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Abstract

Shared Measurement Action Team (SMAT) 2.0 was charged with recommending indicators, related to the Food Infrastructure domain in the Minnesota Food Charter, which would aid in monitoring food system changes. SMAT 2.0 had 6 meetings between March 2018 and January 2019. Work accomplishments included drafting a theory of change for Food Infrastructure domain using systems thinking, discussed other state’s food system indicators, barriers and facilitators to statewide monitoring of the food system, and brainstormed a list of indicators and criteria to select Food Infrastructure indicators. Five recommendations emerged for continuation of this work, which include: 1) define a clear purpose and direction; 2) discuss who is missing; 3) have infrastructure to support sustainability; 4) consider financial support and backbone organization; 5) be okay with letting go.
About This Report

The purpose of SMAT 2.0 was to develop a set of recommendations of indicators for report card for Minnesota’s food infrastructure, with input from a group of diverse stakeholders. This report provides background information about the Minnesota Food Charter Network, describes the SMAT 2.0 team’s charge and accomplishments, summarizes meetings, reflects on the SMAT 2.0 process, and presents lessons learned and recommendations for next steps. This report should be used as a tool and resource to inform the process and direction of a team continuing the SMAT 2.0’s work.
Introduction to the Minnesota Food Charter

The Minnesota Food Charter (http://mnfoodcharter.com/) is a roadmap to healthy, safe, and affordable food for all Minnesotans. It was developed through a broad-based public process, in which thousands of Minnesotans provided input. See Figure 1 for a review of the input process.

As a result of this robust input process, five themes emerged as challenges to accessing healthy, safe, and affordable food in Minnesota: Food Affordability, Food Availability, Food Accessibility, Food Skills, and Food Infrastructure. The Minnesota Food Charter defines each theme as follows:
Food Affordability:
People can buy most or all of the healthy foods they want with the money they have available.  

Food Availability:
There are an adequate number of convenient food sources, offering a sufficient number and variety of healthy options in a community.

Food Accessibility:
Sources for healthy food are easy to get to at a manageable distance from home or work, using affordable and convenient personal or public transportation.

Food Skills:
Growing food; planning, selecting, and budgeting for healthy food; preparing safe, healthy food from scratch; trying new foods; and understanding the food system, including agriculture and cultural dimensions of food.

Food Infrastructure:
Food infrastructure is the underlying physical, policy, and organizational structure needed for our food supply’s operation, services, and facilities.

Food Environment:
This is not one of the emergent themes documented in the Minnesota Food Charter, but is a term used to collectively refer to the themes of Food Affordability, Food Availability, and Food Accessibility. These three themes are what create the conditions for consumers to purchase food.

Within each theme, this report describes challenges faced by Minnesotans and strategies to tackle these challenges. Many of the challenges described emphasize the cultural and structural barriers and inequities that Minnesotans face on a daily basis. Proposed strategies focus on changing policies, systems, and environments supporting the Minnesota food system infrastructure, as well as increasing food skills of Minnesotans.

The Minnesota Food Charter Health Equity Guide takes the challenges described in the Minnesota Food Charter deeper, raising to the surface the structural barriers that are the root causes of lack of access to healthy, safe, and affordable food, including income, transportation, housing, language, and illness. Further evidence for these challenges can be found in the Minnesota Department of Health’s 2014 Legislative Report, entitled Advancing Health Equity in Minnesota. This report describes how in Minnesota, people of color and American Indians, people with disabilities, people living in poverty, members of the LGBTQ community, and people who have disabilities have less opportunity for health,

---

less access to healthy, safe, and affordable food, and experience worse health outcomes. Food can also be a unifying change agent to advance health equity in communities. In the Minnesota Food Charter Health Equity Guide, Vayong Moua, Health Equity Advocacy Director at the Center for Prevention at Blue Cross Blue Shield of Minnesota, notes, “For coalitions and organizations striving to advance health equity, food can be a unifier, and a powerful way to make change.”

Minnesota Food Charter Network: Shared Measurement Action Team (SMAT) 2.0

The Minnesota Food Charter Network is the connections between people, organizations, and communities that support and implement the food charter strategies. It was created in tandem with the Minnesota Food Charter. The Network’s work is guided by the input from local communities implementing the strategies within the community as well as action teams focused on achieving the Minnesota Food Charter’s vision of providing healthy, safe, and affordable food where people live, work, learn, and play. Action teams are teams focused on advancing specific aspects of the Minnesota Food Charter. The Shared Measurement Action Team (SMAT) is one such Action Team, which is focused on providing leadership and guidance around developing a report card to monitor the changes in the Minnesota Food System. SMAT 1.0 focused on developing indicators for the Accessibility, Availability, and Affordability domains of the Minnesota Food Charter. For a summary of SMAT 1.0, see http://mnfoodcharter.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/SMAT_1.0_RECOMMENDATIONS-4.pdf. SMAT 2.0 was a continuation of 1.0, with a focus on developing indicators for the Food Infrastructure domain.

Unlike the SMAT 1.0’s preliminary recommendations (see Appendix 1 for a summary of SMAT 1.0 Meetings and preliminary recommendations report), this paper does not present preliminary recommendations of indicators to measure the food infrastructure domain, as SMAT 2.0 only brainstormed a list of indicators. See Recommendations & Lessons Learned section for more information about factors contributing to why SMAT 2.0 did not recommend indicators.
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SMAT 2.0 Charge & Accomplishments

Charge:
To recommend indicators, related to the Food Infrastructure domain in the Minnesota Food Charter, to monitor food system changes

Accomplishments:
Between March 2018 to 2019, SMAT 2.0 held 6 meetings. The accomplishment of these meetings included:

- On boarded 4 new members, for a total of 10 members
- Revised the draft Theory of Change to better visualize Food Infrastructure (see Meeting 3, page 11)
  - Presented the revised Theory of Change at the Place Based Food Systems conference in Vancouver, CA (August 9-10, 2018).
- Discussed using a systems thinking framework for the theory of change for food infrastructure
- Identified lack of measurement tools and available data aimed at food system structural racism, bias and inequity and discussed potential measures to bridge gap
- Reviewed others state’s food systems indicators
- Reviewed the Healthy Food, Healthy Lives Indicators
  - Met with the creators of these indicators
- Brainstormed a list of indicators for each of the subdomains of the Food Infrastructure Domain
  - Decided on 3 gate criteria to select Food Infrastructure indicators

Summary of Meetings
Below is a summary of the six SMAT 2.0 meetings, along with a meeting between two of the SMAT 2.0 members and 2 individuals who worked on the State Level Food Indicators. See Appendix 2 for the Google Drive Folder with Meeting Notes & Materials.

Meeting 1: March 23, 2018

Objective:
- Team building, reviewing the SMAT 1.0 work, and discussing the charge of SMAT 2.0.

Attendance:
9 people
Summary:
Team members learned about each other’s backgrounds and interest in food system work. Meeting expectations and ground rules were discussed. Past team members shared their experience with SMAT 1.0. Had a robust discussion about food system inequity and brainstormed about measurement challenges and opportunities in this regard.

Meeting 2: May 11, 2018

Objective:
Continue team building and discussing the specific fit of food infrastructure layer in the draft theory of change developed in SMAT 1.0 to SMAT 2.0

Attendance:
9 people

Summary:
The Team divided into 3 groups to discuss what they think about the theory of change for food infrastructure and then each team presented their discussion. At the end of the meeting, five people agreed to meet and combine each group’s proposed theory of change.

Discussion topics included:
- Indicator definition
  - Are indicators outcomes, process measures, or strategies? Can they be all of those?
- Level of indicator to use
  - State, regional, county, city, neighborhood
- The process of developing a theory of change and assumptions inherent in the theory of change
- Systems thinking
- Levers of change to impact the food system
- Equity

Meeting 3: June 20, 2018

Objective:
- Combine the theories of change developed in meeting 2

Attendance:
5 people
Summary:
We compared and contrasted the three theories of changed and discussed the intricacies of the food system.

Discussed topics included:
- Defining food infrastructure and food system
- Systems thinking
- Assumptions and constraints implicit to the theory of change
- Values and goals we want to incorporate into the food system.

Based on a systems thinking model, the image below is the image of the developed theory of change model based on systems thinking.

Meeting 4: August 24, 2018

Objective:
- Present models of monitoring the food system and the theory of change developed in meeting 3
- Brainstorming of food infrastructure indicators based on the theory of change

Attendance:
10 people
Summary:
Various models of measuring the food system were presented, including other states and organizations. See Appendix 3 for this presentation. The theory of change developed in meeting 3 was also presented and discussed. The scope and charge of the SMAT 2.0’s work was revisited and clarified. The team divided into groups of 2 and each team took at least 1 subdomain of the Food Infrastructure domain in the Minnesota Food Charter and brainstormed potential indicators. A list of potential data sources to use is in Appendix 4 and for examples of brainstormed ideas, see Appendix 5 for Proposed Indicators for a Sustainable Food System.

Meeting 5: November 16, 2018

Objective:
- Discuss the Healthy Food, Healthy Lives Institute State Level Food System Indicators\(^8\) and how model aligns with the SMAT 2.0’s model

Attendance:
6 people

Summary:
Team members discussed how the Healthy Food, Healthy Live Institute’s indicators fit with SMAT 2.0’s model and brainstormed indicators that fit into the subdomains of Food Infrastructure. A Google Spreadsheet was started that had a tab for the other models presented in Meeting 4, potential data sources, as well a tab for each subdomain of the Food Infrastructure domain, to be populated with potential indicators.

Using the Robert Wood Johnson’s Vision to Action Report\(^9\), the following were described for each indicator:
- Population/unit of analysis
- Rationale
- Data source
- Accessing the data source
- Collection/creation data
- Years of data
- Ability to monitor change
- Cost of data
- Communication value

---

\(^8\) [https://www.hfhl.umn.edu/research/food-system-indicators](https://www.hfhl.umn.edu/research/food-system-indicators)

November 30, 2018

*Note: this was not a SMAT 2.0 team meeting, rather a meeting to inform SMAT 2.0 work.*

Two team members (Amy and Liana) met with Hikaru Peterson and Gigi DiGiacomogi, from the Department of Applied Economics at the University of Minnesota, to discuss the development of the [State Level Food System Indicators](#). They indicated that the development of these indicators was a very resource intensive project, including funding and time. At the time of the meeting, they were uncertain of the future funding of that work. See Appendix 6 for the 2012 Minnesota Food System Indicator Report.

**Meeting 6: January 25, 2019**

**Objective:**
- Develop 3 gate criteria to select individual level indicators
- Brainstorm indicators for the subcategories of the Food Infrastructure domain

**Attendance:** 6 people

**Summary:**
We developed the 3 gate criteria to put the proposed food infrastructure indicators through. We understood that not all criteria will pass through all three, so we would have a mix of indicators from a variety of levels.

**3 Gate Criteria:**
- **Which ones should we use as our 1st level gate?** All indicators should pass this first gate.
  - State level data
  - Align with theory of change and MN Food Charter strategies

1. **Which ones should be our 2nd level gate?** Some indicators will pass through this gate.
   - Accessibility of data
   - More specific than state data, for example county or neighborhood
   - Disaggregation of data
   - Ability to monitor change
     - Is it valid or not?
     - Is data collected periodically?
     - How sensitive is it between data collection periods?

- **Which ones should be our 3rd level gate?** Few indicators will pass through this gate.
  - Longevity of data source
  - Relevant to many areas
We also discussed developing 2 levels of recommendations - one level of recommendations assuming the team has resources and staff time to collect, manage, and analyze information. The other set of recommendations assuming limited resources and staff time is available.

Additionally, we continued to brainstorm indicators for the Food Infrastructure domain. The conversation revolved around the subdomains of “Agriculture & Food Research & Technology”, “Food Labeling, Regulations, & Marketing”, and “Influence and Decision Making” and the feasibility and usefulness of using various indicators. A frequent comment in this meeting as that we needed expert opinion or team members with different expertise to inform decision making about indicators, as the team knowledge was limited in this domain. We also discussed that having a grant to fund this work, would facilitate the work moving forward. See Appendix 7 for funding ideas.

Recommenndations & Lessons Learned

After the January 2019 meeting and through phone calls with all team members, the team collectively decided to suspend its work. The following recommendations and lessons learned describe what contributed to the ending of SMAT 2.0 and points to consider if this work were to continue in the future.

1. Define a Clear Purpose & Direction

SMAT originated out of the Minnesota Food Charter Network’s desire to develop a shared measurement system. The SMAT 2.0 was tasked to develop a shared measurement system to monitor the changes in food infrastructure related to the Minnesota Food Charter. It seemed like SMAT 2.0 members interpreted this charge differently, resulting in team members having differing ideas of the work’s outcome. These outlook differences, may have contributed to difficulties in focusing work.

Additionally, food infrastructure is a large, complex system, with many diverse, interconnected players. The Minnesota Food Charter defines the food infrastructure is the underlying physical, policy, and organizational structure needed for our food supply’s operation, services, and facilities. The concept of food infrastructure is a complex concept to fully comprehend, and difficult to consider all at one time. The team continually grappled about the appropriate audiences, and the geographic level of Food Infrastructure to prioritize. For example, meaningful indicators for food accessibility would be different comparing the perspectives of a Minnesota resident (who may want to know the number all food outlets are in their neighborhood) and a county commissioner (who may want the number grocery stores are located in the county). These continual discussions may have hindered the work because team members were attempting to find indicators appeal to a diverse set of audiences, such as farmers, policy makers, and community members, as well as indicators on a diversity of geographic levels of Food Infrastructure. Thus, having a more limited scope for this work could have been helpful.

Lesson Learned

- Define a clear purpose.
- Decide on a define scope of work, instead of trying to tackle everything
- Determine the work’s audience to continue to clarify purpose and direction

2. Discuss Who’s Missing

The SMAT 2.0 included a diversity of sectors (non-profit, for-profit, and community organizations, academia, and government), yet lacked key perspectives needed to understand the food infrastructure of Minnesota. SMAT 2.0 did not have representation from agriculture, manufacturing, food processing, or distribution sectors. These sectors are key players in the food infrastructure of Minnesota. Without these voices at the meetings, the team felt that they were unable to make meaningful, strong recommendations regarding food infrastructure indicators.

Lesson Learned

- Assess who is missing from meetings and determine if the task can be accomplished with the current team’s skill set and the sectors represented

3. Have Infrastructure to Support Sustainability

There was a lack of a secure infrastructure to support this work. All team members volunteered their time and could not devote much, if any, time outside of structured meeting time to continue SMAT work. Although some limited funds were available to provide meeting snacks and travel/parking reimbursements, all meeting time was in-kind support. Additionally, having meetings with diverse stakeholders is crucial to produce robust, meaningful outcomes, yet there are logical challenges to meeting. Coordinating 10 diverse schedules, in which some members had to travel over 200 miles, was challenging, so not all SMAT members could attend all meetings. This meant that we dedicated a portion of each meeting to review the contents of last meeting to get everyone on the same page. Consequentially, it was tough to move work forward when different people were coming to different meetings and without dedicated paid staff time.

The meeting location also changed every time to accommodate the travelling distance of members; yet this also posed a technology challenge because each meeting, we would spend about 30 minutes or more setting up technology to allow for remote members to fully participate. Technology did not always properly function, which resulted in remote and in-person participants not being able to fully engage with and learn from each other, and contributed to hindering the work.

Lesson Learned

- Provide incentives to participate
- Consider having a backbone organization to provide resources and staff time
- Test out the technology equipment before the meeting to make it easy for all participants to attend and participate.
• Provide meeting facility, with stable technology, funded by network or by a backbone organization.

4. Consider Financial Support and Backbone Organization

There were no dedicated funds or staff to support building and maintenance of an online system to display the indicators recommended by SMAT. During SMAT 1.0, a grant was submitted to support the work of the SMAT, but this grant was not awarded. After this time, no members of the SMAT or of the Minnesota Food Charter Network were actively seeking funds to support this work. The absence of current or potential future financial support furthered uncertainty around the value, purpose, and sustainability of the SMAT’s work.

Last but not least, the infrastructure of the Minnesota Food Charter Network was nebulous. This was intentional, as true network design doesn’t have a central backbone organization to organize and facilitate work. Instead, a true network design has no backbone organization, but instead has multiple organizations working together to accomplish similar work, without one organization taking the lead. This had implications for SMAT work, as previously mentioned, as the Food Charter Network wasn’t a sustainably funded organization with dedicated staff to move this work forward. Also meant that once SMAT accomplished our task, there was infrastructure for the work to be sustained.

Lesson Learned

• Despite enthusiasm, financial support is necessary in order to advance theoretical discussions into sustainable action.
• A backbone organization to facilitate and lead the Minnesota Food Charter Network, as well as a paid staff, dedicated to SMAT, may have created a more sustainable environment for SMAT work to thrive.
• Without a supportive, sustainable infrastructure, it is important to design a resilient system that can operate with change in support, funding, and organizational structure.

5. Be Okay with Letting Go

After the January 2019 meeting, the co-leaders had a conversation about the progress of the group, discussing frustration with the lack of clear direction, the lack of resources and infrastructure to support the work, as well as discussing broadening membership to individuals with content expertise in food infrastructure work. While each SMAT 2.0 meeting contained lots of energy and excitement to progress with this work, these barriers continued to prevent progressive steps forward and contributed to circular steps. They concluded that it was time to let go of the work and dissolve the group.

This conversation resulted in the co-leaders having 1-on-1 conversations with each team member, asking them their opinions about SMAT 2.0’s progress and summarized their previous conversation. All team members had similar opinions about roadblocks preventing forward progress and expressed the desire to step meeting.

Road blocks include the previous mentioned difficulties, such as lack of:
• A clear purpose and direction
• Food infrastructure expertise on the team
• Supportive, sustainable infrastructure, including funding, resources, dedicated staff time
• Consistent functional technology
• Certainty of the sustainability of the work

After all conversations were completed, the co-leaders summarized the conversations in an email to all SMAT 2.0 members and indicated that SMAT 2.0 was ending. They were all invited to a SMAT 2.0 celebration, to celebrate their accomplishments and time together.

Lesson Learned
• Take time to reflect about the process
• Talk with team members about how they view work progress

Conclusion and Next Steps

The SMAT 2.0 had 10 enthusiastic team members, dedicated to creating a report card to monitor the Minnesota’s food system. Despite the barriers experienced to trying to accomplish this goal, the team had rich discussions and built interagency relationships that they can leverage as they and their organizations continue to improve the food system.

One aspect that was clear throughout both SMAT 1.0 and 2.0, is that the food system contributes to many health disparities and that future discussions around Minnesota food system metrics should use a health equity lens to advance this work. SMAT 1.0’s report (see Appendix 1) reflected the current state of the evaluation in measuring food systems, while also attempting to uncover health inequities and highlight community assets. Those preliminary recommendations represent an attempt to uncover metrics that describe the state of the food system in Minnesota. They can serve as a springboard for discussion and should be refined over time as indicators advancing health equity in the food system are developed.

SMAT 2.0 discussed the importance of using asset based indicators, instead of deficit based indicators. Using a deficit lens to capture health inequities can perpetuate inequities and the importance of including community assets and strengths, such as community member empowerment and leadership, in measurement conversations. Deficit based indicators highlight what is lacking, instead of highlighting strengths and opportunities. For example, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health’s Center for a Livable Future and the Baltimore Food Policy Initiative used “Healthy Food Priority Areas” instead of “Food Deserts” in a report about food availability. Community input led them to make this change because the “food desert” can elicit the idea that low healthy food access is naturally occurring, rather than an outcome of underlying structural inequities. Furthermore, “food desert” areas may be home to vibrant, passionate communities with programming that provides healthy food and residents who travel outside of their
neighborhood to obtain healthy food.\textsuperscript{11} See Appendix 8 for Structural Racism in the Food System Resources, which includes suggests metrics.

Currently in Minnesota, there is no statewide data system that captures community assets and strengths. The State Level Food System Indicators is a start on this data system, using secondary data sources. One avenue to continue SMAT 2.0 work is to help to secure funding for their work, and partner with this team to further develop these indicators. The ideal monitoring system would incorporate indicators that capture health inequities along with community assets. This gap represents an opportunity for future exploration and development by food system researchers and the field of public health more broadly.

Appendixes

Appendix 1: Brief Summary of SMAT 1.0 Meetings & Link to Final Report

Meeting 1: August 30, 2016
Discussed the charge of the Shared Measurement Action Team. Build relationships with team members. Discussed term commitment.

- **Charge**: Develop indicators that measure success of the 5 domains of the Minnesota Food Charter
  - This is not network analysis, measuring the success of the Minnesota Food Charter Network
  - We will focus on what it means to be success of the 5 food charter domains: affordability, accessibility, availability, skills, and infrastructure
- **Commitment**: Term is until June 30th 2017, approximately 3-5 hours per month

Meeting 2: September 13, 2016
Continued to define our charge. Reviewed the CDC Evaluation framework (https://www.cdc.gov/eval/framework/index.htm). Discussed what products are going to be created, the main audiences, and stakeholder engagement. Developed a meeting map.

Meeting 3: October 10, 2016
Discussed theory of change for each of the 5 domains of the food charter and the accountability. Focused specifically on food access, food affordability, food availability.

Meeting 4: December 12, 2016

Meeting 5: February 17, 2017
Continued discussion about selection of measurement indicators, focusing on affordability, accessibility, and availability. Decided to propose holding off on developing indicators for food skills, since Healthy Food, Healthy Lives is developing a Food Skills Tool.
Meeting 6: March 24, 2017
Continued discussion of the boundaries of accomplishing our charge of “developing indicators that measure success of the 5 domains of the Minnesota Food Charter.” Decided that we will discuss infrastructure of measuring the indicators after we have developed the indicators. Started a conversation about connecting the network evaluation with the shared measurement team evaluation and how to measure strategy implementation.

Meeting 7: April 14, 2017
Had a working meeting, digging into food access, food availability, food affordability domain indicators.

Meeting 8: May 19, 2017
Discussed SMAT infrastructure recommendations including platform, personnel, and process/content areas. Made decisions modifying the Theory of Change to simply it, modifying food access, community nutrition environment, and consumer nutrition environment. Agreed that we would make our recommendations by September 1st, 2017.

Meeting 9: August 30, 2017
Changed the overall domain from “Food Access” to “Food Environment”. Decided that we would have stretch indicators. Discussed limitations of the data, in terms of sensitivity, frequency of secondary data collection, baseline measurements, and potential unintended consequences of using certain indicators. Continued discussions of Food Access and Food Availability (the Community Nutrition Environment and the Consumer Nutrition Environment). Did not get to Food Affordability. Had presentation by Bill Barberg of InsightFormation.

Meeting 10: October 13, 2017
Continued discussion of Food Access and Food Availability indicators. Discussed Food Affordability indicators. Discussed writing up and reporting the indicator recommendations.
SMAT 1.0 Preliminary Recommendations

Double click to open PDF document in a new window or click here to open an electronic version

Minnesota Food Charter Network Shared Measurement Action Team
Phase 1 Working Paper: Preliminary Recommendations & Next Steps: Spring 2018
Appendix 2: Google Drive Folder with Meeting Notes & Materials

The hyperlink below contains all of the meeting materials and notes for the work of SMAT 2.0. https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B7trmEdf8D2uemdZTXloV0RpY0U
Appendix 3: Models of Different Food System Metrics

Double click to open PowerPoint document

Other States Food Monitoring Systems

Created and Presented by: Liana Schreiber
August 24, 2018
Appendix 4: Potential Data Sources

The following are data sources that SMAT 2.0 discussed. These do not represent all of the possible data sources that could be used, but are a starting point to explore.

- USDA Data:
  - Census of Agriculture
  - Agriculture Marketing Service
  - Economic Research Service
  - Farm to School Census
- Minnesota Food System Indicator Data (from: Healthy Food, Healthy Lives Institute)
- Minnesota Compass
- Minnesota Department of Education
- IOM Food Systems Evaluation Framework
- Healthy Food Policy Project
- Feeding America
Appendix 5: Proposed Indicators for a Sustainable Food System

The “Proposed Indicators for Sustainable Food Systems”\(^{12}\) describes indicators for 22 food system and provides details around the indicator selection process and specifics of each indicator. This document also proposes Supplemental Indicators, “Wish List” Indicators, Cross-Cutting Indicators. This 121 page document can help guide teams moving SMAT 2.0’s work forward.

Double click on image below to open a PDF in a new window of this document or click here for an electronic version.
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Appendix 6: 2012 Minnesota Food System Indicator Report

https://www.hfhl.umn.edu/research/food-system-indicators/food-system-indicators-facts-sheets
Appendix 7: Potential Funding Opportunities

The following are websites to explore for potential funding opportunities.

- Acara
  - [http://environment.umn.edu/leadership/acara/](http://environment.umn.edu/leadership/acara/)
- Blue Cross Blue Shield, Center for Prevention
- Bush Foundation
  - [https://www.bushfoundation.org/](https://www.bushfoundation.org/)
- Foundation for Food and Agriculture Research
  - [https://foundationfar.org/grants/](https://foundationfar.org/grants/)
- Grow North
  - [https://www.grownorthmn.com/](https://www.grownorthmn.com/)
- John Hopkins, Center for Livable Future: Food Policy Networks
- Impact Investing
  - [https://www.cogentconsulting.net/ecosystem/](https://www.cogentconsulting.net/ecosystem/)
- McKnight Foundation
  - [https://www.mcknight.org/grants/for-grant-seekers/](https://www.mcknight.org/grants/for-grant-seekers/)
Appendix 8: Structural Racism in the Food System Resources

Measuring Racial Equity in the Food System: Established and Suggested Metrics
https://www.canr.msu.edu/resources/measuring-racial-equity-in-the-food-system

An Annotated Bibliography on Structural Racism Present in the U.S. Food System, Sixth Edition
https://www.canr.msu.edu/resources/structural_racism_in_us_food_system

Double click on image below to open a PDF in a new window of this document.