

PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKING DASHBOARD

EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION METHOD, BY METRIC

The Performance Benchmarking Committee, established by the NAC to assist members in fulfilling the requirements of the 2014 Member Contract, have recommended 12 metrics which should be measured annually and shared annually with each member's Local Board of Directors. This document lists the 12 metrics selected and details the calculation methodology behind each metric.

Sources for data will be the most-recently available Network Activity Report, Quarterly Poundage Report, Map the Meal Gap data, USDA data on TEFAP distribution, and data from independent vendors (employee and board engagements). Please note that most food bank-related data is self-reported by food banks. Although rigorous validation routines are built into the data collection tools themselves, it is the responsibility of each food bank to report accurate and comprehensive data.

MEETING THE NEED

1. Percent Foods to Encourage

This metric was selected because it is an indicator of the level of effort a food bank is making to **distribute** food products that are more wholesome and healthy for the clients in their service area.

The source of data for this metric is the Quarterly Poundage Report, using data from the Distribution by Product Category page (a new page to collect distribution data will be added in 2016 to the QPR). The 31 Product Categories are each classified as Nutritious Food, Other Food, Non-Food, Salvage and Mix. For the purposes of this analysis, Non-Food is disregarded.

We are including the following categories as nutritious: Cereal, Dairy (30%), Fruits, Juice, Meat/Fish/Poultry, Non-Meat Protein, Pasta, Fresh Produce, Rice, Vegetables, and Beverages (10% to reflect plain water). A percentage of Mix (60%) and a percentage of Salvage (39%) was classified as Nutritious, with the remainder being classified as Other Food.

There are six categories which taken together, represent Non-Food. Those categories are Cleaning, Health and Beauty, Household Paper, Personal Paper, Nonfood, and Pet.

The number of pounds classified as Nutritious is divided by the total number of pounds excluding Non-Food.

2. Meals Distributed as Percent (%) of Meal Gap in Service Area

This metric was selected because when overall food bank level of meal distribution is compared with the total required within the service area, the percentage indicates the effort required to meet the 2025 Bold Goal of closing the meal gap.

Source of data for this metric is the Quarterly Poundage Report primarily, and Map the Meal Gap data. Service Area Meals is calculated on the total amount of meals¹ distributed to clients (no transfers) and SNAP meals from applications completed, including all meals provided by other food banks in your service area. The meal total also includes meals from TEFAP Augments, as seen in the MPIN County-Level Compliance Indicator Report. Meals influenced as a result of advocacy efforts are not included (such as School Breakfasts, School Lunches, etc). The aggregated number of meals is compared to the number of meals required, as defined in the Map the Meal Gap work for the service area, and the percentage determined. Meal Gaps are adjusted in the case of split counties, where splitting members are responsible for only the percentage of the Meal Gap corresponding to their service area.

3. Percent (%) of Counties Meeting Half the Meal Gap

This metric was selected because it is an indicator of the reach of food bank's distribution efforts within its service area.

Source of data for this metric is the Quarterly Poundage Report, Distribution by County page, and Map the Meal Gap data. For this calculation, Meals Distributed per County is calculated on a four-quarter basis, using the meal definition from Metric #1 above. The number of meals distributed in each county is then compared with the meal gap in that county, and the gap percentage calculated for each county. The number of counties with a meals distributed vs meal gap percentage of 50% or more is tallied, and becomes the numerator of this fraction, with the denominator of this fraction being the total number of counties in the members' service area. The percentage of counties covering at least 50% of the meal gap is thus calculated. Members of the Performance Benchmarking Committee felt that this approach would enable food banks with single-county service areas to compare to each other and food banks with many counties to compare to each other.

STEWARDING RESOURCES

4. Cost to Distribute a Meal

This metric was selected because it represents the efficiency of the food bank in distributing meals.

Source of data for this metric is the Network Activity Report for the current year, and Quarterly Poundage Data for the food bank's fiscal year. To derive this value, total meals distributed are determined by adding the total meals² distributed to clients (no transfers) by each food bank and the total meals from SNAP applications by each food bank (and its trained partner agencies). Total expenses, including depreciation, are included. The total expenses (costs) are divided by the number of meals distributed.

¹ Meals are converted from pounds which have been adjusted to remove nonfood and plain water. Since the metric is meals only, no comparison to food insecure persons is made, and there is no comparison to MPIN.

² Meals are converted from pounds which have been adjusted to remove nonfood and plain water

5. Cost to Raise a Dollar

This metric was selected because it represents the efficiency of the food bank in managing fund-raising expenses toward higher-yield activities.

Source of data for this metric was the Network Activity Report, the Allocation of Functional Expenses page and the Sources of Private Support page. The numerator of the fraction is the total expense reported for Development/Fund-Raising on the Allocation of Functional Expenses page (this total should match the total reported on the 990). The denominator of the fraction is the total amount of cash raised from private sources.

Capital expenses and capital campaign revenue are not included in this metric.

6. Year-over-Year Fundraising Percent Change

This metric was selected as the primary measure of sustainability of a food bank. In this specific case, our expectation is that year-over-year growth will increase on an annual basis. If the rate of change shows a decline, this should serve as a trailing indicator of food bank financial health.

Source of data for this metric was the Network Activity Report. Totals for Private Support include dollars raised from individuals, corporations, foundations, and social organizations. The year-over-year change is calculated for every food bank, and expressed as a percentage.

Capital campaigns are not included.

ENGAGING THE COMMUNITY

7. Number of Individual Donors per 1,000 Population

This metric was selected not only because number of individual donors is a Feeding America Board Outcome, but also such a number, especially when compared year over year, indicates how successful a food bank is in engaging the community to support the food bank with dollars.

Source of data is the Network Activity Report and Service Area total population using the most recently available US Census data. The Service Area population was divided by 1,000 to serve as the denominator in this fraction. Population numbers are adjusted in the case of split counties, where splitting members serve only the percentage of the population corresponding to their service area. The numerator is the number of active unduplicated individual donors in who gave a financial donation in the most recent fiscal year (12-month period), including donors which made bequests. The total number of active donors in the food bank's most recent fiscal year is compared to the total from the prior year. The year-over-year change is calculated for every food bank, and expressed as a percentage.

8. Advocacy Index

This metric was selected as an additional indicator of community support for the food bank. Admittedly, defining objective measurements of this characteristic was difficult, chiefly because the desired results from successful advocacy initiatives cannot in themselves be quantified. Ultimately, after seeking input from experts in this area, we added questions to the Network Activity Report which would measure the activities, not the results.

Source of data for this metric was the Network Activity Report. For questions 3 through 9 on the Advocacy page responses were graded on a scale of 0, 1, 2 or 3, depending on the level selected for each question. The answers were then averaged to determine an overall score.

9. Volunteer Hours per 1,000 Population

This metric was selected because it is another indicator of community support for the food bank, where donors give time instead of dollars. Total volunteer hours is used because food banks track volunteerism in different ways --although hours is the most consistent way and most reliable.

Source of data for this metric was the Network Activity Report, and Service Area total population using the most recently available US Census data. The Service Area population is divided by 1,000 to serve as the denominator in this fraction. Population numbers are adjusted in the case of split counties, where splitting members serve only the percentage of the population corresponding to their service area. The numerator is the number of volunteer hours served by volunteers at the food bank.

FOSTERING MISSION-DRIVEN TEAMS

10. Employee Retention

This metric was selected as a primary indicator of employee satisfaction. The literature indicates a strong positive correlation between the rate of retention and the level of employee morale and satisfaction. Although we understand that the retention rate varies when considering only exempt employees and only non-exempt employees, for the purposes of this metric, we are calculating a combined rate.

Source of data is the Network Activity Report. To calculate retention, we take the number of employees which left the food bank in a specific 12-month period (July to June), and divide that number by the average of the number of employees active at the end of the current 12-month period and the number of employees active at the end of the prior 12-month period. The result of this calculation is subtracted from 100% to yield the retention rate.

In FY2016, the methodology was updated to calculate employee retention only for full-time employees. In earlier years, part-time employees were included in the calculation.

11. Employee Engagement

Employee Engagement is measured by the answers to a series of questions which probe attitudes and the strength of connection between an employee and the organization which employs him or her. An "engaged **employee**" is one who is fully absorbed by and enthusiastic about their work and so takes positive action to further the organization's reputation and interests.

For the purposes of this metric, food banks participated in an Employee Engagement Survey administered by Quantum Workplace, a third-party vendor with expertise in this area. Although employees answered a series of up to 42 questions, with answers ranging in values from 0 to 6, only 14 questions (the "Core 14") were averaged to create the Engagement Index.

If no value appears for a particular food bank (e.g. your food bank or a selected peer), that particular food bank did not participate in the employee engagement survey through Quantum Workplace.

12. Board Engagement

Low board engagement threatens the sustainability of the organization and viability of the mission—chiefly because unengaged board members do not operate at their full potential. This means that a members' ability to improve its performance may be closely related to the performance of its local board.

Source of data will be the Network Activity Report (beginning with NAR 2016). There are a set of 10 yes/no questions that will determine the value of this metric. For each question answered "yes", there will be one point added to the metric, with a maximum score of 10.

- 1) Does the board use a skills, experience and diversity matrix as a guide to board development and board member recruitment?
- 2) Does the board have a clear job description for directors that outlines expectations?
- 3) Does the board utilize an orientation and onboarding plan for new directors?
- 4) Has each board member spent time in volunteer service to clients during the year?
- 5) Has each board member attended at least 75% of board meetings?
- 6) Did each board member make a personal financial contribution to the organization this past year?
- 7) Did the board actively support the organization's fundraising efforts during the past year?
- 8) Has the board consistently used consent agendas to enable discussion about issues of greatest impact in the boardroom?
- 9) Does the board have a policy on term limits for directors that it consistently follows?
- 10) Did the board do an evaluation of its own effectiveness this past year?