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1.0 Executive Summary

Over recent decades organizations worldwide in the private, public and government sectors have been researching and building strategic processes to measure and track the impacts of their Corporate Community Investments (CCIs). This research paper investigates and compares different outcome-based models and provides a consolidation of leading global examples of the preferred methods of measuring CCI impact. The specific research question investigated in this report is: How have outcome-based measurement models been used and researched to date, and specifically how have outcome-based Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) been used and integrated into Corporate Community Investment?

In addressing this research question I collected a consolidation of the leading global examples of CCI projects, which used outcome-based measurement models, to better understand the application of outcome-based KPIs. I have also created a database of different examples of outcome-based KPIs in five different impact subgroups, including: environmental, health, disaster risk prevention, training/education, and human rights. Methods used in this report include both an extensive academic and grey literature review and case study evaluations.

Through this research I am able to make several conclusions: first, that when it comes to measuring impact of corporate community investment, outcome-based KPIs are both the most effective and comprehensive; second, that there is a growing trend of corporations who are using outcome based measurement models to track their community investments, due to their efficiency; and third, that there is a lot of written work and analysis on this topic but not a lot of consistency in presentation style, as it applies to language and layout, which may confuse those looking to implement outcome-based models.

It is my recommendation, for organizations looking to monitor the performance of their community investment ventures, that outcome-based measurement models are implemented – with specific emphasis upon logic models and outcome-based KPIs. For further information on these topics I would recommend also consulting these specific references: (Corporate Citizenship, 2014) (Parmenter, 2010) (United Way, 1996) (Penna R. M., 2011) (W. K. Kellogg Foundation, 2006) (Weston, Sept, & Naylor, 2011).
2.0 Introduction

Across every sector, all organizations engage in investment activities that create impacts which affect surrounding communities. Corporate community investment (CCI) is a major part of corporate social responsibility (CSR). Whereas broader CSR and sustainability activities are categorized as part of the core business activities of a socially responsible company, CCI is a “...specific voluntary engagement with charitable organizations or activities that extends beyond companies’ core business activities...” (Corporate Citizenship, 2014). CSR can be thought of as a large umbrella that includes many types of investment which is made by corporations; CCI falls under this umbrella.

While measuring the effectiveness and impacts of a CCI venture, corporations may implement different measurement models. The intent of the program or investment plays a major part in which measurement model is selected, this is because each model is specifically designed to report on different functioning qualities of the program or investment venture.

Throughout this report a basic understanding of the differences between what constitutes inputs, outputs and outcomes, as they apply to performance evaluation, will be necessary. Therefore, next I will provide a brief overview of each, with reference

Quick Definitions

**Corporate Community Investment**

Businesses’ voluntary engagement with charitable organizations or activities that extends beyond their core business activities. Different terms include: Social investment, CSR programs, philanthropy, company giving, social programs, strategic philanthropy are just a few.

**Inputs**

The resources that a company provides to support a community activity or activities. Contributions include: Cash; time; in-kind contributions of product, property or services; management costs. The combined cash value of all these equals to total cost of community investment.

**Outputs**

Are what happens as a result of the resources that a company commits to a community activity. Can include: people reached, organizations supported, activities delivered and funds raised as a result of the contributions made.

(Corporate Citizenship, 2014)
Inputs can be understood as the resources that a company provides to support a community activity or activities. In other words, the measurable resources that have been dedicated, by the investing company, to aid and/or accomplish venture completion. Examples of inputs can be located in the sidebar of the previous page. Outputs, on the other hand, are what happens as a result of the resources that a company commits to a community activity. Simply put, these are the products of the direct corporate investment made into a program/venture. Examples can be viewed in the sidebar on the previous page. It is important to note that outputs are not an assessment of the activity’s effectiveness, quality or value to either the community or the business. Those characteristics are more akin to outcomes, which can be understood as the changes that happen to individuals, organizations and the company, in the short or long-term, as a result of the activity.

Indicators can be defined at each level to monitor CCI goals; however, only outcome-based indicators, not input and output-based indicators, provide monitoring data which show the impact or effectiveness of a CCI program or venture.
3.0 Methods

I have engaged in an extensive academic literature review to consolidate a comprehensive summary of the current prominence and depth of research which is focused on outcome-based KPIs within CCI. I have referred to a variety of different resources, including: journal articles, company reports, guidance manuals, and other such scholarly works. All of which have helped me in obtaining a broad understanding of KPIs and their use within CCI. To accompany this literature review I will provide an analysis of multiple case studies in which corporations utilize outcome-based KPIs in their community investment ventures. The extensive literature review will aid in analyzing the chosen case studies and methods used in them.

I began by reviewing the differences between input, output and outcome KPIs and performance evaluation models; the LBG Guidance Manual (2014) and David Parmenter’s book Key Performance Indicators (KPIs): Developing, Implementing, and Using Winning KPIs (2010) were both essential in this task. Both Lynch-Cerullo & Cooney’s (2011) article and Naylor, Sept & Weston’s (2011) article advised me next on how to select KPIs through basic logic models and the basic functions of performance monitoring. Weston, Sept & Naylor (2011) also provided information on performance measurement models alternative to performance monitoring. Last, I referenced Poetner, Moore & McDonald’s article (2008) and Taylor’s article (2009) which address the main factors that affect the use of performance indicators for decision making, including identifying barriers to using them. Once I established a thorough understanding of the basic functions of, and barriers to, using outcome-based KPIs and measurement models to track CCI, I was in the position to select specific and relevant case studies. Even though only two (Gabcanova, 2012; Vermilion Energy and YWCA, 2012) selected case studies are reviewed in the body of the text, an extensive amount of additional case studies were required in the creation of the KPI database discussed in section 4.1.4 and viewable in section 5.0.

The methods I used in selecting both my literature references and case studies were based upon a strict set of criteria. For my literature review it was important that all of my resources maintained, foremost, a strong foundation in program monitoring systems. From this base point
it was possible for me to broaden out and include topics such as: corporate social responsibility, corporate community investment, KPIs (in all their forms), alternative measurement methods to performance indicators, the role of performance measurement in investment ventures, and the worldwide trends regarding the use of performance indicators in CCI. Each case study was selected based on its ability to convey: CCI performance reporting; relationships between corporate investors and community programs; and whether or not specific data metrics, which were used in performance monitoring efforts, were reported. With this criteria I found the bulk of my case studies came from annual online corporate social responsibility and performance reports.

4.0 Outcome-based Measurement Models

Corporations are currently facing increasing pressure to demonstrate that their corporate community investment programs and initiatives add real social value by improving the lives of individuals and/or strengthening communities (Lynch-Cerullo & Cooney, 2011). In response, corporations are increasingly using outcome-based measurement models to track the impacts of their CCI endeavors. However, even though companies “…have benefited greatly from the development of various tools to guide outcomes thinking, understanding the unique advantages of each model and how to select the right one is challenging for many” (Penna & Phillips, 2005).

4.1 Performance Monitoring

Performance monitoring is an outcome focused evaluation method which provides information about how key aspects of a program are operating and the extent to which specified program objectives are being attained (Weston, Sept, & Naylor, 2011). Specifically, “…it involves an ongoing process of establishing performance objectives; transforming those objectives into measurable components; and collecting, analyzing, and reporting data on those measures” (Lynch-Cerullo & Cooney, 2011).

My research suggests that performance measurement, with its focus on demonstrating effectiveness, has become deeply embedded in how policy makers and many funders and service providers think about programs designed to elicit changes in human beings. Adequacy of
resources is often cited as the biggest obstacle to performance measurement (Lynch-Cerullo & Cooney, 2011), however, when compared with other outcome-based models, performance monitoring is still the most efficient and effective. This is because it typically offers a cheaper, faster way of gathering data on a program’s on-going performance (Weston, Sept, & Naylor, 2011).

Weston, Sept and Naylor (2001) identify a list of questions that performance monitoring can answer:

- How are key aspects of a system or program operating?
- Are pre-specified program objectives being attained, and to what extent?
- How satisfied are those being served by the program?
- How efficient, effective and productive is the program, when we compare inputs with output and outcome indicators?
- Are there any failures to produce expected program outputs?

Once the intent and goals of a program have been identified, key performance indicators are selected to monitor progress and continual program performance. It is through these KPIs that performance monitoring methods are able to answer all of the listed questions above.

4.1.1 Outcome-based KPIs

Corporations use outcome-based KPIs as specific, observable, and measurable characteristics or changes that will represent achievement of a program’s desired outcome. In essence, outcome-based KPIs are performance measurement indicators that reflect overall results or impact, of the business activity, in terms of generated benefits as a quantification of performance. More formally, KPIs represent a set of measures focusing on those aspects of organizational performance that are the most critical for the current and future success of a project or organization (Parmenter, 2010).

The ‘outcome-based’ part of outcome-based KPIs is significant because it establishes that the indicator in question is focused on outcome measurements and not merely on input or output measurements. This means that what will be measured are the actual “...changes that
happen to individuals, organizations and the company, in the short or long-term, as a result of the activity” (Corporate Citizenship, 2014). This is significant because, when measuring the outcomes and impacts of CCIs, input and output-based KPIs are not representative of this endeavor. Making outcome-based KPIs the most effective; because unlike other indicators, outcome-based KPIs provide companies with the calculable data that shows their impact of the company’s investment in a community and not just their input/output. For example, an input KPI could be money invested to advertise, an output KPI could be how many people were reached as a direct result of the made investment in advertising, and finally an outcome KPI could be the amount of people affected by the advertised program. When measuring the performance and effect of a program it can thusly be seen through this example how outcome KPIs are best suited for the role. Consequently, corporations are increasingly utilizing this outcome-based tool because it supplies the ability to assess specific observable community impacts connected with their CCI.

By understanding what outcome-based KPIs are and how they function in CCI it can be seen that the careful selection and application of outcome-based KPIs is integral to the quality of results you will receive. If the KPIs are poorly selected, the results will poorly reflect the program’s performance. The inverse of this is also true however, if the outcome-based KPIs are carefully selected and are truly representative of the desired impact, the resulting evaluation will efficiently and effectively reflect a program’s social impact. This relationship, between the program and evaluation usefulness, shows that the contribution that programs can make to their communities is enhanced the more that that programs' professionals take advantage of insights and conclusions that come from evaluation research (Mancini, Huebner, & Byrne, 2004).
The Palm Beach County Food Security Initiative was funded and organized by United Way. This program aimed to address the community assessment that Palm Beach County residents were not having their basic food needs met. The program implemented a variety of community changes through SHARE food co-op sites. The effectiveness of their efforts were measured through the amount of lives changed due to better access to affordable and healthy food. In proving this change a variety of outcome-based KPIs were selected, monitored and documented.

**Phase one:** used the USDA’s U.S. Household Food Security Survey (HFSS) in a door-to-door survey to find out more about household food security in areas with a median income of $35,000 or less.

**Phase two:** completed more qualitative research about the households that are food insecure with and without hunger.

**Phase three:** allowed community partners to participate in the strategic planning and implementation process that included both a proactive long-term strategy and a short-term reactive strategy to address the needs of the community.

**Measuring Community Change and Lives Changed:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targeted Change</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data Collection Tools/Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contracted school-based community centers in low-income neighbourhoods to operate additional SHARE sites</td>
<td># and % of new SHARE sites that turn in food orders each month</td>
<td>Records from Palm Beach county SHARE food warehouse showing number of new sites that place food orders each month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New SHARE sites receive nutritious food via new refrigerated truck</td>
<td># and % of new SHARE sites that receive monthly deliveries from the newly purchased refrigerated truck</td>
<td>Transportation records from the truck driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food-insecure households in low-income neighborhoods get nutritious food at reduced prices</td>
<td># and % of households receiving SHARE food in new sites who live in low-income neighborhoods</td>
<td>Household addresses recorded on food order forms, checked against median income of corresponding county census blocks; findings recorded in log and collated monthly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(United Way, 2005)
4.1.2 Logic Models in selecting KPIs

“Key performance indicators can be defined, collected and assessed on an ongoing basis to evaluate a program’s operations and to estimate its social impact” (Weston, Sept, & Naylor, 2011). There are three steps to follow in using a logic model to develop KPIs for a program: first, create a logic model (see figure 1); then identify relevant indicators at each stage of the model; lastly, carefully select from the many potential indicators to develop a short list of key performance indicators (Weston, Sept, & Naylor, 2011). Using a logic model to select KPIs is effective in preliminary stages of program development and monitoring because it provides a “…diagrammatic representation of [the] program, showing what it is supposed to do, with whom, and why” (Penna & Phillips, 2005). Key concepts involved in logic models include inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts connected with a project or investment. Logic models are specifically useful because they “…link results (short-term and long-term) with program activities and processes, illustrate the theoretical assumptions of the program…” (Weston, Sept, & Naylor, 2011), and are well suited for program overview and program and evaluation planning (Penna & Phillips, 2005). Once the logic model is created it should provide a reasonable job of illustrating how a program intends to create desired outcomes; it should then be possible to identify relevant performance indicators at each stage of the model.

![Figure 1: The Basic Logic Model (W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 2006)](image)

4.1.3 Barriers to using Performance Indicators

Taylor (2009) claims that public agencies use performance indicators more for meeting external reporting requirements than for achieving internal improvements. Even though this may
be the case, this still shows that outcome-based KPIs are increasingly being used in external reporting, such as CCI. The benefits that performance indicators can provide to internal improvements within company operations is substantial, but whether or not all companies neglect to use them for internal improvements is debatable. Taylor (2009) identifies two common barriers faced by corporations in using performance indicators, those include: technical problems, and to a lesser extent political and organizational issues.

4.1.4 KPI database

One of the deliverables requested of me, in addition to my research question, was a database of outcome-based KPIs. Throughout my research it became apparent that free access, wide ranging repositories of KPIs are not readily available to the public. Sadly, there is little guidance available to managers or employees for creating a set of outcome indicators that yield a valid picture of program performance (Poetner, Moore, & McDonald, 2008). Most of the grey literature, academic literature and case studies that I reviewed stated the benefits to using outcome-based KPIs in CCI performance monitoring, however only a couple actually provided examples of potential KPIs. In response to this I have created an outcome-based KPI database which provides KPIs across five different groups, including: health, human rights, environmental, disaster risk prevention, and training/education. By providing this database, companies wishing to implement outcome-based KPIs will have readily available examples and associated measurement methods from which to draw. This database is viewable in the annex section of this report (5.0). It is important to note that creating an all-inclusive selection of KPIs is near impossible, this is due to the fact that KPIs are created based on the specific and unique parameters and intended goals of each individual CCI program or venture (Samad, Koolwal, & Khandker, 2010).

4.2 Alternative Outcome-based Methods

Performance monitoring is an efficient and effective method to measuring corporate community investment, it is not however the only method. There are a variety of other methods that companies can implement, each one providing a different focus and all with their own positive and negative qualities. While designing the evaluation methods for a CCI venture
companies may select which ever method they deem most fitting for their specific program. It is also common for companies to utilize two or more different methods in tandem, this allows them to monitor and evaluate on as many facets of their venture as possible (Samad, Koolwal, & Khandker, 2010). However, each additional method will demand an increase in time and resources upon the company. Therefore, implementing every evaluation method is not the most efficient or effective route; making careful method selection imperative.

In the following two sections I will review two common outcome-based evaluation methods, alternative to performance monitoring. I will include characteristics and pitfalls for each. It should be noted that they have not been listed based on any hierarchy or scale.

4.2.1 Impact Evaluation

Also an outcome-based evaluation method, impact evaluation focuses on questions of causality. This method “…compares program outcomes with some measure of what would have happened without the program” (Weston, Sept, & Naylor, 2011). This measurement method can be useful in determining whether or not impacts and outcomes experienced are related directly to a program’s operations or due to external influences (Samad, Koolwal, & Khandker, 2010). Even though this method offers the most rigorous assessment of program effectiveness, it also requires more time, resources and expert assistance than other methods (Weston, Sept, & Naylor, 2011), which can make it undesirable to use.

4.2.2 Social Return on Investment Evaluation

Social return on investment (SROI) evaluation “…[i]ncorporates information on the cost of a program, often in relation to alternative uses of the same resources and to the benefits produced by the program” (Weston, Sept, & Naylor, 2011). In other words, by calculating a monetary value to the observed social impact, corporations can show a quantified social return on investment ratio, this is called a cost-benefit analysis. An example of this method can be seen in Case Study Box 2. This method is successful in conveying the social return on investment, however, “…problems remain with the high cost of social ROI estimation efforts and the inherently unquantifiable nature of some types of social impact” (Weston, Sept, & Naylor, 2011). These two
issues are typically significant enough to deter companies from using the SROI framework, especially when other methods are available. This method, however, still remains quite useful if the company wishes to provide an estimation of investment versus social return in the same metric (e.g. a monetary value).

4.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

The tangible impacts and outcomes seen in a community, associated with a corporation’s investment, are of paramount importance to each corporation. In the endeavor to track CCIs associated impacts, companies have increasingly been turning to outcome-based measurement models, and away from input and output-based models. There are a variety of different methods available which evaluate program performance based on outcomes. In comparison to other outcome-based measurement models however, such as SROI and impact evaluation, performance monitoring and outcome-based KPIs offer a cheaper, faster way of gathering data on a program’s on-going performance. As a result, outcome-based KPIs are becoming more widely used in measuring outcomes of corporate community investments. It is made apparent, through my research, that the measurement parameters used to define each specific KPI can have significant effects upon the recorded outcomes. Additionally, it is clear that using outcome-based KPIs to measure impact resulting from CCI, instead of input or output-based KPIs, yields much more useful information when attempting to prove whether a community investment has the intended impact or not.
5.0 Annex: KPI Database

This database contains potential outcome-based key performance indicators in five different fields, which include: environmental, disaster risk reduction, human rights, training and education, and health (these are listed in the order which they appear in the database). KPIs can report results by using either quantitative or qualitative data, this database includes a mixture of both.

While collecting the KPIs for this database I referenced a multitude of different resources, including: case studies, company performance reports, consulting company reports/databases and other miscellaneous reports and databases. One specific resource that I found most useful was the IRIS’s full metrics catalog, which is a “...catalog of generally-accepted performance metrics that leading impact investors use to measure the social, environmental, and financial performance of their investments” (IRIS, 2014). Another useful resource was the Global Reporting Initiative’s *G4 Sustainability Reporting Guidelines: Implementation Manual*, which “…contains explanations of how to apply the Reporting Principles¹, [and] how to prepare the information to be disclosed [in performance reporting]...” (Global Reporting Initiative, 2013). A specifically useful, publicly accessible resource was the UNSD Statistical Database (United Nations, 2015), which provided raw data on a multitude of social and environmental topics.

The intention of this database is provide a repository of outcome-based KPIs to any person and/or corporation who is seeking to better understand outcome-based performance measurement or to assist in brainstorming KPIs for personal/company use. This is not by any means meant to be an inclusive list of all potential outcome-based KPIs, but merely a starting point or overview of what potential outcome-based KPIs can be.

---

ENVIRONMENTAL

1. Amount of energy saved by the organization through energy conservation techniques employed to reduce the amount of energy needed to carry out the same processes or tasks, during the reporting period. Reporting form: Number of kWh. (IRIS, 2014)

2. Amount of on-site energy produced and consumed by the organization from renewable sources such as solar, wind, geothermal, hydro energy, and biomass during the reporting period. Reporting form: Number of kWh. (IRIS, 2014)

3. Amount of greenhouse gases (GHG) emitted through the organization's operations during the reporting period. This should include GHG emissions from direct and indirect sources. Reporting form: Number of metric tonnes of CO2 equivalent. (Global Reporting Initiative, 2013; IPCC, 2015; World Resources Institute, 2004).


5. Amount of firewood consumption. Reporting format: weight, number of pieces. (Samad, Koolwal, & Khandker, 2010)

6. Amount of water drawn from municipal water sources for the organization's operations during the reporting period, including uses for productive processes such as packaging, manufacturing, and for human consumption. Reporting form: liters, tons. (IRIS, 2014) (Global Reporting Initiative, 2013)

7. Indicate whether the organization has undertaken any biodiversity-related assessments to evaluate the biological diversity present on the land that is directly or indirectly controlled by the organization. Reporting format: yes/no. (IRIS, 2014) (Global Reporting Initiative, 2013)

8. Cleaner community. Footnote: baseline reporting on the initial ‘cleanliness state’ of the community should be provided. Reporting form: % of community members who have an increased positive perception of the cleanliness of their community.

9. Increased access to clean water. Footnote: assumptions regarding what constitutes ‘clean water’ should be reported. Reporting form: % of changed positive perception in community members regarding the accessibility to clean water.
1. Access to first aid personnel/facilities. Footnotes: should provide assumptions made on what is defined as ‘access’ (transportation necessary, monetary cost, trained personnel etc.). Reporting form: amount of necessary travel time required, economic availability. (Gautam, 2009).

2. Access to and reach of search and rescue teams. Footnotes: should provide assumptions made on what is defined as ‘access’ (transportation necessary, monetary cost, local terrain etc.). Reporting form: reach in distance. (Gautam, 2009).

3. Community understanding of disaster risk management. Footnotes: assumptions and parameters used in defining ‘community understanding’ should be included. Reporting form: qualitative data on level of community understanding. (Gautam, 2009).

4. Disaster preparedness and disaster risk management capability of school teachers. Footnotes: assumptions made about what constitutes the desirable amount of ‘preparedness’ should be include. Reporting form: amount of disaster risk management tools/structures/training sessions have been provided and/or created. (Gautam, 2009).

5. Greater feeling of security within the community in relation to disaster risk. Footnote: assumptions surrounding what encompasses ‘feeling of security’ should be noted. Reporting form: % of changed feeling of security in community citizens.

6. Increased community trust in disaster risk prevention/alleviation programs. Footnote: assumptions about what ‘community trust’ entails should be reported. Reporting form: % increase of citizens who have higher trust in disaster risk prevention/alleviation programs after CCI intervention.
HUMAN RIGHTS

1. Indicate whether the organization has a written policy to compensate employees fairly and equally. Footnotes could include: gender, race, color, disabilities, political opinion, sexual orientation, age, religion, social origin, and ethnic origin. Reporting format: yes/no. (IRIS, 2014).

2. Percentage of a full-time employee's healthcare premium that is covered. This should be based on benefits available to full-time employees as of the end of the reporting period. Reporting format: decimal. (IRIS, 2014).

3. Indicate whether the organization has systems and policies in place to monitor, evaluate and ensure worker safety. Footnotes: details around these systems and policies including information on safety training, protection gear required, testing of equipment, posting of signs, etc. Reporting format: yes/no. (IRIS, 2014).


5. Men to women ratio on staff. Reporting form: amount each in ratio. (Silberman & Fontana, 2013)

6. Improved access to information through television, radio and/or internet. Reporting form: total amount of time and quality of information available. Footnotes: assumptions about what constitutes ‘quality information’ should be made available. (Samad, Koolwal, & Khandker, 2010)

7. Percent affordable housing. Calculation: Number of housing units constructed or preserved that are considered to be affordable housing divided by Number of housing units constructed or preserved. Footnotes: assumptions used in defining affordable housing. (IRIS, 2014).

8. Increased perception of human rights advocacy within the community. Footnote: assumptions about what constitutes ‘human rights advocacy’ should be reported. Reporting form: % increase of positive perception of human rights advocacy in citizens.

9. Increased perception of equality in community. Footnote: equality may include – ethnicity, gender, sexual preference, age, disability etc. All assumptions and inclusions/exclusions surrounding equality should reported on. Reporting form: % change in citizens perception of equality in their community.
TRAINING AND EDUCATION


5. Teachers Employed. Reporting form: # of teachers employed (as direct result of program efforts) (Better Work, 2014).

6. Student Transition Rate. Percentage of students advancing from one level of schooling to the next. Calculation: # of school students enrolling in the next level of schooling for the upcoming year divided by # of students who completed the previous level of schooling during the preceding year. Reporting form: percentage of students/children. (IRIS, 2014).

7. Number of study hours with improved lighting. Reporting form: hours. (Samad, Koolwal, & Khandker, 2010).

8. Number of employees (full-time, part-time, or temporary) who were trained through programs provided by the organization (both internally and externally) during the reporting period. Footnote: types of training provided and duration of training, with particular emphasis on those that lead to recognized certifications. Reporting format: number of people. (IRIS, 2014)

HEALTH

1. Food security levels. Footnotes: report assumptions made around secure food levels and household selection. Reporting form: average amount of food per household. (Gabcanova, 2012)
3. Number of visits to health clinics. Footnote: can involve the severity of the reason for the clinic visit as a sub-metric. Reporting form: amount of visits, length of visits. (Samad, Koolwal, & Khandker, 2010)
4. Obesity levels. Footnotes: include on size of geographical area reporting on. (United Nations, 2015; United States Department of Agriculture, 2008)
8. Increased positive perception of health in community. Footnote: health can include – mental, physical, and emotional. Assumptions made about what is included/excluded in ‘perceived health’ should be reported on. Reporting form: % change in citizen perception of health in their community.
9. Increased positive community perception of government and/or corporation concern for public health. Footnote: assumptions about what constitutes ‘public health’ should be reported. Reporting form: % of citizens who feel that their community governments and/or corporations which are concerned with public health.
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