

DIVING INTO THE SURVEY DATA






FROM CRITERIA TO PRIORITIES: AVERAGE COMPOSITE SCORING

- Non-negotiable, the criteria must be on the final list = 4 points
- Highly important, I recommend inclusion = 3 points
- Slightly, important, open to discussion = 2 points
- Inclusion does not matter to me = 1 point

For each criteria, we calculated a composite score on a 1 to 4 point scale. Scores that are closest to 4 are of utmost importance to the average respondent, while and scores closer to 1 are of lesser importance. The total number of respondents was N = 25.





Rank	Criteria	Average Score
1	Community engagement	3.84
2	Diverse membership	3.68
3	Inclusive membership structure	3.64
4	Ensures culturally-appropriate accessibility to resources and information	3.44
5	Ensures consistent funding to support community-led ideas/solutions/innovations	3.4
6	Able to influence policymakers and therefore local policies and regulation related to food	3.36
7	Addresses food sovereignty	3.36
8	Strengthens local food economy	3.36
9	Assess the current status of food (in)security on a regular basis	3.32
10	Autonomy over decision making	3.28
11	Reduces silos across city agencies	3.2
12	Addresses food sourcing and worker's rights	3.2
13	Addresses the dignity of the food shopping and acquisition process	3.16
14	Convenes stakeholders	3.16
15	Leverages potential synergies between cross-sector programs/opportunities	3.12



Rank	Criteria	Average Score
16	Financial sustainability/independence	3.08
17	Evaluates the impacts of City-funded solutions on the broader food system	3.08
18	Reduces silos across non-city entities	3.04
19	Connection to local power structures and institutions	3
20	Administrative feasibility	2.96
21	Political feasibility	2.88
22	Promotes urban agriculture and supports local food production	2.88
23	Close connection to local government	2.84
24	Engages with broader power structures and institutions	2.8
25	Addresses emerging issues rapidly and nimbly	2.76
26	Manages and distributes funding for community-led food innovations/solutions	2.6
27	Coordinates pre-disaster emergency food planning with CBOs and city agencies	2.48
28	Oversees food-related programs	2.44

Community Engagement



- Inclusion does n..
- Slightly importa..
- Highly important..
- Non-negotiable, ..


Reduces silos across city agencies




Autonomy over decision making



Financial sustainability/independence



Close connection to local govt



Connection to local power structures and institutions



- Inclusion does n..
- Slightly importa..
- Highly important..
- Non-negotiable, ..

Engages with broader power structures




Able to influence policymakers



Administrative feasibility



Political feasibility



Address food sovereignty



Slightly importa..
Highly important..
Non-negotiable, ..

Assess the curent status of food (in)security on regular basis



Addresses food sourcing and worker's rights



Strengthens the local food economy




Diverse membership



Inclusive membership structure



Promotes urban agriculture and supports local food production




Addresses the dignity of the food shopping and acquisition process



Coordinates pre-disaster emergency food planning with CBOs and city agencies



Addresses emerging issues rapidly and nimbly



Ensures consistent funding to support community-led ideas/solutions/innovations



- Inclusion does n..
- Slightly importa..
- Highly important..
- Non-negotiable, ..

Evaluates the impacts of City-funded solutions on the broader food system



Leverages potential synergies between cross-sector programs/opportunities



Convenes stakeholders




Ensures culturally-appropriate accessibility to resources and information



Manages and distributes funding for community-led food innovations/solutions



Reduces silos across non-city entities



Oversees food-related programs



DISCUSSION



**THANK
YOU**

