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Executive Summary

Introduction

UBC Wellbeing is a collaborative effort to make the University a better place to live, work and learn through a systems-wide approach to wellbeing across campuses. The work of UBC Wellbeing is guided by the Okanagan Charter, a shared call to action for partners, leaders, and community members to embed health and wellbeing into all aspects of the institution and lead wellbeing promotion actions locally and globally.

The UBC Food and Nutrition Committee is a diverse group of faculty, staff and students with interest and expertise in food systems and food security. The committee developed an Action Framework for a Nutritionally Sound Campus (1), which in turn informed the food and nutrition targets within the draft UBC Wellbeing Strategic Framework (currently in development – February 2019). Both frameworks identified food insecurity as an area of focus and were informed by Goal 2 of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (2).

Given the Action Framework and Wellbeing Strategic Framework, there is a need to establish a baseline and ongoing measure to monitor food insecurity prevalence within the UBC community – which includes students, staff and faculty. Additionally, the measure will be useful to determine if current and future interventions have a potential impact on food insecurity prevalence.

To achieve this goal, a literature and best practices review was conducted to inform recommendations for measuring food insecurity prevalence within the UBC community.

Background

Household or individual food insecurity is defined as “the inadequate or insecure access to food due to financial constraints” (3). Household food insecurity is a social determinant of health, which is closely linked with income (another determinant of health) (4). Food insecurity is distinct from community level food security, which is defined as “when all community residents obtain a safe, personally acceptable, nutritious diet through a sustainable food system that maximizes healthy choices, community self-reliance, and equal access for everyone,” which is focused primarily on food systems as opposed to individual households (4).

The prevalence of food insecurity in Canadian Universities from the work of Meal Exchange is approximately 40% (5), which is four times as high of than in the general Canadian population (approximately 10%) (6). University students face many factors that contribute to a risk of food insecurity, including high rates of unemployment, rising cost of tuition and textbooks, inadequate student assistance, poor availability of summer jobs, and high population prevalence of unattached individuals and renters (4). Despite high rates of unemployment compared to the general Canadian population, more and more students are working during the school year (7) to cover essentials like food, housing and tuition, which has seen an increase of 238% since 1991 (8). Additionally, students that are international, graduate, Indigenous or have children are more likely to be food insecure (5).

Food insecurity (especially over many years) can contribute to a higher risk of poor physical and mental health (anxiety, depression, other mental health disorders) in University students (9), because of stress and poor diet quality, just as with the general Canadian population. Being food insecure is also a concern...
in the University population because it can negatively impact academics over many years (9) and social wellbeing (5).

University institutions have implemented various interventions to combat food insecurity, in addition to the strategies individual students may employ. Universities may have campus food banks, food skills programs, community gardens, subsidized restaurants/cafeterias and meal card programs which all can be considered downstream interventions that are essentially community food security interventions (as described above), meant to help those who are already food insecure. Universities (specifically students unions) also partake in advocacy efforts to reduce the cost of studying and living, which is a financial-based intervention that would have an impact on food insecurity.

In Canada, household food insecurity has been measured as part of the population-based cross-sectional Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS) since 2004, using a series of questions called the Household Food Security Survey Module (HFSSM) (adapted from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Household Food Security Survey Module) (10). The prevalence of food insecurity amongst the University student population is currently not measured nationally in Canada. However, although not extensive, some research has been conducted at some Canadian institutions, including a multi-site measure conducted by the non-profit organization Meal Exchange (5).

At UBC, a variety of tools and methods have been used to measure food insecurity. Although not all validated tools for the general Canadian population or University setting, prevalence of food insecurity measured ranges from 37-56% (11-13), which is similar (although a bit higher) than food insecurity estimates at institutions across Canada conducted by Meal Exchange (5).

The UBC Undergraduate Experience Survey is an institutional survey on the student experience. The survey collects information on a variety of indicators, including those related to health and wellbeing. Beginning January 2019, the survey will include questions on food insecurity, specifically using the 6-item HFSSM (shortened version from full version presented above). To date, no survey has collected information from UBC students, staff, or faculty on food insecurity with a validated tool (for general Canadian population). Additionally, currently under development, the Canadian Campus Wellbeing Survey (CCWS) will provide population-level health and wellbeing data for and across Canadian post-secondary institutions. The CCWS will include a validated food insecurity measure (for general Canadian population).

**Summary of Results**

After reviewing 40 publications measuring food insecurity in the University population, it was found that the majority (35/40) utilized versions of the USDA tool (including Canadian version, HFSSM) to measure prevalence of food insecurity. Studies also added additional questions to the core tool, depending on the study goals. Aspects of survey administration, such as number of questions (version of USDA tool), period of recall, and population included varied from study to study, with some studies adapting the original instructions/aspects of the USDA/HFSSM tool. Two studies included the entire University community (students, staff, faculty) in assessment, however the quality of food insecurity measure was poor for one study and staff/faculty results not stratified for one study. Food insecurity prevalence ranged from 13-59 percent. Food insecurity recommendations in the literature included interventions for community food security (short term relief, capacity building and empowerment, sustainable food systems) and food insecurity interventions that are income based (advocacy and policy change). Overall,
a key limitation discussed by studies included the fact that the USDA/HFSSM tool is not validated in the university population specifically and would be a valuable future step in research and practice.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The current review contributes to a greater understanding of food insecurity measurement in the University population and provides a context-specific review of existing programming within the UBC setting. From this review, it is recommended that UBC Wellbeing:

- Continue to support the regular inclusion, analysis and dissemination of results from a food insecurity module in campus community surveys (ex. the UES Survey, CCWS, other), for the purpose of monitoring prevalence and, most importantly, the use of information for programming and advocacy efforts (income-based solutions to food insecurity to higher levels of government).
- Utilize the Canadian HFSSM survey tool to measure food insecurity, for the purpose of comparability with other work (national measures in CCHS and other universities). Additionally, context specific needs of the survey should be determined (ex. number of questions, reflection time, population).
- Support the validation of the HFSSM survey tool in the University population, as it is only validated for use in the general Canadian population.
- If possible, include University staff and faculty as part of the food insecurity measure, as prevalence data is limited in this population. Both the UBC Wellbeing Strategic Framework and the Action Framework for a Nutritionally Sound Campus goal encompass the entire community, including staff, and thus should be included in measurement.
- Explore the assessment of community food security at UBC. The assessment could contribute to context specific evidence to inform already existing campus food programming that can be categorized as short-term relief and capacity building and empowerment and sustainability interventions.
- Support food (in)security literacy on campus, and the use of appropriate terminology for food related interventions, to inform University policy and programming.

Overall, the study and measurement of campus food insecurity is complex; only recently has work focused on the University population. As an institution, committing to the evidence-informed measurement of campus food insecurity is a positive step towards understanding the true burden experienced in this specific context at UBC and towards achieving goal four of the Action Framework for a Nutritionally Sound Campus, that no community member experiences severe food insecurity.
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Introduction

Food insecurity in the University setting is an emerging field of study in North America and a topic on the agenda of Universities, due to the impacts on the health and wellbeing of students. Household food insecurity has been measured across the Canadian population since 2004, however has not specifically focused or specified information for the student population. When considering student food insecurity as a concern, it is first important to understand the definition and root causes of food insecurity in addition to having a quality population measure to assess prevalence over time. The focus of this document will be to introduce food insecurity, specifically in the University population, and provide a review of tools in the literature being used to measure food insecurity. The purpose will be to inform the selection of a tool and considerations to measure food insecurity for the University population.

This work is supported by UBC Wellbeing, in the form of a Sustainability Scholar position through UBC Sustainability. For more information on the UBC Sustainability Scholars program, please visit: https://sustain.ubc.ca/get-involved/students/applied-research-and-internships/ubc-sustainability-scholars-program.

UBC Wellbeing and the Food and Nutrition Committee

UBC Wellbeing is a collaborative effort to make the University a better place to live, work and learn through a systems-wide approach to wellbeing across campuses. The work of UBC Wellbeing is guided by the Okanagan Charter, a shared call to action for partners, leaders, and community members to embed health and wellbeing into all aspects of the institution and lead wellbeing promotion actions locally and globally.

UBC Wellbeing plays an active role in supporting work around 5 priority areas for wellbeing: food and nutrition, physical activity, social connection, built and natural environment and mental health and resilience, including through cross-institutional committees.

The UBC Food and Nutrition Committee is a diverse group of faculty, staff and students with interest and expertise in food systems and food security. The committee developed an Action Framework for a Nutritionally Sound Campus (1), which in turn informed the food and nutrition targets within the draft UBC Wellbeing Strategy Framework (currently in development - February 2019). Both the Action Framework and the draft Strategy identified food insecurity as an area of focus and were informed by Goal 2 of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (2).

Given the Action Framework and Wellbeing Strategy, there is a need to establish a baseline and ongoing measure to monitor food insecurity prevalence within the UBC community, including students, staff and faculty. Additionally, the measure will be useful to determine if current and future interventions have a potential impact on food insecurity prevalence.

Purpose

The main purpose of this document is to provide a best practices and literature review of food insecurity, specifically including best tools used to measure food insecurity, all with a specific focus on the University setting. This review will provide evidence-informed recommendations for measuring food insecurity for University student, staff and faculty populations. Additionally, this document will provide a
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brief summary of work to date at UBC, which is context specific to this institution and can be used as a reference for future work.

Background

What is food (in)security?

The primary focus for this paper is the term food insecurity, however defining both household food insecurity (terms defined as a household, as opposed to an individual) and food security with precision is important, as it has implications for interventions.

Food Security

The current definition adopted by Health Canada for food security is from the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) and defined as “food security exists when all people, at all times have physical and economic access to sufficient safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life” (3). Four dimensions of food security has been extracted by the FAO and demonstrated in figure X: physical availability of food (supply of food), economic and physical access to food, food utilization (such as ability to cook and existence of food storage facilities) and stability of the three dimensions over time (3). The FAO describes food security being achieved if all four dimensions exist at the same time (3).

“Food security exists when all people, at all times have physical and economic access to sufficient safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life”

FAO World Food Summit 1996

Figure 1. Four domains of food security (3)
Food Insecurity

Household food insecurity (which is the focus of this document) is defined as “the inadequate or insecure access to food due to financial constraints” (4). Food security includes financial access to food as one of four domains, however being food insecure only includes issues with financial access to food.

Community Food Security

Another distinction that is important to make is that of community level food security, which is defined as “when all community residents obtain a safe, personally acceptable, nutritious diet through a sustainable food system that maximizes healthy choices, community self-reliance, and equal access for everyone,” which is focus primarily on food systems as opposed to individual households (5), thus not equivalent to the definitions of household food insecurity or food security.

How is food insecurity measured in Canada?

In Canada, household food insecurity has been measured as part of the population based cross-sectional Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS) since 2004, using a series of questions adapted from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Household Food Security Survey Module (6). Both tools are very similar, but their terminology and classification of food insecurity differ (4). The Canadian tool is called the Household Food Security Survey Module (HFSSM) and it is a validated tool to measure household food insecurity as opposed to individual food insecurity (6). Both tools have an optional module that include children if relevant and the USDA tool also has a 6-item short form (7). Questions of the Canadian HFSSM (for households without children) can be found in Table 1. A copy of the full Canadian HFSSM (including children) can be found in appendix A. These tools only measure the domain of food access, specifically financial, thus are a measure of household food insecurity.

Table 1. Condensed HFSSM questions (not including children) (8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worry food run out</td>
<td>before money to buy more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food bought didn’t last</td>
<td>and not enough money to get more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couldn’t afford to eat balanced meals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever cut size of meals or skip</td>
<td>because not enough money? How often?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat less than you should</td>
<td>because not enough money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungry</td>
<td>because couldn’t afford enough food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lose weight</td>
<td>because not enough money for food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever not eat for a full day</td>
<td>because not enough money for food? How often?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the HFSSM and the USDA tool determines if a household is food insecure (and to what extent) based on the number of affirmative responses to the questions (8,9). Figure 2 displays the classification
systems of the HFSSM and the USDA tool (8,9). Of note, the Canadian HFSSM includes moderate and severe in the classification of a household as food insecure. In the USDA tool, low and very low food security are grouped as food insecure.

The Canadian HFSSM defines moderate food insecure as “compromised food quality or quantity because of not enough money for food” and severe as “missing meals, reduce food intake, and at the most extreme go day(s) without food” (4). The PROOF research group, which is a prominent research group in Canada for food insecurity lead by V. Tarasuk has considered an additional classification for the HFSSM, which is used in their research, which is marginal food insecurity, defined as “worry about running out of food and/or limited food selection due to a lack of money for food” (4).

Figure 2. Classification of food insecurity in the USDA and Canadian HFSSM (8,9)

**How common is food insecurity?**

Over the years, not all provinces have participated in the food insecurity module of the CCHS. In 2012, which is the most recent year that all provinces and territories participated, 1 in 8 Canadian households (12.5%) were considered food insecure (10). This equates to over four million Canadians and 1.15 million children (10). Data from the most recent CCHS in 2015-2016 demonstrates 10.2% of British Columbia households are food insecure, with specifically 3.1% severe, 4.8% moderate and 2.3% marginal food insecure (11).

PROOF produced a British Columbia specific report in 2016 called Priority Health Equity Indicators for British Columbia: Household Food Insecurity Indicator Report (12). Data from 2011-12 indicated 11.8% of British Columbia households were food insecure, with food insecurity in the Vancouver Coastal Health Region (where the University of British Columbia resides) being 9.8% specifically (12).
What determines food insecurity?

Household food insecurity is a social determinant of health, which is closely linked with income (another determinant of health) (13). It has been demonstrated that households with low income are more likely to be food insecure, and experience specifically severe food insecurity (13). The finances of household food insecurity have been described as a construct of resources like income, assets, credit and expenditures consisting of shelter, food, other necessities and debt (14). Specifically, the type of income is also a determinant of food insecurity, where in 2014 61% of households with social assistance as a main form of income were food insecure (4). Similarly, 62.2% of food insecure households were receiving mostly income from working (4). Besides income, which is the most influential determinant of food insecurity (4,13), other factors that are associated with food insecurity include: being Indigenous or Black (4,13), renting (4,13), being a woman, lone parent, unattached single person, disabled, lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender population, and new immigrant or refugee (13).

Why is food insecurity an issue?

Food insecurity negatively impacts an individual’s ability to access affordable healthy food (4,13). Food insecurity has adverse effects on both physical and mental health (13), through pathways of nutritional deficiencies and stress. Examples of illnesses that are associated with food insecurity include: diabetes, heart disease, depression and poor self-rated physical and mental health (13). Additionally, food insecurity impacts health care costs, whereby household food insecurity is associated with a higher likelihood of becoming a high cost user of the healthcare system (13).

What is being done about food insecurity?

In Canada, household food insecurity is a recognized national concern, with both interventions and advocacy undertaken by a variety of stakeholders. Interventions for food insecurity can be considered either upstream or downstream, where upstream interventions focus on systems wide prevention of food insecurity and advocacy (related to income, as it is an income based problem) (figure 3) and downstream interventions mainly assist those who are already food insecure, and essentially domains of food security in the community context as opposed to food insecurity solutions (figure 3). The Hamilton Community Food Security Stakeholder Committee summarizes the continuum of food security interventions, which can be described as short term relief, capacity and empowerment and systemic shift for sustainability (Figure 4) (15).

![Figure 3. Select examples of upstream and downstream interventions and advocacy groups](image-url)
Food Insecurity in the University Context

Students within the university population are a unique demographic for examining prevalence, determinants of and interventions for food insecurity. Recently, more attention, including research, has been focused on this population potentially due to the rising reported usage of campus food banks (16).

The prevalence of food insecurity amongst the University student population is currently not measured nationally in Canada. However, although not extensive, some research has been conducted at some Canadian institutions, including a multi-site measure conducted by the non-profit organization Meal Exchange (17). The prevalence of food insecurity in Canadian Universities from the work of Meal Exchange is approximately 40% (18), which is four times as high of than in the general Canadian population (approximately 10%) as presented above (10).

Demographics of university students are heterogeneous in nature, for example year of study (undergraduate vs graduate), living situation (at home with family vs on campus), and income (student loans, working, unemployed). However, in general, University students face many factors that contribute to a risk of food insecurity, which are unique to this population. Examples of these contributing factors include high rates of unemployment, rising cost of tuition and textbooks,
inadequate student assistance, poor availability of summer jobs and high population prevalence of unattached individuals and renters, which are associated with higher likelihood of being food insecure (13). Despite high rates of unemployment compared to the general Canadian population, more and more students are working during the school year (19) to cover essentials like food, housing and tuition, which has seen an increase of 238% since 1991 (20). Additionally, students that are international, graduate, Indigenous or have children are more likely to be food insecure (18).

Other factors may contribute to specifically a concern with the ability to utilize food, which is a domain of food security, is University student housing, which may have limited food storage and cooking facilities, including inadequate utensils and ingredients (13). Attention has also been given regarding student abilities to budget and cooking skills, however, it is well established that for most students who are financially independent, forms of income such as student loans and minimum wage employment are often not enough to cover basic needs and tuition (20).

Food insecurity (especially over many years) can contribute to a higher risk of poor physical and mental health (anxiety, depression, other mental health disorders) in University students (21), because of stress and poor diet quality, just as with the general Canadian population. Being food insecure is also a concern in the University population because it can negatively impact academics over many years (21) and social wellbeing (18).

Although the outcomes of food insecurity are similar to the general population, the circumstances surrounding them differ in the University student population. University is well known as a stressful experience for students, with academic pressures to succeed and, for some, new challenges living away from home and managing personal finances. For those with financial stability, food insecurity due to economic reasons would be non-existent. For those with inadequate finances (including insufficient student loans), they may have additional stressors affording necessities like food and housing (and school supplies), contributing to risk of anxiety and depression, which are already high in University students for various social and academic reasons (22). Additionally, some students may attempt to alleviate financial pressures by taking on a part-time job, which can also contribute to further stress managing time to dedicate to schoolwork (23).

University institutions have implemented various interventions to combat food insecurity, in addition to the strategies individual students may employ. Universities may have campus food banks, food skills programs, community gardens, subsidized restaurants/cafeterias and meal card programs which all can be considered downstream interventions that are essentially food security interventions (as described above), meant to help those who are already food insecure. Universities (specifically students unions) also partake in advocacy efforts to reduce the cost of studying and living (example from UBC below), which is a financial based intervention that would have an impact on food insecurity. Students themselves have adapted to a state of food insecurity by buying less expensive food (21), borrowing food from friends or family (21), using credit cards (accumulating debt) and for the most severe food insecure visiting food banks.

University of British Columbia Context

The University of British Columbia (Point Grey Campus) is situated in Vancouver, where the cost of living is very high. Rental properties are in high demand, with 1% vacancy rate in 2018 and the highest monthly rental cost in Canada for a two bedroom unit, at $1649 (5.5% increase from 2017) (24).
Additionally, the cost of healthy eating has been rising, where in 2015 and 2017, respectively, it cost a single male or female 19-30 years old $234-302 and $246-316 per month to eat healthy (25,26). The monthly cost for a single student for food and rent alone (not including other expenses like tuition, books, utilities etc) is approximately $1,125. In British Columbia for the 2018/19 academic year, the maximum weekly combined loan and grant funding for a full-time student without dependents with financial need is $320 (4 weeks per month $1,280), which is close to covering the basic expenses of food and rent, however not much else. It is important to note that students are not guaranteed to receive the maximum funding (27).

Within the context of the University of British Columbia, various initiatives are in place to mitigate food (in)security. In this section, this work will be summarized.

*University of British Columbia AMS Food Bank*

The UBC campus food bank was opened in 2005 and is operated by the Alma Matter Society (AMS). The food bank provides emergency food items for students in need, and additionally provides referrals to budgeting skills (UBC student services) and connections to resources like free food skills workshops, kitchen equipment and recipes. Students can access the food bank up to six times per term, as the service is intended for emergencies and not supplementing existing food purchases. The food bank is financed by sponsors and donations from students and staff, however, is not a registered charity which limits large contributions due to the inability to issue a tax receipt. Most recently, the UBC President’s Office announced an annual contribution of $10,000 per year for five years to the program (28). Additionally, various campus initiatives have facilitated support of the Food Bank. Examples include Food for Fines, where students can donate food items to the food bank to reduce library fines (29) and holiday initiatives to add $1 to campus restaurant food bills that will go directly to the food bank.

The food bank saw approximately 982 clients in 2017-2018 (30), which has been steadily increasing since the opening in 2005, likely due to increased awareness of the service and high cost of living in Vancouver (28). With this information on access, approximately 1.8% of the student population are accessing the food bank, which is likely a substantial underestimate of those who are food insecure at UBC (28).

In general, the clientele at the food bank is quite different to that of the Greater Vancouver Food Bank, as the campus food bank supports very temporary usage from students who, in time, will likely make an income adequate to be food secure.

*Food Services*

UBC Food Services provides Meal Plans for student and staff purchase that offer cost savings at over 30 UBC locations (31). Students can save up to 12% on food and non-alcoholic beverages at UBC run services (31). Additionally, UBC Food Services offers food skill workshops, online nutrition information via blogs and other forms of media, and Registered Dietitian counselling services free of charge for students living in residence exclusively (32). UBC Food Services is also proceeding with the development of other strategies to help address food Insecurity, including a “Swipe Out Hunger” program and a low cost food cafe with meals for five dollars or less.

Subsidized meals are offered at volunteer run restaurants on campus, including Sprouts/Seedlings (33) and Agora Café (34). The restaurants are not for profit and provide affordable meals for students and
staff. For example, at Sprouts, the seasonal stew, bean burger and curry bowl all cost $4.00 per serving (35).

**UBC Farm and Community Gardens**

The UBC farm provides students and staff with the opportunity to volunteer on the farm and receive produce in return for participation (36). Additionally, the farm has a weekly farmers market, where staff and students have a 10% discount on items, to encourage purchasing local produce (37). UBC also has community gardens, including Roots on the Roof, which has a goal of increasing participant food literacy (38). Ability to participate is limited, however, due to program capacity. The Roots on the Roof program, for example, has the capacity for 6 members.

**UBC Student Services**

UBC Student Services has Enrollment Services Advisors available to assist students with applying for student loans, budgeting and finances (39). Additionally, the UBC Bursary Program provides funding for students who do not have their full cost of living covered through government assistance (40). Students must apply for this additional funding as it is not guaranteed, and international students do not qualify.

**SEEDS Program**

The UBC SEEDS program, which connects students with UBC faculty, staff or community partners to complete work that contributes towards UBC sustainability goals, has completed work in campus food security (41). Past SEEDs projects have included work that supports the AMS Food Bank Strategy (30) Increasing Food Skills of students in residence (42), and investigating sociodemographic predictors of food insecurity among UBC students (43). There are several SEEDS projects that support food security upcoming in 2019, including research to understand student perception of food quality and affordability, mapping the UBC food security interventions, UBC community garden needs assessment, and focus groups with international students to determine a resource for UBC Student Services staff to better support needs.

**Advocacy and Awareness**

Recently, awareness has grown over the concern of campus food insecurity at UBC, including the release of feature articles from the UBC newspaper, the Ubyssey (28). Additionally, the profile has been raised with the recent funding announcement towards the food bank from the UBC President's office (28).

The AMS as an interest group completes advocacy work on behalf of students to improve affordability, which has a direct impact on food insecurity. The AMS advocates on matters related to tuition increases and funding for graduate studies with UBC and advocates on a provincial level to the BC government.

**University of British Columbia Okanagan**

The University of British Columbia Okanagan (UBCO) campus has two main food assistance programs to aid food insecure students: the UBCO Food Exchange and Food Hampers. The UBCO Food Exchange is hosted by the Student Experience Office and supported by student volunteers. The Food Exchange is a low barrier food access program, where a shelf stocked with food items and toiletries that are available anonymously to students free of charge. Students may fill out a food request form to receive a food hamper for additional short-term relief. In addition to the two programs, there are also a number of
student lead initiatives to promote food security, including “the Karma Bowl” where students cook for their peers a hearty soup with locally donated produce.

Similar to the UBC Vancouver campus, UBCO also has available emergency financial aid to students through Enrollment Services.

**Monitoring of Food Insecurity at UBC**

Most recently at UBC, a variety of tools and methods have been used to measure food insecurity.

Although not a validated tool or question to assess food insecurity, the 2018 AMS Academic Experience Survey, undergraduate and graduate students were asked if in the past year they were concerned about having sufficient food (figure 5) (44). Graduate and undergraduate student groups experienced concern at some frequency throughout the year of 37-42%, which is similar to food insecurity estimates at institutions across Canada conducted by Meal Exchange (45).

![Figure 5. UBC AMS Academic Experience Survey- 2018 (44)](image)

The Graduate Student Society (GSS) conducted a survey in 2018 to assess student perceptions on finances and funding, which indicated 56% of respondents experience financial stress related to a lack of funding for studies (46). It can be hypothesized that this financial stress likely would translate to stress affording food in this population.

As part of a UBC SEEDS project in 2016, Land and Food Systems undergraduate students were surveyed using the 9-item Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (43). From this measure, 45% of participants were deemed food insecure (43). The tool used in this study will be discussed further in the literature review (below).
At UBCO, one question from the Canadian HFSSM was used to estimate food insecurity as part of the VOICE 4 (2016-18) research project. In 2017, the question used was “in the past 12 months, have you worried that food would run out before you got money to buy more food?” From this measure, 41.9% of participants were classified as food insecure.

The UBC Undergraduate Experience Survey is an institutional survey on the student experience. The survey collects information on a variety of indicators, including those related to health and wellbeing. Beginning January 2019, the survey will include questions of food insecurity, specifically using the 6-item HFSSM (shortened version from full version presented above). To date, no survey has collected information from UBC students, staff or faculty on food insecurity with a validated tool (for general Canadian population).

Currently under development, the Canadian Campus Wellbeing Survey (CCWS) will provide population-level health and wellbeing data for and across Canadian post-secondary institutions. The CCWS will include a validated food insecurity measure (for general Canadian population).

### University Food Insecurity Measurement: Literature Review

#### Methods

A systematic approach was utilized for this review. Both peer reviewed literature and grey literature was included in the literature search, utilizing Medline and Google Scholar. Determined exclusion criteria included: food banks, qualitative research (due to no measure of food insecurity), colleges (specifically two year), countries that were not comparable to Canada (in terms of development).

Inclusion criteria included quantitative methods to measures of food insecurity in universities, within countries comparable to Canada (development). Measurement of food insecurity in all members of the university community were included (contractors, faculty, staff, graduate and undergraduate students).

Medline was searched with terms including: Food insecurity* AND Universit*, College, student, campus

Search terms were similar for Google Scholar.

Medline was searched first, followed by a search in google scholar. Sources found in Google Scholar were cross referenced with the Medline publications, to avoid duplication.

#### Results

**Included literature**

From the peer reviewed literature search, 50 publications were found with the removal of duplicates. After review of abstracts for relevance, 15 full publications were included for review. Eighteen additional documents or peer reviewed publications were included from the grey literature after cross-referencing results from that of the Ovid Medline search and relevant inclusion criteria. Citations from a recent systematic review (21) were also cross-referenced, and an additional seven documents were included in this review. A total of 40 documents were identified as part of this literature review. All the included studies were cross-sectional.

A summary of literature review results can be found in Appendix B and C.
Survey populations

All surveys reviewed were conducted within Universities in Canada, the United States or Australia. Most studies were conducted in American universities (n=29) (47–75), with fewer in Canadian setting (n=8) (20,43,76–81) and even fewer in Australia (n=3) (82–84). Studies varied in population examined. The majority of studies explicitly included both undergraduate and graduate students and few were conducted in specific populations, such as freshman students (first year), exclusion of freshman students or a specific faculty. Two studies included the entire University community (undergraduates, graduates, faculty, staff) (72,78). One study examined FI across more than one university institution (45). The study sample sizes ranged from 43-9705 individuals. The majority (37/40) included 200 or more participants.

Survey design and administration

Nearly all studies measured FI with the USDA Household Food Security Module or the HFSSM in Canada and they are described in table 2. The exception to this would be five studies (43,48,68,78,82), which used the Hager et al. 2010 two item screener (49), Hager two item screener and the USDA Household Food Security Module, USDA Community Food Security Assessment Toolkit and single-item question from Australian National Nutrition Survey, Household Food Insecurity Access Scale, and self-reported measures, respectively. All forms of the USDA tool were represented in studies reviewed, with four using the full 18-item questionnaire (48,66,75,83), 15 the 10-item adult form (50,52,56–65,73,74,84) and 10 using the 6-item short form (47,49,51,53–55,69–72). Of the six studies using the Canadian HFSSM (20,45,76,77,79,80), four used the 10-item survey (no children) (20,76,77,80) and two adapted the 10-item survey to make a customized six-item survey (45,79).

Table 2. Summary of Main tools (8,9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th># Questions</th>
<th>Classification (# affirmative)</th>
<th>Food Insecure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canadian HFSSM Adult (no children)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Food Secure (0-1) Food Insecure Moderate (2-5) Food Insecure Severe (≥6)</td>
<td>Moderate + Severe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian HFSSM Household (if children)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Food Secure (0-1) Food Insecure Moderate (2-4) Food Insecure Severe (≥5)</td>
<td>Moderate + Severe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA Household/Adult (no children)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>High Food Security (0) Marginal Food Security (1-2) Low Food Security (3-5) Very Low Food Security (6-10)</td>
<td>Low + Very Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA Household (children)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>High Food Security (0) Marginal Food Security (1-2) Low Food Security (3-7) Very Low Food Security (8-18)</td>
<td>Low + Very Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA Short Form</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>High or Marginal Food Security (0-1) Low Food Security (2-4) Very Low Food Security (5-6)</td>
<td>Low + Very Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although most studies used a form of the USDA tool, some differences were found in terms of adaptation of the questionnaire and administration. Some studies, for example Frank, 2018, described minor adaptations to survey question wording or preambles for the purpose of clarifying if the participant was completing the survey from the perspective of an individual or household (20), which will be described further in the discussion section of this document. Period of recall asked of participants differed among studies, of those using derivatives of the USDA tool, four studies (47–49,69) adapting the tool to the past 30 days and three studies under one year (9 months, 1 semester, 3 months) (50–52), with the remaining majority of studies maintaining the original instructions of the USDA tool of reflecting on the past 12 months.

In addition to a standard FI measure tool, most studies collected additional demographic information and included other specific questions of interest based on the research objectives. Examples of additional questions include context specific to food insecurity like food bank use, self-reported mental health, grade point average, finances, meal plan, and living arrangements, which were used to determine potential associated factors of FI or provide more context to population FI.

Most surveys were electronic, administered online without the assistance of an interviewer. Additionally, convenience sampling was common, with very few studies utilizing probability sampling techniques.

**Analysis methods**

FI analysis methods and categories of FI differ based on which survey tool was used and, in most studies, followed analysis instructions set out by tool (as described in the introduction of this paper and in table 2). However, there were some exceptions, where some studies did not follow standardized methods of scoring of validated tool used. One example of this includes two Canadian studies used an adapted form of the HFSSM (six questions) and adapted scoring: 2-4 affirmative moderate FI as opposed to 2-5, and 5-6 severe as opposed to greater or equal to 5 (45,79). Another example is Blundell who used standard analysis and one from PROOF- food secure if 0 affirmative (not 0-1) (76).

Depending on the objectives of the research, methods for analysis differed. However, most were consistent using descriptive statistics and bi-variate analysis (chi-squared test, t-test, ANOVA) to determine prevalence of FI and associated variables with FI. About half (twenty-two) of all studies (20,43,48,49,52–59,61,64,66,69,73,74,76,79,83,84) provided analysis using regression/modeling methods, which controlled for potential confounders in the relationship of the variable to FI.

**Prevalence FI and associated outcome measures**

Overall, regardless of survey tool used, the prevalence of FI (low and very low, or moderate and severe) ranged from 13 to 59 percent. Of the two studies including university staff, Eubanks et al did not report prevalence of staff separate from students and Booth and Anderson reported an academic staff prevalence of 39% and 48% for faculty members (72,78).

In general, as not a focus of this review, the statistically significant variables associated with FI reported can be categorized by: demographics, health, and behaviors. See appendix C for more details.
Recommendations

Recommendations discussed in the literature can be categorized by “future research”, “intervention” and “policy”. Examples of each type of recommendation can be found in appendix C. Of note, this was not an extensive review of recommendations.

Study Limitations

Study limitations cited were consistent across the literature reviewed. Main limitations listed included: study design (cross-sectional) prohibits identifying correlations (only associations), non-randomized sampling methods (not representative of population), limited generalizability of results to other populations (University specific), bias associated with self-reported information (recall, social desirability), non-validated tool for University population, and low survey response rates.

Discussion

After reviewing 40 publications measuring food insecurity in the University population, it was found that the majority (35/40) utilized versions of the USDA tool (including Canadian version, HFSSM) to measure prevalence of food insecurity. Studies also added additional questions to the core tool, depending on the study goals. Aspects of survey administration, such as number of questions (version of USDA tool), period of recall, and population included varied from study to study, with some studies adapting the original instructions/aspects of the USDA/HFSSM tool. Two studies included the entire University community (students, staff, faculty) in assessment, however the quality of food insecurity measure was poor for one study and staff/faculty results not stratified for one study. Food insecurity prevalence ranged from 13-59 percent. Food insecurity recommendations in the literature included interventions for community food security (short term relief, capacity building and empowerment, sustainable food systems) and food insecurity interventions that are income based (advocacy and policy change). Overall, a key limitation discussed by studies included the fact that the USDA/HFSSM tool is not validated in the university population specifically and would be a valuable future step in research.

Limited studies used tools other than the USDA measure, and have been found to be a weaker measure of household food insecurity or not an appropriate measure (food security measure instead). Additionally, none of the tools are validated for use in the University population. Other tools present in the literature review included the Hager 2-item screener (85), the USDA Community Food Security Assessment Toolkit (86), a single-item question from Australian National Nutrition Survey (87), and the Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (88). Briefly, the Hager 2-item screener was assessed to be sensitive, specific and valid as a screener in low income families with children for food insecurity (85). The screener identifies those households that are at risk of food insecurity (69) but does not assess true presence of food insecurity or the extent of insecurity. The USDA Community Food Security Assessment Toolkit contains a variety of tools (including the USDA HFSSM), to assess food security on a community level as opposed to individual households. The toolkit as a whole assists in assessing food accessibility, availability, affordability, and food production resources, with the HFSSM measuring only financial access (86). The toolkit is valuable for community planners, government and non-profit organizations (86), as it assesses community food security, as opposed to household food insecurity, which are different measures and overall purposes. The single Australian National Survey question asks specifically “In the last 12 months, were there any times that you ran out of food and couldn’t afford to buy any
more?” and has been described as underestimating food insecurity prevalence (73) and additionally cannot classify level of food insecurity as other tools do. The Household Food Insecurity Access Scale is a set of nine questions focusing on household food security, specifically the access domain (89). The questions are similar to the USDA tool, however, use the term “resources” to describe access as opposed to “money” in the USDA tool, which indicates physical access (ex. transportation as a resource) could be included in this measure. The scale has been described as being able to be used to measure household food insecurity as well (89), however as indicated, it measures more than just financial access to food, which is not consistent with the definition for food insecurity, thus would argue only measures food security domains.

It is important to note that no tool for measuring food insecurity has been validated in the University population, including on an individual basis (as opposed to considering household only), which was a key limitation discussed in studies reviewed. There would be value in validating a survey in such population, as it is unique compared to the general population of Canada. For example, students live in diverse households with a variety of food or meal sharing dynamics. The dynamics may include roommates or family members, or neither, depending on the living situation. These dynamics exist in the general population, however, tend to be more concentrated in University student demographics. Additionally, the interpretation of questions in the HFSSM may differ in the University population. One question that has been flagged for interpretation differences in other populations is the affordability of a “balanced meals” (90), which could also differ in the University population.

Despite the limitations discussed for the USDA derived survey, with the current body of literature, the USDA/HFSSM tool will allow for comparability to other studies in the literature, and national measures such as the CCHS. The tool and accompanying procedures provide a reliable and valid measure of food insecurity in the general population (86) and is recognized as the best measure available (91). Most studies (except for five) used these tools, which speaks to the benefits of using a population wide validated tool for food insecurity measurement.

The 18-item USDA tool (including the Canadian HFSSM) have short forms, which have been shown to have high sensitivity, specificity and minimal bias compared to the long form in assessing food insecurity prevalence (92), however if an option, the long form is still recommended as additional questions provide more opportunity to capture those who are food insecure (93). Additionally, the survey is customizable, and can be used in combination with other specific desired questions to understand domains of food security. It is important to note, however, that additional questions (such as food utilization) would not contribute to the assessment of food insecurity prevalence as they are different measures.

The papers reviewed used a variety of methods for survey administration. The USDA survey can be customizable to the desires of the surveyor (94). In addition to length already discussed, the period of recall can vary, for example reflecting upon the past 30 days or past 12 months. There may be a variety of reasons for selecting a specific time period, such as a whole year provides a more comprehensive measure of duration of food insecurity, considering all seasons (including the end of a second term, where food insecurity risk may be highest). However, with longer period of recall, the likelihood of recall bias would increase, which may lead to a less accurate measure. Not all studies included all types of students, such as graduate students, which are at high risk of food insecurity (18). Some studies did not include first year students, because the standard period of recall is 12 months. For this population, in
the past 12 months they likely were living in a different situation, such as at home with parents, compared to their current University experience where they may live alone, in residence or with roommates. To address this concern, some surveys adapted the recall period to a shorter duration or asked students to only consider time attending University. In some of the papers reviewed, such as the paper by Frank, the standardized survey questions were adapted to be more appropriate for the university population, including defining the term “household”. Some studies did not include questions to assess if children in the household were food insecure, which would be optional and dependent on the desires of the surveyor. Additionally, as indicated above, additional questions to assess dimensions of food security (ex. utilization and status over time), demographics, and other outcome variables can be included in a customized survey, however this is dependent on the goals of the survey.

Only two studies reviewed included University staff in the food insecurity prevalence assessment. Unfortunately, the study conducted by Eubanks et al. did not report a separate prevalence for staff (72). The study conducted by Booth and Anderson reported a separate and very high prevalence for academic staff and faculty members (78), however the authors did not specify what tool was used to measure food insecurity prevalence, which complicates the interpretation and discussion in this report. The authors cite “food deserts” with a single food services provision contracted company and “time crunches” as impacting staff food insecurity. Despite these concerns, it is questionable if the measurement in this report aligns more with food service satisfaction and food security measures compared to food insecurity. This highlights an area for opportunity, as University communities, such as UBC, focus on the health and well-being of both students and staff. Measuring food insecurity in this population would provide institutions with a better understanding of the current prevalence of staff food insecurity, which could also be compared to other nation and provincial wide measures, such as the CCHS.

The food insecurity prevalence found in this review (range 37-56%) was similar to that of another review conducted by Bruening et al., which found an average of 35% food insecure within peer reviewed literature and 42% in grey literature (95). A review by Lee et al., only reported a range of food insecurity prevalence, which was 9-89.6%, however studies included and at the high range of prevalence were conducted within food banks, which represents a study sample that is highly likely to be food insecure and thus inflates the estimate (21). In addition to measuring prevalence of food insecurity, controlling for confounding factors, such as primary income source or parental status (76), through regression statistical methods, provides a more accurate representation of the relationship between a given factor (ex. GPA) and the outcome of food insecurity.

Briefly, recommendations for future actions vary, with future research, interventions (both upstream and downstream, including food banks, gardens, and income supports) and policy being made. Current evidence from food insecurity research states that food insecurity due to financial inaccessibility is an income-based problem, that is best suited to income-based solutions at a systemic level (96). However, much efforts have been focused on emergency food provisions (food banks) as opposed to addressing the root cause of food insecurity- financial accessibility (96). Additionally, community-based food programs, such as gardens and community kitchens have also been describe as positive social and skill building experiences, however, have limited impact on food insecurity experiences (96). Examples of income based solutions discussed in the Dietitians of Canada position statement on food insecurity and consistent with some studies included in this review include tax exemptions, income protection from precarious employment and low wages, social assistance, subsidized childcare and subsidized,
affordable and stable housing, which is very applicable in the Vancouver setting for UBC students (96). Additional considerations specific to the university student population include the cost of tuition and textbooks.

**Limitations**

A key limitation of the review is that only one reviewer participated in the literature search, data extraction and analysis. Inclusion of additional reviewers could reduce potential bias, including confirmation bias.

**Recommendations**

The current review contributes to a greater understanding of food insecurity measurement in the University population and provides a context-specific review of existing programming within the UBC setting. From this review, it is recommended that UBC Wellbeing:

- Continue to support the regular inclusion, analysis and dissemination of results from a food insecurity module in campus community surveys (ex. the UES Survey, CCWS, other), for the purpose of monitoring prevalence and, most importantly, the use of information for programming and advocacy efforts (income-based solutions to food insecurity to higher levels of government).
- Utilize the Canadian HFSSM survey tool to measure food insecurity, for the purpose of comparability with other work (national measures in CCHS and other universities). Additionally, context specific needs of the survey should be determined (ex. number of questions, reflection time, population).
- Support the validation of the HFSSM survey tool in the University population, as it is only validated for use in the general Canadian population.
- If possible, include University staff and faculty as part of the food insecurity measure, as prevalence data is limited in this population. Both the UBC Wellbeing Strategic Framework and the Action Framework for a Nutritionally Sound Campus goal encompass the entire community, including staff, and thus should be included in measurement.
- Explore the assessment of community food security at UBC. The assessment could contribute to context specific evidence to inform already existing campus food programming that can be categorized as short-term relief and capacity building and empowerment and sustainability interventions.
- Support food (in)security literacy on campus, and the use of appropriate terminology for food related interventions, to inform University policy and programming.

Overall, the study and measurement of campus food insecurity is complex; only recently has work focused on the University population. As an institution, committing to the evidence-informed measurement of campus food insecurity is a positive step towards understanding the true burden experienced in this specific context at UBC and towards achieving goal four of the Action Framework for a Nutritionally Sound Campus, that no community member experiences severe food insecurity.
References


10. PROOF – Research to identify policy options to reduce food insecurity [Internet]. [cited 2018 Dec 19]. Available from: https://proof.utoronto.ca/


15. food security continuum hamilton - Google Search [Internet]. [cited 2019 Jan 18]. Available from: https://www.google.com/search?q=food+security+continuum+hamilton&source=lnms&tbs=isch&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwj4o7jgjfjAhWCiDQIHeF5DwwQ_AUIDygC&biw=1280&bih=610#imgrc=ndkdQzPoR8b1tM:


27. Apply | StudentAidBC [Internet]. [cited 2019 Feb 22]. Available from: https://studentaidbc.ca/apply/eligibility#maximum


32. Nutrition | UBC Food Services [Internet]. [cited 2019 Jan 2]. Available from: https://www.food.ubc.ca/nutrition/

33. UBC Sprouts [Internet]. UBC Sprouts. [cited 2019 Jan 2]. Available from: http://www.ubcsprouts.ca/

34. AGORA CAFÉ – Monday – Friday 9:30am to 3:00pm | Sept – April, excluding holidays [Internet]. [cited 2019 Jan 2]. Available from: https://blogs.ubc.ca/agora/


36. Volunteering | Centre for Sustainable Food Systems at UBC Farm [Internet]. [cited 2019 Jan 18]. Available from: https://ubcfarm.ubc.ca/get-involved/volunteer-program/

37. UBC Farm Markets | Centre for Sustainable Food Systems at UBC Farm [Internet]. [cited 2019 Jan 18]. Available from: http://ubcfarm.ubc.ca/food-production/farm-markets/

38. We are – Roots on the Roof! – Fully student cultivated club and community, for the campus and beyond [Internet]. [cited 2019 Jan 2]. Available from: http://blogs.ubc.ca/rootsontheroof/


47. Maguire J, O’Neill M, Aberson C. California State University Food and Housing Security Survey: Emerging Patterns from the Humboldt State University Data. .12.


62. Espinoza A. ASSESSING DIFFERENCES IN FOOD SECURITY STATUS AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS ENROLLED AT A PUBLIC CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CAMPUS. :108.

63. Chappelle N. FOOD INSECURITY AT HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY. :87.


69. Kashuba KE. The Prevalence, Correlates, and Academic Consequences of Food Insecurity among University of Oregon Students. 2017 [cited 2018 Dec 30]; Available from: https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/xmlui/handle/1794/22865

70. MacDonald A. Food Insecurity and Educational Attainment at the University of Arkansas. Sch Soc Work Undergrad Honors Theses [Internet]. 2016 May 1; Available from: https://scholarworks.uark.edu/scwkuht/3


72. Eubanks MM. The Prevalence of Food Insecurity within the University of Mississippi Community and Knowledge of and Opinions About the University of Mississippi Food Bank [Internet] [undergraduate]. University of Mississippi; 2017 [cited 2018 Dec 30]. Available from: http://thesis.honors.olemiss.edu/845/

73. Danek AC. Food Insecurity and Related Correlates Among Students Attending Appalachian State University.


81. Silverthorn D. HUNGRY FOR KNOWLEDGE: :49.


Appendix A: CCHS Household Food Security Survey Module (HFSSM) (97)

The following questions are about the food situation for your household in the past 12 months.

Q1. Which of the following statements best describes the food eaten in your household in the past 12 months, that is since [current month] of last year?

1. You and other household members always had enough of the kinds of foods you wanted to eat.
2. You and other household members had enough to eat, but not always the kinds of food you wanted.
3. Sometimes you and other household members did not have enough to eat.
4. Often you and other household members didn’t have enough to eat.

Don't know / refuse to answer (Go to end of module)

The HFSSM begins here:

Now I'm going to read you several statements that may be used to describe the food situation for a household. Please tell me if the statement was often true, sometimes true, or never true for you and other household members in the past 12 months.

Q2. The first statement is: you and other household members worried that food would run out before you got money to buy more. Was that often true, sometimes true, or never true in the past 12 months?

1. Often true
2. Sometimes true
3. Never true

Don't know / refuse to answer

Q3. The food that you and other household members bought just didn't last, and there wasn't any money to get more. Was that often true, sometimes true, or never true in the past 12 months?

1. Often true
2. Sometimes true
3. Never true

Don't know / refuse to answer

Q4. You and other household members couldn't afford to eat balanced meals. In the past 12 months was that often true, sometimes true, or never true?

1. Often true
2. Sometimes true
3. Never true

Don't know / refuse to answer

IF CHILDREN UNDER 18 IN HOUSEHOLD, ASK Q5 AND Q6; OTHERWISE, SKIP TO FIRST LEVEL SCREEN

Now I'm going to read a few statements that may describe the food situation for households with children.

Q5. You or other adults in your household relied on only a few kinds of low-cost food to feed the child(ren) because you were running out of money to buy food. Was that often true, sometimes true, or never true in the past 12 months?

1. Often true
2. Sometimes true
3. Never true

Don't know / refuse to answer

Q6. You or other adults in your household couldn't feed the child(ren) a balanced meal, because you couldn't afford it. Was that often true, sometimes true, or never true in the past 12 months?

1. Often true
2. Sometimes true
3. Never true

Don't know / refuse to answer

FIRST LEVEL SCREEN (screener for Stage 2): If AFFIRMATIVE RESPONSE to ANY ONE of Q2-Q6 (i.e., "often true" or "sometimes true") OR response [3] or [4] to Q1, then continue to STAGE 2; otherwise, skip to end.

STAGE 2: Questions 7-11 - ask households passing the First Level Screen

IF CHILDREN UNDER 18 IN HOUSEHOLD, ASK Q7; OTHERWISE SKIP TO Q8

Q7. The child(ren) were not eating enough because you and other adult members of the household just couldn't afford enough food. Was that often, sometimes or never true in the past 12 months?

1. Often true
2. Sometimes true
3. Never true
Don't know / refuse to answer

The following few questions are about the food situation in the past 12 months for you or any other adults in your household.

Q8. In the past 12 months, since last [current month] did you or other adults in your household ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?
   1. Yes
   2. No (Go to Q9)
Don't know / refuse to answer

Q8b. How often did this happen?
   1. Almost every month
   2. Some months but not every month
   3. Only 1 or 2 months
Don't know / refuse to answer

Q9. In the past 12 months, did you (personally) ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money to buy food?
   1. Yes
   2. No
Don't know / refuse to answer

Q10. In the past 12 months, were you (personally) ever hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?
   1. Yes
   2. No
Don't know / refuse to answer

Q11. In the past 12 months, did you (personally) lose weight because you didn't have enough money for food?
   1. Yes
   2. No
Don't know / refuse to answer
SECOND LEVEL SCREEN (screener for Stage 3): If AFFIRMATIVE RESPONSE to ANY ONE of Q7-Q11, then continue to STAGE 3; otherwise, skip to end.

STAGE 3: Questions 12-16 - ask households passing the Second Level Screen

Q12. In the past 12 months, did you or other adults in your household ever not eat for a whole day because there wasn't enough money for food?

1. Yes
2. No (IF CHILDREN UNDER 18 IN HOUSEHOLD, ASK Q13; OTHERWISE SKIP TO END)

Don't know / refuse to answer

Q12b. How often did this happen?

1. Almost every month
2. Some months but not every month
3. Only 1 or 2 months

Don't know / refuse to answer

IF CHILDREN UNDER 18 IN HOUSEHOLD, ASK Q13-16; OTHERWISE SKIP TO END

Now, a few questions on the food experiences for children in your household.

Q13. In the past 12 months, did you or other adults in your household ever cut the size of any of the children's meals because there wasn't enough money for food?

1. Yes
2. No

Don't know / refuse to answer

Q14. In the past 12 months, did any of the children ever skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?

1. Yes
2. No

Don't know / refuse to answer

Q14b. How often did this happen?

1. Almost every month
2. Some months but not every month
3. Only 1 or 2 months
Don't know / refuse to answer

Q15. In the past 12 months, were any of the children ever hungry but you just couldn't afford more food?

1. Yes
2. No
Don't know / refuse to answer

Q16. In the past 12 months, did any of the children ever not eat for a whole day because there wasn't enough money for food?

1. Yes
2. No
Don't know / refuse to answer

End of module

20 Question Q1 is not used directly in determining household food security status.
# Appendix B: Literature Review Results Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, year, location</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Number of Questions</th>
<th>Methods Administer</th>
<th>Recall period</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Prevalence Food Insecurity</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blundell et al., 2018, Newfoundland</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>HFSSM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Online, recruitment-emails, posters, social media.</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Logistic regression; Chi-sq test</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>Cross-sectional, non-random sample, self-reported, 9.4% response rate. Measures household FI, not individual. Doesn't consider social acceptability of how food obtained, interpretation of &quot;balanced meals&quot;, adapt for cultural differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruening et al., 2018, Arizona, USA</td>
<td>University freshman living in residence</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>USDA 6-item FI Short Form</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Part of another survey, online 4 times per year.</td>
<td>Past month, 4 times per year</td>
<td>Structural equation models; chi-sq test</td>
<td>28-36%</td>
<td>Limited generalizability, self-reported, limited to prospective examination FI and healthy/behavior outcomes. No examination of causes of FI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruening et al., 2016, Southwestern USA</td>
<td>University freshman living in residence</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>US HFSSM + validated 2 item screening instrument (Hager et al.)</td>
<td>18 + 2 screener</td>
<td>Online, recruitment-resident hall floor meetings</td>
<td>Past month, and same question 3-month period</td>
<td>Mixed Logistic regression; Chi-sq test, t-test</td>
<td>32-37%</td>
<td>Convenience sample, no temporality, non-generalizable findings, self-reported (recall bias, social desirability bias), misinterpretation questions, not validated for college students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaparro et al., 2009, Hawaii, USA</td>
<td>University (non-freshman)</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>USDA AFSSM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>In person; surveyed classrooms (contacted instructors for approval), questions assessed for readability, relevance with sample of 9</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Descriptive stats; chi-sq test; t-test; linear-by-linear association analysis; Logistic regression</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>Selection bias, generalizability, challenge assessing income/spending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darling et al., 2017, Ohio, USA</td>
<td>University (freshman)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Hager et al. 2010 2 item screener</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Interview administered questionnaire</td>
<td>The past (no restrictions)</td>
<td>Descriptive stats; t-test</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>FS not a current measure (history)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Zein et al., 2018, Florida, USA</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>USDA AFSSM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Online, via email campus wide (grad and undergrad)</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Chi-sq logistic regression</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>Cross-sectional, non-generalizable findings, convenience sample, self-reported data (social desirability bias)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author, year, location</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>Tool</td>
<td>Number of Questions</td>
<td>Methods Administer</td>
<td>Recall period</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>Prevalence Food Insecurity</td>
<td>Limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagedorn et al., 2018, Appalachia, USA</td>
<td>University (undergrad and grad)</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>USDA AFSS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Professors emailed with link to survey</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Logistic regression; chi-sq test; descriptive stats</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>Limited generalizability from non-probability sample, not establish causation, self-reported measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinez et al., 2018, California, USA</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>9705</td>
<td>USDA 6-item FI Short Form</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Online–part of NCSA and independent survey</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Structural equation modeling; descriptive stats; chi-sq test; t-test; Confirmatory Factor analysis</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Cross-sectional design, no cause/effect/directionality, more females than males, low response rate, FI status past 12 months which could be before attended the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McArthur et al., 2018, Appalachia, USA</td>
<td>University Freshman</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>USDA AFSSM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>online</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>T-test; chi-sq</td>
<td>Living with family FI 7%, on campus FI 22%</td>
<td>Limited generalizability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, year, location</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Number of Questions</th>
<th>Methods Administer</th>
<th>Recall period</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Prevalence Food Insecurity</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrabir et al., 2016, Midwest, USA</td>
<td>University (within housing with and without food provisions)</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>USDA 6-item FI Short Form Modified to focus on individual, not household</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Online, emailed random sample</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>data weighted; chi-sq test; ordered logistic regression; linear regression</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>Small sample minority groups, needed to group together ethnicities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris et al., 2016, Illinois, USA</td>
<td>University (undergrad)</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>&quot;HFSSM&quot; incorrectly identified, really is the Adult PSSM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Online, emailed</td>
<td>9 months</td>
<td>Descriptive stats; chi-sq test; t-test; linear-by-linear association analysis; Logistic regression</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Self-reported, limited generalizability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patton-Lopez et al., 2014, Oregon, USA</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>USDA HFSSM Short Form</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Online, emailed all students</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics; chi-sq; Logistic regression</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>Cross-sectional, self-reported, non-probability sample, low response rate (sampling error and non-response bias), no measurement of child food insecurity and doesn’t capture most severe adult food insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author, year, location</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>Tool</td>
<td>Number of Questions</td>
<td>Methods Administer</td>
<td>Recall period</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>Prevalence Food Insecurity</td>
<td>Limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payne-Sturgis et al., 2018, Midleton, USA</td>
<td>University (undergrad. of three faculties)</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>USDA HFSSM</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Online, during class time</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Descriptive stat; chi-sq; test: logistic regression</td>
<td>Fi: 15%, 16% at risk Fi</td>
<td>Cross-sectional (no causation), selection bias, HFSSM not validated in college population,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds et al., 2018, Atlantic Province, Canada</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>HFSSM (Canada), wording: adapted for individual, not household</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Online, emailed</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics; chi-sq</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>Self-reported, low response rate, non-probability sampling (selection bias)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wattick et al., 2018, Abbotsford, USA</td>
<td>University (undergrad and grad)</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>USDA AFSS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Online, university listserv emailed link</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Logistic regression; chi-sq, descriptive stat</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>Self-reported indicators, not generalizable, didn’t collect major information (could have contributed to stress level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuster et al., 2016, Canada</td>
<td>University (5 campus’s)</td>
<td>4015</td>
<td>HFSSM (select questions)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Online, social media, university promotion</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>Did not use full HFSSM, response bias (over reported FI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espinosa, 2013, California, USA</td>
<td>University (grad and undergrad)</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>USDA Adult HFSSM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Paper survey, selected courses</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>chi-sq, descriptive stat</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>Timing end of fall semester (could have had drop outs not participating), self-reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, year, location</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Number of Questions</th>
<th>Methods Administer</th>
<th>Recall period</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Prevalence Food Insecurity</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calvex et al., 2016, Texas, USA</td>
<td>University (undergrad)</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>USDA HFSSM (short form)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Online, social media, listserv, class announcement</td>
<td>Current semester</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>Small sample size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chappelle, 2015, California, USA</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>USDA AFSSM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Online, all enrolled students</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>chi-sq, test; descriptive stat</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Very low response rate (technical difficulties, skew data to people who live on campus respond),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maguire et al., 2016, California, USA</td>
<td>University (grad and undergrad)</td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>USDA HFSSM (short form)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaines et al., 2014, Southeastern USA</td>
<td>University (undergrad, no freshman)</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>USDA AFSSM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Paper, selected courses, mix of sampling frame and convenience</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Descriptive; chi-sq; ANOVA; probabilistic regression analysis (financial analysis)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Cross sectional, selection bias, not generalizable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author, year, location</td>
<td>Population (grade and under grad)</td>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>Tool</td>
<td>Number of Questions</td>
<td>Methods Administer</td>
<td>Recall period</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>Prevalence Food Insecurity</td>
<td>Limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallegos et al., 2013, Australia</td>
<td>University (undergrad)</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>USDA FSWM</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Online, to all students in Business and Health Faculty, university home page link, posters</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Descriptive; Chi-sq logistic regression</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Low response rate, not representative sample, cross sectional design, self-reported data,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes et al., 2011, Australia</td>
<td>University (undergrad and under grad)</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>USDA Community Food Security Assessment Toolkit (adapted) and single-item question from Australian National Nutrition Survey</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Paper survey</td>
<td>unsure</td>
<td>Descriptive; Chi-sq</td>
<td>Single measure FI. 12.7% USDA 46.5% FI without hunger, 25.3% FI with hunger</td>
<td>Cross sectional, no causation determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridedout et al., 2017, British Columbia, Canada</td>
<td>University (undergrad one faculty)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Household Food Insecurity Access Scale</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>Chi-sq, t-test, stepwise multiple binary logistic regression</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Not indicated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, year, location</th>
<th>Population (grade and under grad)</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Number of Questions</th>
<th>Methods Administer</th>
<th>Recall period</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Prevalence Food Insecurity</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King, 2017, Oko, USA</td>
<td>University (undergrad and grad)</td>
<td>4479</td>
<td>USDA APSSM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Online, university wide email</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>Descriptive; Chi-sq; multinomial regression</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>Cross-sectional no causation or generalizability, self-reported data, skip patterns survey, not validated for college population 3-month recall, misinterpretation questions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank, 2018, Nova Scotia, Canada</td>
<td>University (undergrad)</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>CCHS HFSSM-Adult</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Online, university wide</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Descriptive; Chi-sq logistic regression</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>Cross-sectional no causation, self-reporting, non-probability sample (although whole population sampled), 12 months recall of tool could have captured spring/summer off campus, tool measures FI due to financial reasons - other reasons possible (with access and use of food-ies, limited stores, lack transportation, payment times lump sum vs spread out)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McArthur, 2017, Australia</td>
<td>University (2nd year undergrad to grad)</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>USDA HFSSM-Adult</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Online, emails to all students</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Correlation; chi-sq regression</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>Limited generalizability, non prob sample, self-reporting,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miczojo et al., 2014, Australia</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>USDA HFSSM-Adult</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Paper survey (on campus recruitment, info flyers, posters etc)</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Chi-sq multinomial regression</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>No clear section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author, year, location</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>Tool</td>
<td>Number of Questions</td>
<td>Methods administered</td>
<td>Recall period</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>Prevalence Food Insecurity</td>
<td>Limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obuszko, 2018, Saskatchewan, Canada</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>CCHS-HFSSM-Adult</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Online, email sample random sample</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Descriptive chi-sq</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>No causality, non-representative of campus (self-selection bias),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silva et al., 2017, Massachusetts, USA</td>
<td>University (grad and undergrad)</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>USDA HFSSM (not explicitly stated, likely adapted)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Paper survey-random classes selected</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Not described in methods</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>*poor description of methods, including tool and statistics used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDonald, 2016, Arkansas, USA</td>
<td>University (grad and undergrad)</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>USDA HFSSM (short form)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Online, convenience sample</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Descriptive chi-sq</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Convenience sample, not representative, small sample size, self-reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorman, 2018, Ohio, USA</td>
<td>University (grad and undergrad)</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>USDA AFSPM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Online, convenience sample</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>Small sample size, convenience sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esh et al., 2017, Manitoba, Canada</td>
<td>University (grad and undergrad)</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>HFSSM (select) (Meal exchange) Silverthorn, 2016 questions + 2 questions students rate own F</td>
<td>9</td>
<td><em>Census style sampling</em> through email</td>
<td>unsure</td>
<td>Descriptive; chi-sq regression</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Small sample size, other confounders not accounted for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author, year, location</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>Tool</td>
<td>Number of Questions</td>
<td>Methods Administer</td>
<td>Recall period</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>Prevalence Food Insecurity</td>
<td>Limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges-Fredman et al., 2016, Texas, USA</td>
<td>University (grad and undergrad)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>USDA AFSSM (short form)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Online, convenience sample</td>
<td>12 months?</td>
<td>Descriptive; t-test; ANOVA</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Cross sectional data, convenience, small sample size,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorell, 2017, North Carolina, USA</td>
<td>University (undergrad and grad, no freshman)</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>USDA AFSSM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Online, randomized sample</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Descriptive; chi-square regression</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>Non-generalizable, cross-sectional, self-reported data, low response rate (sampling error and non-response bias), non-probability sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubanks, 2017, Mississippi, USA</td>
<td>University (faculty, staff, grad and undergrad)</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>USDA AFSSM (short form)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Online, 1/3 campus</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Descriptive; chi-square</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>Did not differentiate between staff and faculty responses, or age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kastha, 2017, Oregon, USA</td>
<td>University (grad and undergrad)</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td>USDA AFSSM (short form)</td>
<td>6 (combined two questions into 1: cutting meals and frequency)</td>
<td>Online, non-probability sample</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>Descriptive; logistic regression</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>Response bias, cross-sectional (no casual), no income/expenditure info collected, selection and measurement bias (non-random sampling, non-response bias, voluntary response bias, measurement bias. USDA tool in university population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, year, location</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Number of Questions</th>
<th>Methods Administer</th>
<th>Recall period</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Prevalence Food Insecurity</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Krof et al., 2017, Alabama, USA</td>
<td>University students off campus</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>USDA AFSSM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Online, non-probability sample</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Descriptive; logistic regression; chi-square</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>Food security scale only 4 dimensions of FS, cross sectional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller et al., 2017, Pacific Northwest, USA</td>
<td>University (Social work students)</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>USDA HFSSM (7 Children included)</td>
<td>15? (includes children)</td>
<td>Online, non-probability sample</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Descriptive; chi-square</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>Non prob sample, single faculty, measurement bias from tool, cross sectional (no causation), social desirability bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booth and Anderson, 2016, British Columbia, Canada</td>
<td>University Community (Including staff)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Question: &quot;How food insecure do you think you are right now&quot;</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Online Survey</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>59% FI students, 59% academic staff, 48% faculty members,</td>
<td>None listed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C: Literature Review Results Table - Associated factors and recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, year, location</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Other associated factors</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blundell et al., 2018, Newfoundland</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>Logistic regression; Chi-sq test</td>
<td>Out of Province and international students more likely to be FI compared to provincial students (controlled); High risk FI- international, with children, government income as primary income</td>
<td>Dietitians and stakeholders work together, implement strategies to reduce FI, especially in at risk population. Strategies- affordable childcare and housing, increased availability financial support. Research needed to develop and validate individual food security- most vulnerable don’t live in traditional households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruening et al., 2018, Arizona, USA</td>
<td>University freshman living in residence</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>Structural equation models; chi-sq test</td>
<td>FI related to: poorer eating patterns, physical activity behaviors, mental health.</td>
<td>Multifaceted intervention. Systematically screen for FI in Universities. More research prevent and address FI on and before university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruening et al., 2016, Southwestern USA</td>
<td>University freshman living in residence</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>Mixed logistic regression; Chi-sq test</td>
<td>FI higher odds depression, lower odds eating breakfast, consuming home cooked meals, perceiving off campus eating habits as healthy, receiving food from parents.</td>
<td>For interventions, consider students with limited resources. More research needed understand scope and prevalence FI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaparro et al., 2009, Hawaii, USA</td>
<td>University (non-freshman)</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>Descriptive stats; chi-sq test; t-test; linear-by-linear association analysis; Logistic regression</td>
<td>Higher risk FI- living on campus and off-campus with roommates, Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders/Filipinos/mixed</td>
<td>Increase food availability and accessibility through on-campus food banks, student gardens. Future studies should assess prevalence in colleges nationwide, investigate connection to performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darling et al., 2017, Ohio, USA</td>
<td>University (freshman)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Descriptive stats; t-test</td>
<td>FI history- higher BMI, depressive symptoms, stress, disordered eating scores</td>
<td>Interventions that target decreasing negative mental health outcomes and risk for overweight for those with history FI; research prospective longitudinal design, more comprehensive measure of FI, psychosocial/educational food buying and preparation skills on budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Zein et al., 2018, Florida, USA</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>Chi-sq; logistic regression</td>
<td>Increased likelihood accessing food pantry; being food insecure, international status, student loan/reed based federal funding</td>
<td>Reduce social stigma with food pantry/interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author, year, location</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>Other associated factors</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagedorn et al., 2018, Appalachia, USA</td>
<td>University (undergrad and grad)</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>Logistic regression; chi-sq test; descriptive stats</td>
<td>Higher scores for money expenditure and coping strategies significantly higher odds being FI. Odds of higher academic performance score inversely related to FI. Significant predictors of FI: money expenditure, coping strategies, health, school year remained.</td>
<td>Provide for basic needs—would promote success of students. Targeted interventions to promote academic success. Behavioral differences for coping strategies, money expenditure, academic performance of FI individuals can be used to identify and target at risk students to promote well-being.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinez et al., 2018, California, USA</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>9705</td>
<td>Structural equation modeling; descriptive stats; chi-sq test; t-test; Confirmatory Factor analysis</td>
<td>FI related to lower GPA directly and indirectly through poor mental health</td>
<td>Interventions and policy to provide students with basic needs for academic and future success, institutions devise strategies to ID students at risk and assist those who would benefit from campus services and federal/state/local programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McArthur et al., 2018, Appalachia, USA</td>
<td>University Freshman</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>T-test; chi-sq</td>
<td>FS significantly higher on self-rated academic progress, perceived health status and healthy eating habits</td>
<td>Campus and community interventions to increase food access (ex. More part time jobs, affordable meal plans)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, year, location</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Other associated factors</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mirabbas et al., 2016, Midwest, USA</td>
<td>University (within housing with and without food provisions)</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>data weighted; chi-sq test; ordered logistic regression; linear regression</td>
<td>Within housing without food provisions, marginal and low FS lower Fruit and vegetable intake, undergraduate more likely to have lower FI compared to PhD/graduate professionals</td>
<td>Garden/farm access, affordable food outlets, reduce cost campus meal plan (on campus for off campus students), health center/counselling screen for FI and refer to resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris et al., 2016, Illinois, USA</td>
<td>University (undergrad)</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Descriptive stats; chi-sq test; t-test; linear-by-linear association analysis; Logistic regression</td>
<td>Significant relationship between FS and race, GPA, loan use, living location</td>
<td>Campus food banks/pantries, counselors/nutrition educators provide info re: eligibility Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (federal benefit), erase stigma for food assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patton-Lopez et al., 2014, Oregon, USA</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics; chi-sq; logistic regression</td>
<td>Factors associated with FI: fair/poor health, being employed, Income &lt;$5,000 per year. Good academic performance inversely associated with FI</td>
<td>Expand research on different campus settings and strengthen support systems to increase access to nutritious foods and improve economic stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author, year, location</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>Other associated factors</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payne-Sturges et al., 2018, MidAtlantic, USA</td>
<td>University (undergrad, of three faculties)</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>Descriptive stat; chi-sq test; logistic regression</td>
<td>Higher odds F/I at risk F/I: African-American, other race/ethnicity, multiple forms financial aid, and experiencing housing problems. F/S - less likely report depression symptoms than at risk F/I.</td>
<td>Universities that measure F/S better positioned advocate for policy changes regarding affordability and financial assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds et al., 2018, Atlantic Province, Canada</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics; chi-sq</td>
<td>Students in higher years study, living off campus higher rates F/S</td>
<td>Advocate increased funding for students, reducing/halting education costs for students, improve access to healthy, affordable food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wartick et al., 2018, Appalachian, USA</td>
<td>University (undergrad and grad)</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>Logistic regression; chi-sq, descriptive stat</td>
<td>Association of anxiety and depression and F/S status</td>
<td>Research a better validated tool for mental health and diet quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverthorn, 2016, Canada</td>
<td>University (5 campus's)</td>
<td>4013</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy recommendations- national survey F/S and housing, guaranteed annual income (investigate), TRC calls to action, local programs/policies for affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espinoza, 2013, California, USA</td>
<td>University (grad and undergrad)</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>chi-sq; descriptive stat</td>
<td>No difference F/S based on GPA, race/ethnicity. Difference based on living arrangement, income level, credit card debt, health status, food coping strategies</td>
<td>Research further, identify factors increase risk F/S, reduce poor ID why few use emergency food services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, year, location</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Other associated factors</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calvo et al., 2016, Texas, USA</td>
<td>University (undergrad)</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>42% meal plan users low or very low F/S rate is non-meal plan users 50%</td>
<td>Reject “impoverished student experience” that is normalized, long term solutions needed-food assistance program, health and wellness education, work with policy makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chappelle, 2015, California, USA</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>chi-sq; t-test; descriptive stat</td>
<td>Poor health and wellness outcomes significantly assoc. with F/S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maguire et al., 2016, California, USA</td>
<td>University (grad and undergrad)</td>
<td>1594</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Freshman more likely to be high/marginal F/S, graduate students more likely high/marginal F/S</td>
<td>State and Federal policies need to be redesigned to be more inclusive for college students – ex. Easier to be eligible for public social service programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaines et al., 2014, Southeastern USA</td>
<td>University (undergrad, no freshman)</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>Descriptive; chi-sq; ANOVA; probit regression analysis (financial analysis)</td>
<td>F/S status signoff. Assoc. with food resource adequacy (receiving financial aid, on food assistance, financially independent). Familial financial support, alternative financing (eg credit cards) negatively assoc. with F/S. Higher score on measure of resource adequacy (not cooking self-efficacy) less likely food insecure</td>
<td>Further research F/S variety student populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author, year, location</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>Other associated factors</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gollgeon et al., 2013, Australia</td>
<td>University (undergrad)</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>Descriptive; chi-sq; logistic regression</td>
<td>Associated with FI: low income, reliance on government support, renting. FI households +2 as likely report fair or poor health, x2’s likely to have deferred studies due to financial difficulties. 80% studies compromised</td>
<td>Strategies to alleviate FI could improve retention rates and educational outcomes. Improve access, availability, affordability of food on campus. Develop innovative strategies that promote dignity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes et al., 2011, Australia</td>
<td>University (grad and undergrad)</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>Descriptive; chi-sq</td>
<td>FI significantly associated with renting, boarding or sharing accommodation, low incomes or receiving government assistance. FI more likely rate health lower than those FS.</td>
<td>Further research broader determinants of FI and responses: including social support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideout et al., 2017, British Columbia, Canada</td>
<td>University (undergrad and one faculty)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Chi-sq; t-test; stepwise multiple binary logistic regression</td>
<td>Each year education associated with 39% decrease FI risk, parent as primary food purchaser associated with 80% decrease risk, having moved to Vancouver within 3 years associated with 27.9% increase in FI risk. 6 FI students used emergency food programs.</td>
<td>Ensure FI students connected with appropriate resources, public support (ex. Guaranteed Income Supplement), more research across Canada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, 2017, Ohio, USA</td>
<td>University (undergrad and grad)</td>
<td>4473</td>
<td>Descriptive; Chi-sq; multinomial regression</td>
<td>Association with FS status: ethnicity/race, marital status, class standing (undergrad vs. grad), residence, employment status, financial aid and previous/current use of federal assistance (ex. NSLP, SNAP) significant relationship with FS Status.</td>
<td>Validate tool with University population (language to avoid misinterpretation), inclusion FS question on funding application, institutions work with student’s awareness benefits, barriers to access, contracts with food vendors to include provisions to address student FI (ex. portion annual profit for resources), modify current SNAP guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank, 2018, Nova Scotia, Canada</td>
<td>University (undergrad)</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Descriptive; Chi-sq; logistic regression</td>
<td>FI associated with living arrangements, source of funds for schooling, meal plan and year of study. Poor overall health, poor mental health, high stress, poor academic performance significant for FI students.</td>
<td>Re-evaluate funding policies for post-secondary education to ensure affordability of costs of basic needs and educational costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McArthur, 2017, Appalachia, USA</td>
<td>University (2nd year undergrad to grad)</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>Correlation; chi-sq; regression</td>
<td>Predictor variables: higher money expenditure, lower GPA, male, receiving financial aid, fair/poor self-rated health, never cooking for self or others</td>
<td>FI student interventions teach budgeting skills, how purchase and prepare healthy foods, policies increase access food resource assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mleczko et al., 2014, Australia</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Chi-sq; multinomial regression</td>
<td>Lower odds FI students living with family, higher odds if receiving government support</td>
<td>Increase food availability, accessibility (ex. Food bank) (not a solution), further work to determine causal intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author, year, location</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>Other associated factors</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klappa, 2016, Saskatchewan, Canada</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Descriptive chi-square</td>
<td>Increased odds of students who are parents, international students, rely on government loans as primary source income</td>
<td>Need to understand barriers to FS better engage other universities to undergo similar work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silva et al., 2017, Massachusetts, USA</td>
<td>University (grad and undergrad)</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>Not described in methods</td>
<td>Homelessness and severe FI greater risk no completing University</td>
<td>Identify students with difficulties to intervene and increase retention and student health and wellbeing. Study results can inform policy and practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDonald, 2016, Arkansas, USA</td>
<td>University (grad and undergrad)</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>Descriptive; chi-square</td>
<td>Negative correlation FI and educational attainment</td>
<td>More awareness FI issues and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorman, 2014, Ohio, USA</td>
<td>University (grad and undergrad)</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Descriptive; chi-square</td>
<td>Significant relationship between living arrangement, location, level of FI. Higher FI living off campus. No relationship between FI and class standing (ex. first year vs graduate student)</td>
<td>Increase food availability and accessibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eitel et al., 2017, Manitoba, Canada</td>
<td>University (grad and undergrad)</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>Descriptive; chi-square; regression</td>
<td>Indigenous students 5-10 times more likely report FI than non-Indigenous students. Severe FI 5x's more likely on student/bank loans, FI significantly more likely poor to fair mental and physical health.</td>
<td>Institutions/government need to consider implications of tuition increases and funding for universities on FI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biediger-Friedman et al., 2016, Texas, USA</td>
<td>University (grad and undergrad)</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>Descriptive; t-test; ANOVA</td>
<td>Purchasing patterns consistent across levels of FI</td>
<td>Explore other influencers of food purchasing (upper level environmental)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danek, 2017, North Carolina, USA</td>
<td>University (undergrad and grad, no freshman)</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>Descriptive; chi-square; regression</td>
<td>Predictive of FI: female, higher money expenditure and coping strategy scores, lower GPA, receiving financial aid, students who did not own a car, perceived fair/poor health status, lower frequency cooking for self or others. Reported coping strategies as well.</td>
<td>&quot;Immediate need for food resource assistance&quot; on campus and community based.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eubanks, 2017, Mississippi, USA</td>
<td>University (faculty, staff, grad and undergrad)</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>Descriptive; chi-square</td>
<td>Awareness of food bank and food consumption q's (meal plan, budget, food cultural beliefs)</td>
<td>Future research on financial aid status and FI. Relationship between food banks in area and FS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katbella, 2017, Oregon, USA</td>
<td>University (grad and undergrad)</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>Descriptive; logistic regression</td>
<td>Higher risk FI: Hispanic/Latina, International, LGBTQ, first-generation college students, Black/African American, FI significant lower GPA.</td>
<td>Add FS questions to more general student survey to reduce response bias and have longitudinal data to understand FI and help ID causal relationship if exists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koo et al., 2017, Alabama, USA</td>
<td>University students off campus</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>Descriptive; logistic</td>
<td>FI not associated with obesity, FI significant higher rates fair/poor health compared to FS</td>
<td>Educators should be cognizant of financial conditions may place students at risk for FI, need interventions to address FI on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author, year, location</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>Other associated factors</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles et al., 2017, Pacific Northwest, USA</td>
<td>University [Social work students]</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>Descriptive; chi-square</td>
<td>Students in BSW program, students of color, females, first gen college students more likely FI</td>
<td>Administrators should strongly support students challenged to meet basic needs; additional beyond financial aid packages from university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booth and Anderson, 2016, British Columbia, Canada</td>
<td>University Community [including staff]</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>Not described</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>