting when um we get together in those groups and um I feel so you know you're gonna be able to go there and you're going to be able to make a difference when you come back to your home” (cited in Monteith, Honours thesis, 2011, p.51, lines 1450-1452).

**Increased support for inclusion**
Confidence was built in participants as a result of feeling valued and included in the project.

“um it just really made you feel honoured and valued that you took a part in it...in that whole project” (cited in Monteith, Honours thesis, 2011, p.60, lines 1725-1726).

“you know I was asked to help make presentations, I was very involved in almost everything going...and even today if there is something going on, you know, <principal investigator> or somebody sends out a note just to find out who is interested in doing what and it makes me feel that I'm valued” (cited in Monteith, 2011, p.60, lines 1728-1731).

**Improved collaboration skills for community involvement**
Being involved with PFC has provided opportunities for food costers to meet and collaborate with other people across the province and share what they have learned in their communities.

“well like I said I have been able to take this information and share it with families and share it with our communities...” (cited in Monteith, 2011, p.52, lines 1195-1196).

I think there’s been skills built and [community participants are] feeling more confident …more willing to take the lead in some areas. (Provincial Steering Committee) (Heath & Pyra, 2004, p.25).

Many food costers and support people have also been directly involved in public education and advocacy activities to promote food security by engaging with the media, politicians, and their communities on behalf of the PFCPs.

I approached the community health board . . . and was able to talk to them about food security and now I’m on the board of the community health board. (Community Champion) (cited in Heath & Pyra, 2004, p. 20)

In general, it seems as though food costers have gained capacity building skills related to leadership and advocacy and have indicated some aspects of empowerment, support for inclusion, and collaboration as a result of being involved with PFC. Survey findings from 2010 (post PFC training survey) indicate that some food costers were interested in further development of their leadership and advocacy skills.

**D) Other individual capacity building**
Food costers have also developed personal skills related to purchasing food as a result of PFC. These skills have been applied to their own purchasing patterns, demonstrating personal development.
*I ... what are you doing differently as a result of your involvement in food costing?*

*P oh I’m looking at the prices... you know like just on a personal level, when I’m grocery shopping for home, I make sure I look at the size of things and I guess I am better equipped when I am at the grocery store... I know about looking at the unit price and I know about you know, looking for the bigger size of the broccoli... and then um here at the centre, well I mean I do the grocery shopping here to and, and uh, and we do programs and a lot of times I bring the information that I’ve gotten ... and [I am] able to use it in the programs with the clients (cited in Monteith, Honours thesis, 2011, p.52, lines 1493-1505).

Many of the lessons learned that have been reported were related to direct knowledge and skill development as a result of participation in PFC training. Participants of a focus group conducted after the 2002 spring PFC responded that they gained knowledge in terms of doing math, calculations, and unit pricing for cost comparisons.

Math for me, the math and weighing out the vegetables and stuff like that (cited in Johnson & Williams, 2005, p.14, lines 840-841).

Learning how to convert amounts to... like a package amount to a unit amount. I find that easier to do now since I’ve gone through the food costing. I’ve always known that it’s a good thing to do that, but that really gave a hands on why it’s a good thing to do that (cited in Johnson & Williams, 2005, p.14, lines 843-847).

Participants also felt that they were able to apply the learnings gained through their involvement in food costing, both in applying the skills developed to their own situations, such as when grocery shopping, and in sharing their knowledge with others.

“The learning to comparison shop and breakdown prices, and being able to apply that for our own grocery shopping purposes. The sale price is not always the cheapest” (cited in Johnson & Williams, 2005, p.15, lines 867-869).

“Like especially now my kids are getting older and you can actually show them... You know, this tomato soup... This is Campbell’s tomato soup that you see on TV that’s glorified, but this is the same soup” (cited in Johnson & Williams, 2005, p.15, lines 875-877).

Chard, (2010) writes in her internship project report:

Respondents also hoped to be able to share with others what they learn in the workshops and to be able to apply things they learn, such as reading labels to determine if a product is local, to their own lives. One respondent said that she wants to share this information with her children and have them be able to check labels to see if items are local when they go grocery shopping. Another respondent mentioned that she hopes to learn how to eat healthier on a limited budget and pass what she learns onto the next generation. (Chard, undergraduate internship project, 2010, p.21, lines 578-583)

Participants also felt that their involvement in the PFCPs had given them a greater knowledge of healthy eating and they reported that they had changed their eating habits in an effort to eat more nutritiously.

“I have been lately, in the past few months, been trying to eat a little healthier. And by going by what was in the food basket and stuff like that. And trying to eat healthier instead of buying like the bag of chips or something I'll buy like some fruit or something like that. And... Maybe not all of the time, but like fruits can get pretty expensive. So, but... Like... You know, every once in a
while instead of getting the chips or whatever I'll try to get the fruit and whatever. We have been really stocking up on vegetables lately. We've been kind of adding to that... that to our grocery list, which was kind of slim before so...” (cited in Johnson, Masters thesis, 2004, p.107, lines 5125-5136).

“It helps me kind of just make better choices since I've done the food costing because I can look at the food and say oh yeah well nutritionally really I don't need these cookies and you put them back you know or do you know what I mean and I do make more of a point now to make sure that most of the groceries I get are the yellow store brand or whatever because I know, because of the food costing, that they are adequate nutritionally which is something I always wondered about before” (cited in Johnson, Masters thesis, 2004, p.107, lines 5138-5146).

An additional aspect of capacity building for food costers was increased knowledge of local foods, as a local food component and local foods training was introduced to PFC in 2005, extended in 2007 and repeated in 2008 and expanded upon again in 2010. In Chard’s 2010 report, some respondents commented on their surprise to learn that so little local food was available in grocery stores.

“I grew up in Lunenburg right next to a High Liner plant and when we had to look up the price for fish and find out where it was from China, I was blown away. So I think stuff like that is important for people to be aware of and know ‘cause I don’t think a lot of people do, especially the participants that we work with.” (Chard, undergraduate internship project, 2010, p.20, lines 558-562).

**Students and Project Staff Capacity Building**

The PFCPs have employed 60 highly qualified personnel\(^\text{19}\), including at least 25 students, and sponsored 20 dietetic internship and 9 students in practicum placements. Students have been trained via research internships, community service learning, dietetic internship placements, course-based curriculum, and undergraduate and graduate thesis research. Although evaluation that directly assesses capacity building among students and staff has not been undertaken to date, indirect evidence suggests that students and staff involved with PFC have increased their understanding of research and the participatory approach to food costing, food costing methods, increased understanding of research in general and increased support for the food costing initiative. Many past and current students who have worked with PFC have: 1) obtained external funding from the Nova Scotia Health Research Foundation (NSHRF); 2) presented at national/international conferences as lead authors and as part of collaborative research teams; 3) written reports and published articles in respected scholarly journals; and 4) obtained teaching positions at various universities. The PI has also secured funding from the NSHRF to support a post-doctoral fellowship (Dr. Irena Knezevic).

Students and interns, for example, Johnson, Monteith, and Chard were able to write clearly and expressively about the project, methods, and participatory approaches. Through conducting their own independent research they have gained a better understanding of research in general. Other students have developed skills such as website development through their involvement with PFC.

---

\(^{19}\) Highly qualified personnel are defined as individuals with university degrees at the bachelors' level and above. Funding agencies such as the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada support the training, through research, of highly qualified personnel including: undergraduate students; graduate students; postdoctoral fellows; and other trainees such as technicians or technologists. Research training is not considered to be only the training of academic researchers.
Food Costing Developmental Website – For a school project, three MSVU students developed the Food Costing Website. It has been launched and is available for viewing. The website address is: [http://faculty.msvu.ca/foodsecurityprojects](http://faculty.msvu.ca/foodsecurityprojects) (FCWG Minutes, May 22, 2009, lines 68-70).

There is also evidence of increased/ongoing support for the food costing initiative among former students of the PI such as Christine Johnson, Michelle Amero, Rita McAulay, Rebecca Green-LaPierre and Liesel Carlsson, who have all continued to be involved in the project. This continuity was also noted by Williams and others, in a paper submitted to the Canadian Journal of Dietetic Practice and Research:

> …the involvement of students (e.g. honours and graduate students, dietetic interns) in this work further contributes to sustainability through creating future partners with the potential to contribute to innovative dietetic practice. (Williams et al, Model Paper, in press, lines 203-205)

Many former students have also moved into careers for example as researchers, educators and public health nutritionists which involve advocacy for improved food insecurity. Their capacity to fill these roles was likely directly influenced by their involvement with PFC, but further investigation is required.

**Principal Investigator Capacity Building**

For the PI, successful development and implementation of the PFCPs has led to opportunities to build partnerships with community and government, and contribute to the advancement of knowledge by publishing papers and presenting at academic conferences. This has built her credibility as a researcher and advocate for policy change. This background has enabled her to become Canada Research Chair in Food Security and Policy Change and obtain Canada Foundation for Innovation funding to establish FoodARC in 2009 at MSVU.

**Organizational / Community Level**

Capacity building outcomes relevant to family resource centres as a result of being involved in the PFCPs include increased knowledge and improved collaboration and advocacy skills. For example, Johnson and Williams (2005) describe that:

> Support people, through interviews, spoke of benefits exclusive to family resource centres as organizations. This included having greater knowledge and ability to address the issue of poverty by affecting policies in their communities. It was agreed that organizational capacity was built within the family resource centres via the Project. (Johnson & Williams, 2005, p.17, lines 992-1003).

They offer the following quote as an example:

> “Family resource centres have more ties to social groups as well that they would be able to, umm, connect with other agencies to make change” (cited in Williams & Johnson, p.17, 2005, lines 1003-1005).

In the following quote, a family resource centre support person describes how she has used materials/information provided by PFC as a tool for advocacy.
“I think that it gives us a tool to really affect maybe the politician where we can ask the very precise question. It’s a also diverse tool as a family resource centre to do advocacy for parents. Uh... It gives me a tool even when I go and talk to church groups” (cited in Johnson and Williams, 2005, p13, focus group 1, lines 811-815).

A long-term capacity building outcome identified in the 2008 PFC Logic Model is “improved ability to work across a variety of sectors and levels” which is supported by the following excerpt:

Respondents felt that linking occurred on different levels in this Project. Respondents described strengthening existing personal relationships, meeting new people, and sharing different perspectives. Not only did respondents feel that greater links were formed within the family resource centres across the province, but they felt that links were also established between family resource centres and those within other external systems, such as nutrition professionals and universities. It was felt that these groups were all working towards the same goal and had many things to contribute to each other’s efforts. (Johnson, 2004, Masters thesis, lines 5631-5640)

Summary: At a community and organizational level, capacity has been built by enhancing leadership skills among community, academic and government partners to identify root causes and solutions to food insecurity, and mobilize resource to create change. Among many partners this has sparked a renewed motivation to engage in advocacy for policy change. As one community partner commented, “When I approach my MLA or my MP now, I know how to approach them, I am better prepared” (21)

Systems Level
Although evidence of capacity building at the systems level was more of a challenge to identify, the representation of systems-level employees (i.e. people who work in government) on the Food Costing Working Group and their active involvement in PFC suggests that knowledge is being shared and capacity to impact food security is being built at a systems level. In a recent paper, Williams et al describe capacity building at the systems level:

At a systems level, capacity has been built through the development of the NS Food Security Network. Ongoing FC was also identified as an action in the NS Healthy Eating Strategy and thus has supported the need for ongoing provincial funding. The development of our unique PFC Model has also provided an entry point for broad-based civic engagement in the policy change process, catalyzing community mobilization around food security and building capacity for change at multiple levels. Importantly, capacity building serves as both a means and an end of this research process. As a means, it reflects the building of collective skills for change. As an end, it results in individuals, organizations, communities and systems that are more resilient, strengthened and empowered (Williams et al, draft Model Paper, lines 190-200).

Other systems level capacity building includes the development of tools such as the “train the trainer” online resource which allows PFC to influence and support capacity building among food costing related projects in other provinces as well. This is described in a report submitted to the funder (2010) and in Williams et al (2012):
Initial consultation happened with PEI’s Department of Health & Wellness in regards to supporting them to do food costing in spring 2011, through a potential contract agreement (Report to DHPP, 2009-2010, lines 110-111).

Documentation of the process and the development of tools to facilitate the work is part of project sustainability and capacity building beyond NS. For example, using the ‘train-the-trainer’ online resource, two municipalities in New Brunswick (Moncton and Saint John) have implemented PFC based on the NS PFCM, and dietitians in several other provinces have expressed interest in adapting this approach in their provincial or regional FC work (Williams et al, Model Paper, May/June 2012, lines 157-161).

**Summary: Capacity Building**

At the level of the individual, it appears as though food costers have increased their understandings of food costing, participatory research, and support for community participation in the PFCPs which is consistent with the outcomes outlined in the 2008 PFC Logic Model. They have also increased their knowledge and understanding of food insecurity, and decreased self-blame in regards to their own experiences of food insecurity. Many also reported increased leadership, advocacy, and collaboration skills. Other capacity building benefits for food costers include increased food related skills, including increased awareness of local foods. In terms of project staff and student capacity building, students and staff have likely increased their understanding of research and the participatory approach to food costing, food costing methods, increased understanding of research in general and increased support for the food costing initiative, which may have influenced career choices.

At organizational, community and systems levels family resource centres have increased their capacity to build relationships and share information related to food security. Representatives of family resource centres also commented that as a result of being involved with PFC they felt better equipped to engage in advocacy for policy change. Bridging both organization and systems levels, the creation of, and subsequent partnership between PFCPs and the Nova Scotia Food Security Network have mutually increased each organization’s capacity to link and collaborate with representatives working at a systems level. This has included engaging with government decision-makers, university representatives and public health nutritionists. The PFCPs’ creation and the wide dissemination of food costing resources has also created the potential for systems level changes beyond the NS context. In future evaluations, emphasis will be placed on measuring how individual capacity building has led to capacity building at organizational, community and systems levels.
Knowledge Sharing and Uptake

Overview
The purpose of this section is to a) identify and numerate the different ways in which PFC partners have engaged in knowledge sharing activities from 2001-2011 (takes “broad dissemination of processes and results of PFC initiative” and “increased knowledge sharing across multiple sectors and levels” from the 2008 PFC Logic Model into account) and b) identify areas of knowledge uptake (i.e. food costing recommendations that have been incorporated into individual, organizational, or systems level policy).

Knowledge Sharing: Broad dissemination of processes and results of PFC initiative
The following table provides a brief summary of the PFCPs knowledge sharing efforts since 2001. ‘Conferences’ refers to academic conferences with peer review, ‘Publications’ refers to articles published in peer-reviewed academic journals. ‘Invited addresses’ include events and interactions with community groups or government where the PI, or another member of the research team, was invited to consult or share information about PFC. ‘Reports and Resources’ include Food Costing Reports, ‘Thought about Food?’ resources, training guides and other reports produced by the PFCCPs for public use. These are designed to be plain language and easy for decision-makers to employ, using engaging formats with an emphasis on translating findings to facilitate uptake. ‘Media releases’ corresponds with the release of the Food Costing Reports and ‘Media Contact’ includes television, radio, or newspaper coverage of the PFCCPs.

Table 2: Participatory Food Costing Knowledge Sharing Efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>05</th>
<th>06</th>
<th>07</th>
<th>08</th>
<th>09</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conferences**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications (refereed)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1)*</td>
<td>6 (1)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Addresses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports and Resources</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Releases</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Contact</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                | 183  | (1) |

( )* indicates papers that have been submitted to academic journals, which are under review.  
** Conferences include those at regional, national and international levels, see Appendix G for more details.

In the 2008 Logic Model, “improved method of comparison for costing affordability of nutritious food through the regions of NS”, “increased advocacy to address root causes of food insecurity”, “increased willingness to integrate more conventional forms of expertise with qualitative and quantitative community based research”, “increased commitment to use community input in a meaningful and transparent manner” and “enhanced community action on food security” are identified as knowledge sharing and uptake outcomes. Findings related to these outcomes are not included in this report, but these and other themes/findings may be explored in future evaluations. As we move more into Outcome Mapping processes as part of developmental evaluation, the desired outcomes may also be subject to change.
In trying to quantify knowledge sharing efforts for this report, it was identified that there may be a lack of documentation of the knowledge sharing efforts of all partners involved in PFC. As most of the data in the Knowledge Sharing table were compiled from the PI’s CV, the table does not capture the presentations or media contact made by other members of the Food Costing Working Group, or others associated with the project that did not also involve the PI. The table also does not include classroom presentations of the PI or other partners, or outreach to organizations initiated by Food Costing Working Group members, which is an important form of community-level knowledge sharing.

Other efforts not captured in the table include web-based knowledge sharing. The PFCP has created and curates a dynamic website as part of the FoodARC website (www.foodsecurityresearchcentre.ca) to showcase recent and ongoing projects; including research outcomes, reports, and publications. This website played a key role in the release of the 2010 PFC Report. A video and multimedia presentation highlighted the project and key research results. The press conference was also live streamed, resulting in over 4,000 webpage views and hyperlinks by major local and national media. The website features a news section and online newsletter which actively tracks and shares food security and food policy news; striving to be a primary source for this material in Canada. The project has used a range of social media tools, such as Twitter and YouTube, to disseminate findings and build a Community of Practice on PAR, food security and policy. More can be found on the PFC project page http://www.foodsecurityresearchcentre.ca/nova-scotia-participatory-food/ including video, presentations, and links to the websites of project partners. The Thought About Food website http://foodthoughtful.ca/ is also available and an online version of A Workbook on Food Security & Influencing Policy is available in both English and French. (Williams CRC renewal, 2011)

Examples of broad knowledge sharing:

PFC publications in academic journals or books include:


Nationally and internationally cited materials incorporating PFC information include:

Part of the effort to impact policy and broadly disseminate knowledge has been through the creation of plain language knowledge-sharing tools as described in the following excerpt:

Our understanding of food security and its policy solutions and processes for affecting policy have been incorporated in plain language knowledge mobilization tools that are designed to engage diverse perspectives in dialogue on the broad determinants of food security. As the most comprehensive contribution to addressing food security through community capacity building for policy change, they are disseminated and cited nationally and internationally (Williams, 2011, CRC renewal, lines 441-445).

Enhanced capacity to deliver key messages to the media
In 2003/2004, a communications sub-committee worked with a consultant to design and implement a communications plan for the project. This included regional (e.g. community newspapers), provincial (e.g., ATV evening news, Maritime Noon, CBC – First Edition, Information Morning, The Chronicle Herald, Information Morning) and national (e.g., CBC National and CBC Radio Canada) media coverage through television interviews and newspaper stories. The media coverage included interviews with the PI of the project as well as interviews with project participants, specifically women struggling to feed their families (Heath & Prya, 2004, p. 15).

In Heath and Pyra (2004), it was noted that “our name is getting out there as a contact” for the media about the issue of food security:

We’ve also raised a fair bit of public awareness around the issue that wasn’t there before we started doing this. (Provincial Steering Committee) (Heath & Prya, 2004, p. 15)
Since 2004, six additional PFC media releases have occurred, along with 30 additional instances of television, radio, or newspaper coverage. In 2011, the PFC media release of the 2010 Food Costing Report was front page news in the Chronicle Herald. For each media release, media training has been made available to support food costers who wished to share their experiences with the media.

Increased knowledge sharing across multiple levels and sectors
Multiple partners, including food costers and support people, family resource centre staff, students and project staff, members of the food costing working group, and the PI have been responsible for sharing information across levels and sectors. They have shared knowledge at individual, organizational and systems levels. Below, some knowledge sharing examples are provided.

1) Food Costers and support people (knowledge sharing)

From 2001 onward, training sessions, story sharing, media releases, and project gatherings have provided opportunities for knowledge to be shared with food costers, and for food costers to share their knowledge and experience with the PFCPs. Repeatedly, the results of the evaluation of training sessions and other documents indicated that there is a strong desire among food costers to share knowledge with others including family, friends, communities, organizations, and policy makers:

“Yeah, exactly. We’re thinking about having like a public forum with our friends first like our partners and stuff and make them aware of what we’ve learned. Get them on our side. And then open up to a broader public... doctors, professionals (cited in Johnson, 2004, p. 84, lines 3956-3960)

“but that’s the most important thing we need to do with that information is get it out there...let people know about it and let them see, you know, why it is um there’s the month’s end is here and the money’s gone” (cited in Monteith, 2011, p. 44, lines 1207-1209)

Beyond a desire to share knowledge, some food costers have indicated the ways in which they have shared knowledge with others:

“I have learned a lot of data that I can take, a lot of facts that I can take and show the people that I work with” (Fourth Interview) (cited in Monteith, 2011, p. 53, lines 1409-1410).

“I know I talk to more people, like in play group and that, I talk to them and I’ve had a few mothers who have come to ask me about it” (Second Interview) (cited in Monteith, 2011, p.53, lines 1493-1494).

2) Family Resource Centres

As family resource centres have been an important part of the PFCPs since 2001, some family resource partners have come to play very critical roles in sharing knowledge. Partners from
various family resource centres across the province have been involved in presentations on PFC in academic settings, including at an International Union for Health Promotion and Education conference in Geneva, Switzerland and Canadian Association of Food Studies conferences. Other family resource centre partners have been part of regional and national conferences (i.e., the Atlantic Health Promotion Research Centre research forum and CIHR Institute of Gender and Health conference) and invited addresses on building food security in NS, (for example appearing before the Standing Committee on Community Services of the NS government to present evidence and insights from PFC).

3) (Universities) Students and Project Staff Knowledge Sharing

The following is a list of past and current thesis students who are doing/have done work related to the PFCPs. Their thesis work was presented and disseminated within their universities and at provincial, regional and national conferences.

- N. Pabani. MSc.AHN thesis: (title TBD) on assessing the impact of the PFCP at a systems level (MSVU). Expected April 2014

Students taking on thesis work related to the PFC are examples of how knowledge about food costing and food security is shared and generated. Many students involved with the PFCPs have gone on to share food costing results and learnings through conference presentations (captured in Table 2); however, there may be some student presentations that have not been documented. The above list does not include activities of dietetic interns who have been involved with the PFCPs.
Beyond these forms of knowledge sharing, students may also choose to share knowledge of food security, food costing or PAR, with friends, family, colleagues, and others. To this point there has been no attempt to track the number of people in students’ families, communities, work, and school environments who have been exposed to food costing work, aims and methods, through conversations with these students. This could be an important part of knowledge sharing and credibility-building for the project, which may require further attention to evaluate. For some students and former project staff, working with PFC may have influenced their career choices where further knowledge sharing about food costing and food security has occurred.

4) Food Costing Working Group - knowledge sharing at the community level

As mentioned previously, documentation of community-level knowledge sharing has not always been well documented. However, to provide some examples of community-level knowledge sharing and communications, the following excerpts have been taken from 2007 Food Costing Working Group meeting minutes.

From a February 15, 2007 meeting:

- [FCWG member] has spoken with IWK Dietitians, IWK Social Workers, Spryfield Multicultural Roundtable; MSVU Open House (on senior and public pensions); Engineers without Borders; Dal Legal Aid (has also been helping them with a new program that they have on nutrition and IA to build awareness among MDs re special diet allowances.
- [FCWG member] has spoken at classes at MSVU, Acadia; Community Caring Day, [PFC Coordinator] presenting food costing data; also facilitating workshop where [PI] will present for AV Health Promoting Schools forum on food security (FCWG Meeting Minutes, February 15, 2007, lines 128-137).

From an April 27, 2007 meeting:

- PI presented FC data in Annapolis Valley, “health promoting schools”, she also presented to a variety of other audiences
- Dal Legal Aid will use FC data in Utility Review Board hearing, where PI will be expert witness in November.
- Food Costing Coordinator presented data at two church services in March and two Anglican churches, in place of the sermon and received great feedback
- A Food Costing Working Group member presented the Dal Legal Aid pamphlet at Capital Health to Ambulatory Dietitians to discuss “buzz words” to increase the number of people receiving additional $150 allowance for special diets (FCWG Meeting minutes, April 27, 2007, lines 157-167).

From an October 18, 2007 meeting:

- [FCWG member] is going to community nutrition class at Acadia to talk about food security
- [FCWG member]: Food costing meeting at Mahone Bay Food Bank with 7 people; 40 women of UCW in South Shore talking about food costing, asking for more workshops
- [FCWG member] spoke with people at a Women’s Institute meeting re: having an event on Nov 26th to incorporate food security issues
- [FCWG member] Dartmouth groups interested in participatory food costing and getting involved; Atlantic Conference on food security...very interesting
• [Coordinator] spoke on a poverty reduction strategy in Nova Scotia to talk about food security issues; importance of consultation around the strategy to get it to work; article in the paper about this
• [PI] is going to St. John’s, Newfoundland tonight to talk with them about our tools and find out what they are doing
• [FCWG member] is speaking tonight about the need for funding for special dietary requirements
• [FCWG member] is presenting at the local Community Health Board about food security
• [FCWG member] has organized a celebration for food costers from the spring on Monday to talk about their experiences (FCWG Meeting Minutes, October 18, 2007, lines 356-390)

Systems level Knowledge Sharing
From PI’s Canada Research Chair Renewal several examples of knowledge sharing have been compiled:
• [the PI has become a] spokesperson for media interviews/inquiries on health-related issues.
• Strong partnerships and collaborative relationships built with local, provincial and national organizations.
• Consultation on Provincial Childhood Obesity Strategy with NS Department of Health and Wellness "Our Food: Addressing Obesity by Reconnecting Food and Community" (April-May 2011).
• Invitation to present to Standing Committee on Community Services “Building Food Security in Nova Scotia: An Opportunity for Leadership”
• Consultation with a Member of Legislative Assembly (MLA) about Income Assistance (IA) rates.
• Consultation with Prince Edward Island Food Security Network Working Group on Food Costing re developing a Model for their Provincial Food Costing that was suspended in 1994.
• [The PI] Nova Scotia Legal Aid Challenge of Utility Rates to Nova Scotia Utility and Review Board consultation/witness

Additionally, at the systems level, the Food Costing Working Group has secured meetings with Ministers of Health and Community Services and other public officials to share and discuss research results. This includes a consultation with an MLA to discuss how the food costing project is relevant to poverty reduction work he is engaged in with other MLAs (Report to DHW, 2009-2010). As mentioned previously, the Food Costing Working Group has also been invited to make presentations to various policy and standing committees within the NS government and the Federal government. The PI was asked to host the Federal Liberal Caucus Tour on Food Policy, and presented Working to build food security for all, on behalf of the Nova Scotia Food Security Network and the PFCPs at MSVU in April 2009.

Knowledge Uptake
Enhanced community action on food security
The following excerpt from Johnson (2004) describes some ways in which family resource centres have used and/or shared knowledge/learning from the PCFPs:

Learnings were applied at family resource centres by sharing information regarding food security and the Project with other participants and family resource centre committees/boards. Respondents also described using learnings by initiating Project activities at their local centres. Those who were also family resource centre staff reported using learnings on food security in their work at the centre.

a)
“I did a little 15-minute thing on... on, you know, just what food insecurity is. Just to make people more aware of it. So it was really interesting and, umm... everybody was interested in it too. There was two people that wanted to get involved” (Third Interview).

“The four-pager [short report of food costing results]. Okay... You know... I've shared it with, umm, like I said, I shared it with community committee and, umm, people at the centre... on our board” (Eighth Interview).

“I'm more kind of interested in the food costing... element to work with my clients... So I can transfer the knowledge and think now what must it be like for them.” (Second Interview) (cited in Johnson, 2004, p.90, lines 1426-1472).

Other forms of knowledge uptake that have not been captured in this synthesis include the incorporation of lessons learned from PFC into family resource centre organizational policies. This will be further explored in the next phases of comprehensive evaluation.

**Systems level knowledge uptake – policy change**

As noted, PFC has an advocacy and policy change focus, and is fundamentally concerned with improving systems capacity to create more equitable conditions for food security. In 2004, Heath and Pyra identified several systems level knowledge sharing achievements:

- Provincial system level impacts were discussed and bode well for sustainability including:
  - There has been a broadening of the approach to food insecurity that attempts to include both a social justice and a food systems approach to action.
  - The Office of Health Promotion (Nova Scotia) has incorporated food security in their business plan and financial resources have been dedicated to ongoing surveillance and monitoring of food costing, and for the development of a policy paper;
  - The issue of food security has been incorporated into the Nova Scotia Chronic Disease Prevention Strategy;
  - Secondment of a Public Health Nutritionist to work on the projects as the Project Coordinator from Public Health Services at Capital Health;
  - Engagement of Public Health Nutritionists from various District Health Authorities;
  - Representatives from the Office of Health Promotion and Community Services attending the press conference and offering to discuss their role in supporting food security. (cited in Heath & Pyra, 2004, p. 28)

Other evidence of uptake of PFC data to influence policy change is the inclusion of food security as a priority area in the Healthy Eating Nova Scotia strategy, developed in 2005. It has also contributed to the *Food and Nutrition Policy for NS Public Schools* and the *Manual for Food and Nutrition for Daycare Settings*. Participatory Food Costing has been noted as contributing to increases to Income Assistance rates in Nova Scotia (Kay, C. Department of Community Services, Personal Communication, August 26, 2005 and Rathbun, J. Department of Community Services, June 14, 2007) and has informed advocacy on a minimum wage review:

Our research has been used to inform both policy and practice at the provincial government level, including the establishment of a Health Disparities position in the Department of Health and Wellness, the development and implementation of the Healthy Eating Nova Scotia Strategy, the Food and Nutrition Policy for NS Public Schools, and increases to Income Assistance and the
minimum wage. This research is poised to make an even more significant contribution to Canadian Society in terms of deepening our understanding of processes for engaging those who are marginalized and have experience with food insecurity to have their voices heard, and for building capacity at multiple levels for addressing food insecurity. (cited in Williams, 2011, Canada Research Chair renewal, lines 445-452).

Department of Community Services uses the food costing data to inform decision making on increasing personal and shelter allowances. Since the beginning of the food costing project in 2002, we have seen an increase in personal allowance rates from $180 to the current rate of $229. Continued work in this area is essential to support changing or building policies that will contribute to a more food secure Nova Scotia. (cited in Report to DHPP, 2009-2010, lines 260-264).

Beyond NS, other provinces (New Brunswick, Manitoba, Saskatchewan) have used the NS framework and tools for analysis of food costing data:

Documentation of the process and the development of tools to facilitate the work is part of project sustainability and capacity building beyond NS. For example, using the ‘train-the-trainer’ online resource (19), two municipalities in New Brunswick (Moncton and Saint John) have implemented PFC based on the NS PFCM, and dietitians in several other provinces have expressed interest in adapting this approach in their provincial or regional FC work. (cited in Williams et al, 2012, lines 157-161).

Additionally, the Food Costing Working Group has links with food security networks in most provinces and elected officials across the political spectrum, nationally and provincially, have contacted the Food Costing Working Group for information and advice.

Summary: Knowledge Sharing and Uptake
As a whole, there are many documented examples of knowledge sharing on PFC methods/processes and findings through conference presentations, publications, invited addresses, reports and resources, website and social media activities, media releases and coverage on television, radio and newspapers. Among individual actors including food costers, there is evidence of knowledge uptake and a desire to share food costing information with others. Among project staff, students, and the PI, knowledge sharing efforts have been noted, and at the organizational level, family resource centres have been actively involved in knowledge sharing. However, gaps in knowledge sharing documentation, including some community presentations and classroom presentations, have been noted. Importantly, however, there is evidence that knowledge sharing efforts have led to knowledge uptake at the Systems level, including the use of PFC results to help frame the Healthy Eating Nova Scotia and other provincial level strategies as well as increases to Income Assistance rates.
Conclusions and Recommendations

What we have learned...

Successful outcomes

- “What began as a project focusing on the involvement of 21 local family resource centers and their participants in food costing has expanded to a strong network of multiple, intersectoral partners including community, government and university partners at Nova Scotia, national and international levels (total of 62 partners)” (Williams, Canada Research Chair Renewal Application, 2011, pg 6, lines 243-246).
- In Canada, the tools and processes that grew out of PFC have been introduced into national programs for women, children and families that have a broad presence in more than 800 communities. The PFCPs have conducted research and supported collaboration to develop mechanisms and tools that facilitated the types of policy change needed to ensure that all people in NS and Canada are food secure.

PFC as a springboard and catalyst for action

- Since its inception, PFC has been a springboard to engage professionals, community organizations, policy-makers, and individuals with experience of food insecurity in generating practice-based evidence on the issue and to use the findings to engage in broader conversations about food security and policy solutions with other stakeholders.
- Participatory Food Costing has been a catalyst for many other food security related projects and organizations. For example, in 2000, the Nova Scotia Nutrition Council was revitalized as a result of the first PFC project getting started, and later, the Nova Scotia Food Security Network and ACT for CFS arose from the PFCPs to better address food security issues.

Sustained partnerships and commitment

- The continuity of PFC over a 10 year period shows partners’ commitments to reflect, adapt, change and move forward. In other words, to participate in developmental learning processes.
- Long-term engagement of family resource centres, researchers, government partners and organizations engaged in addressing food insecurity and poverty suggests that strong partnerships have been formed. FoodARC and the Nova Scotia Food Security Network’s 2011 CIHR Partnership Award also demonstrates national recognition of the unique, enduring and successful relationships catalyzed through the PFCPs.
- Participatory governance of PFCPs is highly dependent on in-kind contributions from community partners, government personnel, students, researchers and practitioners. Although time and resource intensive, the resulting capacity building, community mobilization and policy change outcomes serve as justification for investment in this approach.
- Trust between family resource centres, researchers, community groups, government and local foods movement has formed, which has provided the foundations for the formation of ACT for CFS. The project aims to build on PFC, allowing a deeper level of conversations to occur to address the larger issues of food system redesign.
**Challenges and Limitations**

- Evaluation of the PFCPs has proven challenging because of the depth and breadth of the work. The PFC in NS is successive; spanning over a decade of work, and involving five separate food costing cycles or projects, and another underway in 2011-2013. As such, it has been difficult to draw boundaries around which documents to include or exclude in this synthesis.
- Like any research that employs PAR, PFC includes the integration of different ‘ways of knowing’ from a variety of perspectives and backgrounds.
- It is a challenge to evaluate the far-reaching and systems-level impacts of PFC because contextual changes are continually happening such as changes to government policies, macro level ideologies, economic forces and demographics; which makes it difficult to attribute causal relationships between project outcomes and FS.\(^{22}\)
- For this synthesis, the use of the PFC Logic Model as the evaluation framework was useful for determining how well the desired outcomes are being met. However, it was difficult to define the ‘community’ category of reach, as it was difficult to find specific quotes to fully capture changes at a community level. In the future, clear indicators of community level partnerships, capacity building and knowledge sharing and uptake may need to be developed.

**Evidence Gaps**

- As was known prior to document synthesis, past PFC evaluation efforts have been more focused on the experiences of food costers than that of other partners. Formal evidence regarding the experiences/impacts of other project partners is more limited.
- Compared to the individual level of analysis, less information is available about the PFCPs’ impact at organizational and systems levels.
- Knowledge mobilization activities which did not involve the PI were not always well-tracked over the five PFC projects.

**Moving forward: Recommendations for PFC evaluation and practise**

**Recommendations for comprehensive evaluation:**

- Engage in project reflection: From this synthesis, we can see that there have been several long-term partners (including researchers, family resource centres, food security and nutrition related organizations, food costers, and community members). However, because this stage of evaluation consisted of a document review, it was often difficult to pinpoint the *reasons* why long-term partners continued to be engaged. Subsequently, one direction for future PFC evaluation efforts will be to determine, especially for long-term partners, “what is it about the PFC that keeps you engaged and committed?”

---


’Ways of knowing’ are: *instrumental*, that which is scientific or expert-driven; *interactive*, gained from the experiences of individuals and communities; and *critical*, arising from reflective thinking - in order to be relevant, accurate or true to the experiences of stakeholders and thus, more effective in promoting change at individual, social, and systems levels.

\(^{22}\) For a review of critical challenges inherent in evaluating a model such as the one described here, see Williams, Langille and Stokvis’ synthesis report on the Community Action Program for Children/Canada Prenatal Nutrition Program experience.
In 2012, it is clear that relationships among diverse partners (universities, family resource centres, community organizations and various levels of government) still exist. In the next stages of evaluation we will seek ways to measure the impacts of such partnerships. To do so we will:

- Seek reflective feedback from former and current students and project staff on benefits/outcomes of their participation. Explore the impacts of ongoing relationships with former students and staff at individual, organizations, community and systems level change.
- Explore in more detail how relationships with food costers and family resource centres are contributing to organizational, community and systems-level change for improved food security.

It may also be useful to conduct an interview with the PI, to reflect on her experiences and learnings. The combined reflective knowledge will be useful for informing other community-university-government collaborations.

It will be important to continue to support food coster capacity building and knowledge sharing through future evaluative efforts. Building on the leadership and public speaking skills many food costers have developed through involvement in PFC, some participants (Chard, 2010) indicated that they would be interested in media training, developing advocacy and facilitation skills and exploring ways to share food costing information with their communities. As PFC has already engaged in this type of training, a new and fresh approach may be participatory photo and video methodologies, which PFC will be exploring as early as fall 2012. This will provide an avenue for food costers to use their experiences to educate others and it may be a more effective fit for those who are not comfortable with public speaking or direct interaction with media.

- Collect evidence and feedback at an organizational level:
  - Speak with representatives of family resource centres, Nova Scotia Food Security Network, Nova Scotia Nutrition Council, Ecology Action Centre (and other community-based partner organizations) to assess the impact of PFC on their organizational policies and practices.
  - Seek feedback from university researchers on their involvement with PFC. Given the significant role they have played and a need for their increased involvement to look at issues such as a living wage, supports for post-secondary students, and the cost and affordability of special diets, feedback should be sought to plan expansions of PFC research.

- Collect evidence and feedback at a systems level: direct efforts towards understanding how PFC has influenced people who work within government (or anyone else operating at the organizational/system level). While this could take the form of stakeholder interviews, there may also be some valuable information revealed by doing a document review (or similar methodology) to see if a food costing lens (or even an inequities lens) has been used in the development of policy or programming at the organizational/systems level. This may allow a more ‘bird’s-eye’ view of impact on ‘the system’ than talking with individuals who may or may not have had some exposure to the food costing work.
Recommendations for future PFC practises:

- In the past, the PFCPs have tried to develop and enact mechanisms for project partners to record their knowledge sharing efforts and report this back to the PFCPs. However, this synthesis indicates that there continue to be gaps in this area. A recommendation is to revisit this idea and work with project partners to develop a recording mechanism that will work for all involved.

- Incorporate small, regularly conducted feedback mechanisms as part of PFCPs organizational practise by:
  - Developing a tool for interns and students to assess their skill development, and identify whether they have increased their knowledge of PAR research, policy change, FS issues and determinants as a result of being involved with PFC.
  - Internal staff evaluation and feedback mechanisms already exist; however, the results are confidential and therefore unavailable for this report. For future evaluations, the PFCPs may need to develop a mechanism for project staff to provide feedback on their positions/roles and offer information about skill development and other learnings resulting from their employment with PFC. Results could provide evidence about the ability of PFC to expand knowledge of, and commitment to, research and advocacy on FS in a new generation of researchers.

Finally, this synthesis has provided the PFC evaluation committee with an opportunity to reflect on project learnings, identify gaps, and consider recommendations for comprehensive evaluation and improved project practises.
## Partnerships and Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievements</th>
<th>Recommendations for future evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of strong and enduring partnerships with food costers, support people and family resource centres suggests that trust and relationships formed with family resource centres and food costers have laid strong foundations for community and systems level changes.</td>
<td>Focus on how these sustained partnerships and relationships have built capacity for community and systems level change for improved FS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligned with placing inclusion as a priority, support for food coster participation has been provided,</td>
<td>Continue to provide supports such as honoraria, travel and childcare expenses to support partner engagement in evaluation processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is evidence of partnerships with various levels of government, with emphasis on provincial and district governments.</td>
<td>Explore how partnerships with PFC have influenced change in government partners and how, subsequently this may have impacted community and systems level change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Évidence of contact with provincial governments and national organizations re: food costing model.</td>
<td>Inquire about uptake of PFC model. Update national data on food costing completed in 2004 (19 interviews) to understand how food costing has been done and applied across the country.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gaps

| Direct, formal feedback from organizations-level partners. | Obtain formal feedback from NSNC, NSFSN, ACT for CFS, universities and other community partner organizations on partnership success/where improvements are needed. e.g., How have partnerships with PFC enhanced capacity to address food security at organizational, community and systems levels? |
| Direct, formal feedback from current and former students and project staff. | Could focus on how partnerships have built individual-level capacity, possibly influenced career decisions, desire to further work on food security. Focus on how continued partnerships with former students/staff have strengthened PFC and connections to communities, organization and government. |
| Overall: we will seek ways to understand how PFC reach has been amplified through the various partnerships. |
## Capacity Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievements</th>
<th>Recommendations for future evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant individual-level capacity building among food costers and support people and evidence that they value their role in PFC.</td>
<td>Examine how raised awareness, leadership and advocacy skills have translated into community, organizations and systems level changes. Examine how local foods component has influenced awareness, behaviors, etc. of food costers and support people, and other partners. Explore links between raised awareness, leadership and advocacy skills and health related outcomes such as decreased risk for obesity (i.e. healthy eating).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food coster/support person community engagement for change (sharing information, contacting MLAs, joining community health boards).</td>
<td>Follow up on the impacts of these actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems level - there is evidence of provincial government partners helping to develop PFC resources/ advising our work. PFC research and personnel have also advised and supported government policy work and initiatives.</td>
<td>Obtain feedback on how capacity has been built among government partners. Examine how PFC evidence, processes, and partnerships have build capacity for systems level change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Gaps

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building among students and project staff (formal evaluation).</td>
<td>Collect information on student and staff capacity building – seek feedback on how they have used enhanced capacity to advocate for/create change for improved FS at organizational, community and systems levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal feedback from university partners.</td>
<td>Seek feedback from university partners about capacity building outcomes and ways to expand and strengthen PFC research and outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations level – some evidence that being involved with PFC has impacted organizations’ (especially family resource centre’s policies), but this has not been formally captured.</td>
<td>Collect evidence from people from partner organizations on how being involved with PFC has informed or enhanced capacity to create change within their organizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall: In future evaluations, emphasis will be placed on measuring how individual capacity building has led to capacity building at organizational, community and systems levels.
### Knowledge Sharing and Uptake

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievements and Gaps</th>
<th>Recommendations for future evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is evidence of PFC knowledge sharing at various levels (individual, organizational, community) and dissemination of PFC information in national and international venues.</td>
<td>Collect more evidence on uptake of knowledge sharing at organizational, community and systems levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is some evidence of how PFC research has impacted policy, especially at NS government level (e.g. Healthy Eating NS, Chronic Disease Prevention Strategy, Daycare food and Nutrition Policy, Innovation Support Team, Income Assistance Reviews, and others).</td>
<td>Speak with policy makers about factors that might increase uptake of PFC information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A: Food Costing Funding and In-kind Contributions 2001-2011

In the past eleven years, PFC has undergone five independently funded food costing cycles, each of which can be conceptualized as an individual project. Table 1 details the sources and amounts of funding. From this table we can see how a small amount of federal funds initiated this project, but over time, the province stepped in with larger amounts of funding, which contributed to capacity building over time. Table 2 provides estimates of in-kind contributions from 2001-2011.

Table 1: Sources and Amounts of Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year-Range</th>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>Health Canada</td>
<td>$24,992</td>
<td>$24,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>Health Canada</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>NS provincial government</td>
<td>$90,000 (over 18 months)</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>NS provincial government</td>
<td>$45,000 (sustainable model)</td>
<td>$49,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,800 (knowledge translation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2009</td>
<td>NS provincial government</td>
<td>$90,000/year</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2011</td>
<td>NS provincial government</td>
<td>$90,000/year</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2013</td>
<td>NS provincial government</td>
<td>$88,273/yr</td>
<td>$25,000 (for evaluation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$91,545/yr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$754,610</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This funding has been used to support core project needs including salaries for three part-time staff (the project coordinator, and from 2008 on, a research assistant and administrative support), as well as honoraria for food costers (to cover travel and childcare expenses), team gatherings and communication (including teleconference fees).

Successful PFC also requires significant in-kind contributions, for example from the PI, members of the Food Costing Working Group and student, including interns, thesis students and volunteers. Research space for PFC has also provided in-kind through the Atlantic Health Promotion Research Centre, MSVU Research House and FoodARC.
Table 2: Estimates of In-Kind Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimated worth of contribution</th>
<th>Totals 2001-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Costing Working Group Members*</td>
<td>$31,200/year</td>
<td>$312,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters student†</td>
<td>$12,000/year</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours student†</td>
<td>$12,000/year</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other students (interns, volunteers)‡</td>
<td>$24,000/year</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research office space **</td>
<td>$28,800/year</td>
<td>$288,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistician†</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation‡‡</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated worth of contribution</th>
<th>Totals 2001-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$312,000</td>
<td>$1,125,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimate based on an average of 10 FCWG members/year *2hrs/week time commitment*estimated value of $30/hr = $31,200/year
†Estimate based on SSHRC estimate for part-time student work during the course of a year.
‡ Estimate based on a total of one full time student position being occupied by several students (i.e. three interns * 16 weeks each * full time hours + three volunteers @ 1 hr/week)
** Estimate based on 24m² of available office space x $100 per m² per month x 12 months = $28,800/year
†† Estimate based 35 hours/year at $100/hour
‡‡ Estimate based on staff in-kind travel expenses (fuel, meals) at $200/day x 5 regional gatherings per year

While this table estimates the significant in-kind contributions made from 2001-2011, it is a significant underestimate as it does not include the Principle Investigator’s time, the time of a former FoodARC Multi-Media Manager, or the use of infrastructure/technology purchased with Canada Foundation for Innovation funds.
### Appendix B: Food Costing Working Group Members 2001-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2004/05</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophie Pitre-Arseneault, Health Canada, CPNP</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barb Anderson Public Health Services, DHA 1,2,3 (2002-2007); Acadia University (2010-present)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Chenhall Nova Scotia Department of Health</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Ehler, Kids First Parent Resource Centre</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Doris Gillis, St. Francis Xavier University</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Eileen Hogan, Acadia University</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Shanthi Johnson, Acadia University</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlene Lawrence, Digby County Family Resource Centre</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Langille, Atlantic Health Promotion Research Centre</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Leenders, Public Health Services, DHA 4</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Magarit, Maggie’s Place Family Resource Centre</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley Moran Chair, Nova Scotia Nutrition Council</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Newcombe, Caring Connections – Native Council of Nova Scotia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Poirier Cape Breton Family Resource Centre, Port Hawkesbury</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Rathbun, Department of Community Services</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Patty Williams Principal Investigator, AHPRC, MSVU, NSNC, PARTC-FS</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley Moran, Public Health Services, South Shore Health Authority; Nova Scotia Nutrition Council</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Reimer, AVH Kids Action Program</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Russell, Dartmouth Family Resource Centre</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(new in 2004)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonya Sarty, Kids First, Pictou</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ilya Blum, MSVU, Mathematics Department</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Monahan, NS Health Promotion &amp; Protection</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Amero, NS Health Promotion &amp; Protection</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polly Ring, Parent's Place, Yarmouth</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen Woodford, Public Health Services, CBDHA, GASHA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen Melanson, SunRoot Eco-Solidarity Association</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(new for 2007 report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Bishop, Fruit Growers Association of NS, Noggins Corner Farm</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Institution</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley Frank</td>
<td>Provincial PFC Coordinator, MSVU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Fraser</td>
<td>Cape Breton Family Resource Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becca Green</td>
<td>Ecology Action Food Centre Food Action Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Ives</td>
<td>Atlantic Canada Organic Regional Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita MacAuley</td>
<td>NS Food Security Network Steering Committee Chair; Public Health Services Capital District Health Authority; Nova Scotia Nutrition Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Macdonald</td>
<td>Public Health Services Capital District Health Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James McGrath</td>
<td>First Nations and Inuit Health Branch, Health Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Florence</td>
<td>Provincial PFC Coordinator, MSVU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Johnson</td>
<td>Department of Human Nutrition, St. Francis Xavier University; NSNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina Killam</td>
<td>Parent’s Place Yarmouth County Family Resource Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Murton</td>
<td>NS Department of Health Promotion and Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Blair</td>
<td>Public Health Services, CDHA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Gosbee</td>
<td>Shelburne County Family Resource Centre, Shelburne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen LeBlanc</td>
<td>Maggie’s Place, Amherst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leanne Munroe</td>
<td>Cape Breton Family Resource Centre, Sydney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Watt</td>
<td>FoodARC, MSVU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C:
Selected PFCP Recommendations for improved food security and population health

In this Appendix, recommendations from the (a) 2011 PFCP Report, (b) NS Standing Committee on Community Services, (c) Briefing notes to a NS MLA, “What would it take? A Vision of Food Security for ALL Nova Scotians” and (d) Childhood Obesity Prevention Strategy Consultation Submission are included.

(A) Food Costing Report, 2010

Recommendations…What More Must We Do?
What can Government do to Help Build a Food Secure Nova Scotia?

All Nova Scotians deserve and can benefit from a healthy diet. Developing policy at various levels of government is essential to building FS in Nova Scotia. Therefore, the Nova Scotia Participatory Food Costing Project invites municipal, provincial, and federal governments to take action, working across jurisdictions, to address this critical issue.

Understanding that individuals living in poverty often view food as a more flexible part of their budget (compared to fixed costs such as shelter, power, childcare and transportation), the policy recommendations made in the following sections consider these costs of living as major determinants of healthy eating. When the burden of fixed costs such as shelter, power, transportation and childcare are reduced, more income will be left over to allow low-income families and individuals to purchase a nutritious diet. Further, costs related to childcare, shelter, and transportation are policy-driven; thus addressing policies on these basic needs is important. In comparison, food costs are market-driven making it nearly impossible to reduce food costs through policy recommendations. The only “food related” proposal that might directly increase food access for low income families would be through bolstering charitable food programs.

While food banks play an essential role in feeding families experiencing food insecurity at this time, this method of obtaining food does not help families or individuals rise out of poverty or provide a dignified method of accessing food. In fact, the experiences of going to a food bank have been shown to be disempowering. Therefore, we make policy recommendations that are aimed at addressing other basic expenses as a way to improve FS in Nova Scotia.

Municipal Level
We encourage municipal governments to:
• Examine implications of food costing findings at local levels, particularly as it relates to integrated community sustainability plans for Nova Scotia. This could include supporting such initiatives as community gardens, farmers’ markets and community kitchens.
• Build awareness at local levels around issues of income-related food insecurity.
• Collaborate with existing provincial and federal initiatives to address income-related food insecurity.
Provincial Level
We encourage the **provincial government** to take action on food insecurity in the following areas:

- Establish mechanisms for policy development and change that will contribute to FS in Nova Scotia communities. This should involve relevant departments within the provincial government including but not limited to the Department of Community Services, Department of Finance, Office of Economic Development, Department of Health and Wellness, Department of Agriculture, Department of Environment and the Department of Labour and Advanced Education.
- Create a mechanism for building upon the 2010 Food Costing findings to examine the adequacy of new poverty reduction strategies such as the Affordable Living Tax Credit, the Poverty Reduction Tax Credit and increases to the Nova Scotia Child Benefit.
- Index the personal allowance portion of Income Assistance rates to reflect the actual cost of a nutritious food basket based on family size and composition.
- Examine the adequacy of the 250 subsidized childcare spaces recently committed by the provincial government.
- Increase access to and awareness of programs, services and supports such as Income Assistance special needs allowances, for low-income individuals.
- Increase the number of affordable, safe housing units to reflect the number of households living below the low-income cut off. Families/individuals on Income Assistance often take from their other allowances (personal, childcare or transportation) to cover the cost of shelter. It is important to adjust shelter allowances to reflect current housing costs and index allowances to reflect location, family size and the cost of living.
- Support the implementation of a Universal Services Program to promote affordable power bills and help alleviate energy poverty for low-income Nova Scotia families and individuals.

Federal Level
We encourage the **federal government** to take leadership on the following recommendations:

- Recognize that families dealing with food insecurity rely heavily on federally supported community programs such as Canada Prenatal Nutrition Program, Community Action Program for Children, and Aboriginal Head Start; it is important to ensure long term sustained financial support to these programs, and align funding criteria to bolster local FS, including support for community gardens, food access programs and cooking workshops.
- Develop and implement a federal poverty reduction strategy that aims to lift people out of poverty.
- Further examine a Guaranteed Income for adults as a means of helping to eliminate income-related food insecurity.
- Continue to develop other programs and supports for working families, including ensuring the availability of affordable childcare, housing and public transportation.
- Develop and implement a National Child Care Strategy based on the model implemented in Quebec recognizing that childcare is a major fixed expense for low-income families that takes funds away from the food budget.
- Continue to review and implement changes to public pension systems to ensure income adequacy among Canadian seniors.
• Increase access and awareness of programs, services and supports, such as Guaranteed Income Supplement for low income seniors.
• Provide continued funding for the Affordable Housing Initiative (AHI) to help increase the amount of affordable housing for low-income individuals and families.
• Increase the Child Tax Benefit from the current $3,271 to a maximum of $5,000 per child per year as a means of helping to eliminate child poverty as recommended by the Caldon Institute for Social Policy (2008). These additional funds would help low-income families to cover their basic needs, including the cost of a nutritious diet.
• Continue to support and promote knowledge sharing on issues of FS in Canada.
• Establish partnerships with local voluntary sector and municipal agencies to help develop and implement federal FS and poverty reduction policy initiatives at a community level

(B) Standing Committee on Community Services, June 7, 2011
Dr. Patty Williams, Debbie Smith, Karen Leblanc, Lynn Langille and Cynthia Watt on behalf of the NS PFCP

A Roadmap for Change to Build Food Security in Nova Scotia

Provincial and Local Policy
- Policy forums involving multiple sectors, levels and jurisdictions
- Consider every existing provincial public policy for its impact on food security
- Accountability framework for examining impact of new initiatives on CFS (e.g., poverty reduction, mental health, chronic disease prevention, sustainability plans)
- Income adequacy is part of a comprehensive strategy for healthy communities

Monitor Income Security
Ensure income and income support policies and programs are adequate to allow Nova Scotians to afford a healthy and sustainable diet

Academic-Community-Government Research
Increase support for funding programs that strengthen community action and collaborative research on community food security (CFS)

Diverse Community Leadership
Champions the Cause

Inter-Departmental Collaboration on Food Security Championed by Senior Departmental Leaders

Food Security... a Cornerstone to Healthy Communities
Recommendations:

At minimum the Nova Scotia Food Security Network (NSFSN) and Participatory Food Costing Project recommends the Nova Scotia government:

✓ Create a mechanism for building upon the NSFSN Food Costing findings to examine the adequacy of the personal allowance for all income assistance recipients, and

✓ Index the personal allowance portion of Income Assistance rates to reflect the actual cost of a nutritious food basket based on family size and composition.

(D) Obesity Strategy Consultation Submission, May 9, 2010

1. Reduce income-related food insecurity in Nova Scotia.

   **Short-term**
   - Establish mechanisms for provincial government departments to work in a coordinated and collaborative way to address food insecurity.
   - Build awareness across Nova Scotia with individuals, communities, organizations and government around issues of income related food insecurity.
   - Support municipal governments and community organizations in implementing local initiatives such as community gardens, farmers’ markets, and community kitchens.
   - Support ongoing participatory food costing research in Nova Scotia.
   - Examine the adequacy of new poverty reduction strategies such as the Affordable Living Tax Credit, Poverty Reduction Tax Credit and increases to Nova Scotia Child Benefit.
   - Examine the adequacy of the current provincially subsidized childcare spaces.
   - Support the implementation of a Universal Services Program to promote affordable power bills and help alleviate energy poverty for low-income Nova Scotia families and individuals.

   **Medium-Long-term**
   - Index the personal allowance portion of Income Assistance rates to reflect the actual cost of: (1) a nutritious food basket based on family size and composition; (2) housing costs; and (3) heating costs.
   - Increase the number of affordable, safe housing units to reflect the number of households living below the low-income cut off.
   - Ensure a living wage through ongoing incremental increases to the provincial minimum wage rate.

---

23 A Universal Service Program supports the implementation of strategies for low-income energy efficiency and affordable housing. For Nova Scotians below the Low-Income Cut-Off (LICO) this would mean receiving a fixed credit to reduce their power bill annually to help ensure that no more than 6% of their income is spent on electricity. (29)
2. **Enhance community food security in Nova Scotia.**

**Short-term**
- Build community capacity and strengthen community engagement and leadership through support for local food literacy and food policy initiatives that communities define for themselves. This might include hands-on education and practical food experiences through community or school-based garden and collective kitchen programs, informal needs-based prenatal nutrition education (including breastfeeding and infant feeding), school and other institutional food policies and programs, and programs that augment or supplement the food budget and improve access to locally produced foods by low-income households such as food box programs and food buying cooperatives.
- Support community engagement in *Activating Change Together for Community Food Security* to contribute to rigorous, valid and reliable community-based data sets on CFS (through participatory community food security assessments and policy analysis).
- Support deliberative dialogues on CFS and policy involving multiple sectors, levels and jurisdictions including industry, individuals experiencing food insecurity and others from diverse backgrounds.

**Medium term**
- Review every *existing* and *new* provincial public policy for its impact on food security.
- Establish accountability framework for examining the impact of new and existing policies that impact community food security.
- Establish mechanisms for provincial government departments to work in a coordinated and collaborative way to address community food security.
- Build awareness across Nova Scotia with individuals, communities, organizations and government around issues of community food insecurity.
Participatory Food Costing Research Project Logic Model

**Ultimate Outcome**: Reduction of nutrition based disparities - Influence policy to support Healthy Eating Nova Scotia

**Date**: June 27, 2008

### Partnerships and Participation
- **Principal investigator**, researchers, administrative staff, and interns and students from a variety of disciplines

### Capacity Building
- **Three Levels**:
  1. Individual (I)
  2. Community (C)
  3. System (S)

### Participatory Food Costing Research Project Logic Model

#### Component
- **Partnerships and Participation**
  - Central Food Costing Coordinator
  - Grocery Stores
  - Project Team
  - Parade Resource Centre/Projects, Women's Centre and other community-based groups throughout Nova Scotia
  - Local coordinators/supporters
  - Universities/Community Colleges
  - Science Foundation Canada
  - Nova Scotia Nutrition Council
  - Community Health Boards
  - District Health Authority
  - Ecology Action Centre
  - Nova Scotia Food Security Network
  - Government

#### Reach
- **Central Food Costing Coordinator**
- **Local coordinators/supporters**
- **Community members who have or are experiencing food insecurity**
- **Researchers**
- **Government**

#### Activities
- **Provide leadership to establish participatory approach**
- **Provide spaces to do food costing**
- **Provide space and support for community members who understand food costing**
- **Provide opportunities for multi-sector collaboration**
- **Provide placement for students**
- **Develop working groups**
- **Establish and maintain an inclusive decision making process**
- **Engage multi-sectoral partners and other departments**
- **Develop training tools**
- **Developing a revised plan for data collection**
- **Transcommunity members who have or are experiencing food insecurity on food costing**
- **Provide leadership, support, and training**
- **FoodCosting**
- **Collect and analyze data**
- **Develop data procedures and analysis tools**
- **Analyze data and write reports**
- **Develop an annual work plan for food costing initiative**
- **Enhance multi-sectoral collaboration (I) (C) (S)**
- **Establish and maintain an inclusive decision making process (I) (C) (S)**
- **Establish leadership within government for the project (I) (C) (S)**

#### Outputs
- **Working groups**
- **Meetings**
- **Data**
- **Dietary**
- **Transportation**
- **Housing**
- **Meetings**
- **Support Central Food Costing Coordinator**
- **Food Costingworking Group Designations**
- **Sub committees**
  - **Documents include minutes of meetings and reports**
  - **Training Guide**
  - **Facilitate Tool the Trainer methods**
  - **Food Costing workshops**
  - **Data**
  - **Evaluation Workshops**
  - **Evaluation Reports**
  - **Annual Work Plan**
  - **Staff and departmental resources for project**

#### Short-Term Outcomes
- **Increased support for food costing**
- **Enhanced partnerships between and among multi-sectors and levels**
- **Improved decision making skills**
- **Enhanced support of multi-sectoral partnerships and participatory**

#### Intermediate Outcomes
- **Enhanced capacity to facilitate community development and population health approach**
- **Increased willingness to partner with communities**
- **Enhanced participation in decision making and among multi-sectors and levels**
- **Increased interdepartmental collaboration**

#### Long-Term Outcomes
- **Increased capacity to identify root causes of food insecurity (I) (C) (S)**
- **Increased leadership skills (I)**
- **Improved facilitation and presentation skills to support collaborative process and multi-food costing (I)**
- **Increased empowerment (I) (C)**
- **Increased knowledge about food and food insecurity (I) (C)**
- **Increased awareness of relationship between food insecurity and population health (I) (C) (S)**
- **Reduced misconceptions of self-blame and victim-blame associated with people earning low income (I) (C) (S)**
- **Increased understanding of public policy impacts on food security (I) (C) (S)**
- **Increased ability to work across a variety of sectors and levels (I) (C) (S)**

---

**Note**: External Factors Influence Outcomes

---

**Appendix D: 2008 PFCP Logic Model**
Participatory Food Costing Research Project Logic Model

**Ultimate Outcome:** Reduction of nutrition based disparities - Influence policy to support Healthy Eating Nova Scotia

**Date:** June 27, 2008

- **Component:** Knowledge Sharing and Uptake
  - Central Food Costing Coordinator
  - Ecology Action Centre
  - Food Costing Working Group
  - Family Resource Centres/Projects
  - NSNC
  - Local community organizations
  - Grocery stores
  - District Health Authorities
  - Health Charities
  - Dept. of Community Services
  - Dept. Agriculture & Fisheries
  - Dept. of Environment
  - Students/Interns
  - Researchers
  - Government(s)

- **Reach:** Activities
  - Enter and analyze data
  - Synthesize data
  - Construct affordability scenarios
  - Establish mechanisms to disseminate information
  - Facilitate a pre-launch planning and preparation for release of food costing data
  - Identify opportunities for further dissemination of information

- **Activities:** Outputs
  - Documents
  - Phone calls
  - Letters
  - Email
  - Key Messages
  - Presentations
  - Newsletter articles
  - Media
  - Websites
  - Community dialogue
  - Radio shows
  - Pre-launch event
  - Flyers
  - Conferences
  - Journal articles
  - Reports
  - Meetings

- **Outputs:** Short-Term Outcomes
  - Improved method of comparison for costing affordability of nutrition food through the regions of NS
  - Increased evidence and awareness of the availability and accessibility of locally produced foods
  - Adoption of Food Costing model by other communities and/or provinces
  - Broad dissemination of process and results of Nova Scotia food costing initiative
  - Increased ability to deliver key messages to media
  - Increased knowledge sharing across multiple levels and sectors

- **Short-Term Outcomes:** Intermediate Outcomes
  - Enhanced capacity to assess affordability of food over time
  - Increased uptake of Food Costing model
  - Increased commitment to use community input in a meaningful and transparent manner
  - Enhanced community action on food security
  - Increased advocacy to address the root causes of food insecurity (e.g., low income)
  - Increased willingness to integrate more conventional forms of expertise with qualitative and quantitative community based research

- **Intermediate Outcomes:** Long-Term Outcomes
  - Generate and share evidence across sectors in order to influence policies and programs to increase people’s access to, and availability of nutritious food.

*Note: External Factors Influence Outcomes*
**Appendix E: Food Costing Partners and Collaborators 2001-2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partners and Collaborators</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2004/05</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Resource Centres</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annapolis Valley Hants Community Action Program for Children (Kids Action Program Annapolis Valley-Hants)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgewater Family Support Centre and Buccaneer Bay/Heritage House Outreach Centre</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Blocks Family Resource Centre</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Breton’s Family Place Resource Centre</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring Connections – Native Council of Nova Scotia</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Resource Centre (Dartmouth) and Dartmouth Family Resource Centre</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digby County Family Resource Centre</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Matters (Annapolis Royal)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing Together</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids First Family Resource Centre (Antigonish/ Pictou)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids First Family Resource Centre (Guysborough)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids First Family Resource Centre (New Glasgow)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street Centre Shelburne</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie’s Place (Amherst)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie’s Place (Truro)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory Lane Family Place (Sackville)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents Place Yarmouth Country Resource Centre</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Link and Wee Bears</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Resource Centre, Halifax</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA’s Place Women’s Centre (Sheet Harbour)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent and Tot Meeting Place Halifax</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen’s County Family Resource Centre</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Partners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic Health Promotion Research Centre</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSVU (FoodARC* formerly PARTC-FS)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis Xavier University (Dept Human Nutrition)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURA : ACT for CFS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nutrition and Dietetics, Acadia University</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NGOs. Networks, associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atlantic Canadian Organic Regional Network</th>
<th>•</th>
<th>•</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Mental Health Association</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester East Hants Branch</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology Action Centre</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulgrave Park Tenancy Association Halifax</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia Advisory Commission on AIDS</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia Food Security Network</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia Fruit Grower Association</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia Nutrition Council</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Government Partners**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nova Scotia Department of Health Promotion and Protection (Department of Health and Wellness – 2010)</th>
<th>•</th>
<th>•</th>
<th></th>
<th>•</th>
<th>•</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia Department of Community Services</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Nations and Inuit Health Branch Atlantic Region</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunenburg Community Health Board</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Services in all District Health Authorities</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Canada, Atlantic Regional Office</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Agency of Canada, Atlantic Regional Office</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Participatory Food Costing Project Staff and Students 2001-2011

Principal Investigator
Patricia Williams (2001-present)

Coordinators
Brenda Thompson, Coordinator (01-03/2002)
Kim Barro, Coordinator (01/2003- 04/2004)
Christine Johnson, dietetic intern, Interim Coordinator (05/2004-07/2005)
Monica Rodriguez, Coordinator (07/2005 - 2007)
Lesley Frank, Provincial Participatory Food Costing Coordinator, MSVU (11/2007-07/2008)
Michelle Florence, Provincial Participatory Food Costing Coordinator, MSVU (08/2008-11/2008)
Cynthia Watt, Provincial Participatory Food Costing Coordinator, MSVU (05/2010-Present)

Research Assistants/Associates and Administrative Support
2002 report:
Eric Hemphill, Research Assistant (2002)
Meredith Kratzmann, Research Assistant (2002)
Tamberly Taylor, Research Assistant, CIHR Health Professional Student Research Award (2002)
Christine Johnson, Research Assistant (2002)
2004/05 report:
Rita MacAulay, Research Assistant
Amy MacDonald, Research Assistant
Denise Russell, Research Assistant
Nadia Stokvis, Research Assistant
2007 report:
Rebecca Green, Research Assistant
2008 report:
Rebecca Green, Research Assistant, MSVU (11/2007-07/2008)
Amanda Rogers, Research and Administrative Assistant, MSVU (01/2009-05/2009)
2010 Report:
Heather Hunter, Part-time Research Associate, MSVU (11/2010-Present)
Ellen McCurry, Part-time Administrative Support, MSVU (04/2010-08/2011)

Consultants
Derek Sarty, Graphic designer (2004-present)
Jan Catano, Plain Language (2004-2006)

Students/ Interns
2002 report:
Christine Johnson, MSVU MScAHN Integrated Dietetic Intern (2002)
Rita MacAulay, MSVU MScAHN Candidate/Integrated Dietetic Intern (2002)
Juanita Caravan, NUTR 4414 Student (2002)
Ussma Ghani, MSVU MScAHN/Integrated Dietetic Intern (2002)
Devin LeBlanc, NUTR 4414 Student (2002)
Amy MacDonald, MSVU Integrated Dietetic Intern, NUTR 4414 Student (2002)
Lindsay Foot, MSVU Integrated Dietetic Intern (2002)
Raylene Kennedy, GAHN 6614 Student (2002)
Anne Lohnes, Acadia University Integrated Dietetic Intern (2002)

2004/05 report:
Rebecca Green, MSVU MScAHN Student/Dietetic Intern
Kristin Joseph, MSVU MScAHN Student/Dietetic Intern

2007 report:
Erica Savage, MScAHN Student/Dietetic Intern
Anneke Vink, MScAHN Student/Dietetic Intern

2008 report:
Sue Conlan, BScAHN Student/Dietetic Intern, MSVU (01/2009-04/2009)
Jessi Fillmore, BScAHN Student/Dietetic Intern, MSVU (04/2008-07/2008)
Lesley Neil, MScAHN Student/Dietetic Intern, MSVU (04/2008-07/2008)

2010 report:
Alyson Branton, MScAHN Student/Dietetic Intern, MSVU (04/2010-08/2010)
Diana Chard, BScAHN Student/Dietetic Intern, MSVU (01/2010-04/2010)
Samantha Cohen, Co-op Student & Honours Student Acadia University (01/2011-04/2012)
Sarah Lake, MScAHN Student/Dietetic Intern, MSVU (04/2010-08/2010)
Hiliary Monteith, BSc Nutrition (Honours), Acadia University (04/2010-08/2011)
Beverly Noseworthy, MScAHN Student, MSVU (05/2009-Present)
Lisa Woodrow, BScAHN Student/Dietetic Intern, MSVU (05/2010-08/2010)
Appendix G: Participatory Food Costing at Regional, National and International Conferences

Regional


National


Pourier, D, Yu V and Williams PL. Pilot Study of Participatory Food Costing Research Methods and Tools in Nova Scotia. Canadian Association for Food Studies Fifth Annual General Meeting, May 27, 2010, Concordia University, Montreal, Quebec, Ont. (Paper)


**International**


Appendix D: Participatory Food Costing Project Materials not Included in this Synthesis Report

During the last decade, other data collection has occurred, but it has not been included as part of this synthesis. For example, early evaluation and project improvement efforts included focus groups with the Nova Scotia Nutrition Council Research Working Group and the Provincial Steering Committee, which were the initial leadership bodies for the PFCP. Later, in (2004/05) consultations and reflection exercised were held with partner organizations and the Food Costing Working Group, which informed Model development. Since the development of the Model, several reflection exercises have taken place including four partnership gatherings held throughout 2009 (2 day meeting June/July in Tatamagouche, 2009 meeting with the Nova Scotia Food Security Network and Food Costing Working Group – facilitated by Lynn Langille, as well as an April Partnership gathering and December 2009 Food Costing Working Group meeting).
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