



FINAL REPORT

Executive Summary

CUNY SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH



AGGREGATED FINDINGS

The Commitment to Healthy Communities (CHC) project developed a framework which allowed for the assessment of companies' community-based healthy, active living portfolios at a corporate, program and community level. It was developed in an academic research partnership between Healthy Weight Commitment Foundation and CUNY School of Public Health in 2015. In 2016, 11 food and beverage companies participated in this project in different ways.

Participated in CHC	11 companies, 38 programs
Participated in the full assessment and audit of their responses	9 companies, 31 programs
Participated in the community assessment	5 companies, 5 programs

The results of the CHC year one assessment show progress, promise and the need for continued work. In one year, 11 participating companies:

- Invested **\$30,528,000** in community health, wellness and hunger programs
- Donated **55,500** employee volunteer hours
- Partnered with nearly **700** not-for-profit organizations
- Provided marketing and media **support**
- Donated **54 million** pounds of fresh food and **420 million** total servings of food
- Facilitated **1,600,000** hours of physical activity
- Reached **34,700 schools** and **11,200,000 people** with health and wellness tools and information

The scores varied, with company scores ranging from 27% to 69% (average of 53%) and program scores ranging from 21% to 91% (average of 56%). Given the wide range of approaches to these issues and varying levels of investment, individual scores were predictably varied.

The programs assessed had common themes:

- Most of the programs that companies had developed or supported involved collaboration with multiple partners in the community.
- Most programs had originally been developed by a not-for-profit organization before the company's engagement in the program. Only one company exclusively designed and implemented its own programs and did not collaborate with other organizations in their design.
- All companies provided cash to fund the programs; 40% also provided employee volunteer resources and about 35% also provided in-kind donations of company products.
- 45% of the programs had a national reach.
- Many of the programs focused particularly on children and young people between 6 and 18 years old. Those least targeted were people aged over 65 years, the disabled and veterans.

- The two most commonly offered activities were nutrition and health education as well as physical activity. About 22% focused on food access while 33% made direct provision of meals.
- Greater corporate financial investment generally aligned with higher scores.

Company Assessment	Range of companies' scores	Average of companies' scores
Design, objectives and strategy	18% - 83%	60%
Governance and management	26% - 89%	64%
Reporting, communication and stakeholder engagement	27% - 89%	63%
Monitoring and evaluation	21% - 60%	40%

- Management of corporate strategies are generally well designed and well run, with room for improvement. Companies with less established approaches would benefit greatly from the leadership of those organizations with more developed ones.
- In order to generate the intended benefits to participants and beneficiaries, and ensure that companies' investments are as impactful as possible, all participating companies should devote more attention and resources to monitoring how effectively they deliver their strategies and evaluate their results.

Program Assessment	Range of programs' scores	Average of programs' scores
Design, objectives and strategy	27% - 89%	60%
Governance and management	17% - 95%	65%
Reporting, communication and stakeholder engagement	11% - 98%	62%
Monitoring and evaluation	11% - 90%	47%

- Companies should evaluate individual programs to determine whether they will continue to support those which may not meet their goals.
- As at the corporate level, it is important to set targets and measure achievements to ensure impact.

Community Assessment

Five companies submitted one program each for assessment within the community. This allowed the stakeholders outside the company to provide insight into the value, reach and effectiveness of the program. These scores were then compared to the individual Program Scores to provide additional insight. Program scores diverged from community scores in both positive and negative results and, as a result, additional analysis was performed. Some examples follow:

- In one case the Program Score was much higher than the Community Score. This implies that this initiative, which appears to have tremendous promise, is encountering obstacles in its implementation. It is likely that the environment where the program was delivered was particularly challenging and/or the target population might be resistant.

- In another case the Community Score was much higher than the Program Score. This implies that the initiative was delivered with no significant obstacles, reached a welcoming community and received the support of strong and willing partners. Indeed, the fact that the community assessment score was significantly higher than the weighted program survey score indicates that local partners were providing robust and well-organized support and that there was an open and efficient channel of communication between the company and stakeholders on the ground.
- One program had perfect alignment between its Program Score and its Community Score. This alignment shows that the program was in line with the company's strategy and was being delivered as intended. The community assessment showed different positive aspects of the initiative. Overall, the initiative was well designed and goals were thoughtfully defined. Furthermore, there is evidence that the initiative reached a welcoming community with the support of strong and willing partners.

Conclusions

The industry can be satisfied that they run community programs in a meaningful and impactful manner. However, there is room for improvement in all areas. Most significantly, the monitoring and evaluation of company-wide efforts and programs can be enhanced to ensure that investments are producing the desired results. With the variability of scores, companies may choose to shift resources to better align with their desired outcomes. Additionally, there is opportunity for information, best practice sharing and collaboration to improve the impact the food and beverage companies have in their communities.