To: UVic Food Services and The Office of Campus Planning and Sustainability

From: Jessica Schellenberg, Good Food Coordinator, UVic Meal Exchange

Date: September, 2018

Subject: Increasing Sustainable Food Procurement at the University of Victoria

Summary

University Food Service Operators spend over five billion dollars on food annually across Canada, making them ideal leverage points for change toward sustainable food economies (Meal Exchange, 2017). This memo examines current leadership with regard to sustainable food purchasing at the University of Victoria (UVic). Directed at both Food Services and the Office of Campus Planning and Sustainability (OCPS), with a purpose of making recommendations for increasing sustainable food procurement at UVic.

This memo is a response to two 'Good Food Calculator Audits' of both Mystic Market (October 2016) and the Cadboro Commons (October 2016) at UVic,[1] lead by the UVic Meal Exchange 'Good Food Coordinator'.[2] The auditing process involved an evaluation of purchasing invoices, and contacting vendors to determine the percentage of 'Community Based', 'Humane', 'Socially Just' and 'Ecologically Sound' food was purchased. Meal Exchange, a national non-profit organization, developed those categories for sustainable food procurement (Meal Exchange, 2018). Inspired by the Good Food Challenge's (GFC)[3] American counterpart "the Real Food Challenge"[4], these standards are developed in ongoing conversation with students,

---

[1] Data for the audit has not been finalized, but is in its final stages. As such, it will be referred to only in general terms, in speculation of final results, and infrequently throughout this memo. However, it does appear that scores for this audit will be similar to those found at Mystic Market's February 2016 audit. This report can be updated to reflect the new scores.

[2] The UVic Good Food Coordinator position involves both coordinating an campus Good Food Audit, as well as leading a campus Meal Exchange chapter. The chapter extends beyond procurement initiatives to raising awareness about 'Good Food' in general. For example, in 2018 the UVic chapter will run educational sustainable cooking workshops for students on campus.

[3] "The Good Food Challenge (GFC) uses the power of youth and students to create campus food systems that are sustainable, socially just, humane, and healthy. Amidst a sea of confusing labels, certifications and claims about sustainability and ethical purchasing, the Good Food Challenge offers campuses a comprehensive and decisive definition for Good Food, set a high standard upheld consistently among institutions, and support users in tracking their progress" (Meal Exchange, 2018).

[4] In the 2015-2016 school year alone, the RFC in the United states organized 6.3 million dollars toward ethical, sustainable and humane foods at participating universities.

Meal Exchange's national office, partnering non profit organizations and experts in the field (including farmers, professors and Food Service workers) across Canada. The guiding principles for the auditing process are found in version 1.0 of the 'Good Food Guide' (see figure 1). Meal Exchange lead 'Student Standards Committee' cross referenced Meal Exchange's perception of 'Good Food' with existing sustainable food certification programs and standards in order to identify products that meet Meal Exchange's criteria, set out in the Good Food Guide. Examples of certifications that count as 'Good Food' included: USDA Organic, SPCA Certified, Rainforest Alliance Certified and Fair Trade International. The use of certifications that guarantee ecological and human welfare along the supply chain have increased in popularity in recent years. Today, 7% of the coffee and 12% of the wild fish sold in international markets, are sustainably produced using certifications such as those utilized in the GFC (Blackman & Rivera, 2011, pp. 1177).

Notably, not all certifications are equal in caliber, as some have more stringent criteria than others. In this light, the GFC serves as a useful tool for universities by offering them a comprehensive list of certifications that match the standards set out in the Good Food Guide. The Good Food Guide is useful for universities as it was created with university food purchasing patterns and student values in mind. The GFC offers university Food Service providers a clear and systematic methodology for increasing sustainable food on their campuses. The short term goal of the GFC is for participating universities to sign a 20% 'Good Food Commitment' by 2025, and UVic has expressed interest to so by 2020. In line with existing policies at the University of Victoria, the GFC offers tangible actions to Food Services to meet the 'Dining Services' mission, set out by the OCPS' Sustainability Action Plan 2014: "to be an institutional model of sustainability, leading the way through innovative local purchasing initiatives and operational sustainable practices that minimize our carbon footprint and provide high quality, ethically sourced, nutritious and diverse food options that sustain the health and

wellbeing of our community (University of Victoria, 2014, pp. 14). Coordinators within the GFC have been working with Food Service operators and sustainability offices to increase knowledgeability about sustainable food, identify the percentage of sustainable food purchased on campus, and identify options to increase that percentage.

This memo will first outline two recommendations for increasing sustainable food on the UVic campus, it will then provide a background on why sustainable food procurement matters, a cross campus comparison between initiatives to do so amongst Canadian Universities participating in the GFC, and finally explore in detail the recommendations for UVic. The preferred recommendation is the creation of a Sustainable Food Coordinator position within UVic Food Services. Suggested tasks for the position include: ongoing collaboration on policy reform with UVic's OCPS, price analysis (maintaining triple bottom line principles), collaboration with local sustainable food initiatives, organizing educational events, and coordinating the development of an educational campus farm that provides organic produce to the university. The second recommendation is for UVic to adopt GFC values and benchmarks into its coming Sustainability Action Plan (2020-2025), and commit to the 20% Good Food Commitment.

The Good Food Guide
The 'Good Food Guide' represents Meal Exchange's 'Good Food Standards', and is used as a reference for student researchers who are conducting the 'Calculator Audit'. Existing sustainable food certifications are categorized as 'Green Light' when they have met all or most of the criteria within a given pillar (Socially Just, Community Based, Humane or Ecologically Sound). Certifications achieve a 'Yellow Light' when they have met some Good Food criteria within a given pillar, but not all. Note that both Green and Yellow light status count as Good Food, but Green light is prefered. Lastly, 'Disqualifiers' are ingredients that are so egregious to human health, that a product containing one cannot count as Good Food, even if

it is certified (Meal Exchange, 2018). However, the presence of disqualified items will not reduce the overall percentage of Good Food at a given campus. Instead, those foods with disqualified ingredients are identified as a priority to replace with 'Good Food'.

Figure 1: The Good Food Guide Version 1.0 (Meal Exchange, 2018)

Recommendations

A. <u>Star Recommendation: Hire a Sustainable Procurement Officer within Food Services</u>

    1. Manage and maintain sustainable purchasing decisions within Food Services;

    2. Maintain UVic's policy directives under sections '5.6 Purchasing' and '5.3 Dining Services' of the Sustainability Action Plan;
   - Work with vendors to increase the availability of sustainable food;
   - Maintain independent restaurants above franchise tenures;

    3. Implement sustainability clauses within contracts between Food Services and its vendors;

    4. Maintain relationships with key stakeholders Involved in UVic's food culture including: Campus clubs, Meal Exchange, local First Nations, CRFAIR, Farm to School Canada, TOPSOIL innovative urban agriculture, and Fair Trade Canada;

    5. Partner to implement a pilot project for an organic educational farm that produces produce for sale to Food Services (long term goal)
   - Increase UVic's Good Food percentage;
   - Educate students about organic growing processes, and running an urban agriculture site;
   - Respond to two key strategies within UVic's Strategic Plan (written in section 2.3 of the Sustainability Action Plan).

B. <u>Adopt the GFC at UVic</u>

1. Incorporate Good Food Challenge Benchmarks Into the Sustainability Action Plan;

2. Implement the GFC's 20% Good Food Commitment;

    i. Implement strategies to go beyond the 20% Commitment, once it is achieved;

    ii. Continue to run the Calculator Audit at additional facilities on campus.

Background: Why Does Sustainable Procurement Matter?

This background will use Meal Exchange's GFC four core pillars (Ecologically Sound, Humane, Socially Just, and Community based) as a lens through which to identify some of the issues correlated with current UVic food purchasing. Note, however, that this memo does not address all issues associated with the industrial agrofood system[5]. Moreover, each of the pillars are explored in brief, encompassing only a small portion of what is explored within Meal Exchange's 'Good Food Position Papers'[6]. Food Services and the OCPS should as such, refer to the full position papers for additional information concerning the meaning of Good Food.

In recent years, concerns regarding the impact of the global industrialized food system have become prevalent in public discourse. Due to increasing applications of advanced technologies and market competition, the food industry has transformed in important ways from that of the past, and as large institutions like universities work to maintain their economic bottom lines, cheaper food commodities resulting from these technologies become more favourable (Sage, 2012, pp. 113). Examples of this transformation in relation to consumption patterns

---

[5] Agrofood system: "An alternative term for *food system*" (Gliessman, 2015, p.345). Food system: "The interconnected meta-system of agroecosystems, their economic, social, cultural, and technological support systems, and systems of food distribution and consumption (p. 347).

[6] Meal Exchange has created position papers associated with each pillar in the GFC. These will be published in the 2018-2019 school year; following Meal Exchange Canada's GFC official launch.

include: increased eating outside of the home, an increase in pre-prepared meals (e.g microwave lunches) and snack foods (e.g. chips and candy), reliance on refrigeration (to enable long distance travel), globally recognized branding, and higher rates of meat consumption globally (Sage, 2012, p. 166-170). Some of the implications of this shift include: global climate change resulting from greenhouse gas emissions, diminished flavour and nutrition due to the number of miles food travels, chemical use in the growing process, and the mistreatment of both workers and animals (pp. 142, 277).

Meal Exchange's pillar 'Ecologically Sound' responds to these issues with reference to environmental impact. This pillar supports production practices that encourage: biodiversity conservation, ecosystem resilience, and the preservation of natural resources including: energy, air, soil, and wildlife (Meal Exchange, 2017, pp.1). Similarly, Food Secure Canada defines a sustainable food system as one that is "...produced, harvested (including fishing and other wild food harvest), processed, distributed and consumed in a manner which maintains and enhances the quality of land, air and water for future generations, and in which people are able to earn a living wage in a safe and healthy working environment by harvesting, growing, producing, processing, handling, retailing and serving food (Food Secure Canada, 2010, pp.10). Presently, although there are efforts to create sustainable food systems, ecologically harmful practices remain most common. The FAO states that GHG emissions from agriculture have grown 14%, from 4.7 billion tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalents in 2001 to 5.3 billion tonnes in 2011. In addition, 13% of all GHG emissions from agriculture globally are derived from synthetic fertilizers alone (Tubiello et al, 2014). Moreover, the livestock industry is responsible for 14.5% of GHG emissions worldwide; adding up to more than the entire transportation sector (Meal Exchange, 2017, pp. 14). Beyond emissions, environmental concerns linked to industrial agriculture also include: decreased biodiversity worldwide, water

contamination and overuse, land degradation and negative consequences for human health (Meal Exchange, 2017, pp. 1).

Figure 2. Agriculture extension agents applying pesticide to a field in Afghanistan (Dafung Dennis, 2015)

Secondly, animal welfare has become a growing concern within the current agrofood system. Meal Exchange's 'Humane' pillar outlines that animals must be free from unnecessary pain and stress, have the ability to express natural behaviour and be raised without unnecessary medication (Meal Exchange, 2017, pp.1). This pillar targets for example, feeding practices within industrial meat production,[7] as often natural feeding patterns such as grazing, foraging, and browsing are not possible, and are as instead replaced by Confined animal Feeding Operations (CAFOS) (Blay-Palmer et al 2012). CAFOS have "increasingly become the norm in pork, poultry, and egg production, with increasing amounts of feedlot beef and dairy" (Sage, 2012, pp. 76). Overall, under the industrial model, the needs of livestock including dietary (habitual diets), affective (e.g. comfort), behavioural (e.g. rumination and social needs), health (e.g. physical alterations and disease prevention), and environmental (e.g. living space, air quality, and temperature) are systematically undermined (Meal Exchange, 2017). These harmful norms cause us to question the methods often used within livestock production on moral and ethical bases. Moreover, it is true that industrial meat production has aided in feeding

---

[7] "Industrial animal agriculture uses intensive 'production line' methods to produce greater volumes of meat, dairy and eggs as quickly and as cheaply as possible. It is characterized by high stocking densities and/or close confinement, forced growth rates, high mechanization and low labour requirements. While this system has resulted in a remarkable increase in food production, it comes at great expense to animal welfare, environmental sustainability, human health and rural communities" (Blay-Palmer et al 2012, pp. 14).

growing populations worldwide by assuring both calorie and protein needs. However, over 20% of crop production globally has been redirected for animal feed; including high-protein soybeans and corn for example (Rojas, 2017, pp. 86). The implication, as a result, is the redirection of valuable nutrients from humans to animals when there are an estimated 1.1 billion people suffering from malnutrition, globally (pp.87). Although redirecting soy and corn would not in itself solve issues around food security and food sovereignty, this fact weakens the argument that livestock products are a viable solution to feed hungry populations.

Figure 3. An Industrial Chicken Farm in the United States (Dr. Mercola, 2014)

A third axis of critique of the industrial agrofood system lies within social justice criteria. Within the GFC, this pillar refers to equitable and fair work environments, socially-just work environments and support for individuals and communities involved in every stage of the production, distribution and consumption of food goods (Meal Exchange, 2017, pp. 1). Related core issues involved in Canada's food procurement include (but are not limited to): production and trade on unceded indigenous territories, farm labour injustices (e.g. abuse of migrant laborers and unpaid farm interns), procurement of unfairly traded products (e.g. coffee, tea, bananas, cacao), unfair wages (in Canada and abroad), and inequitable access to affordable and healthy food (pp. 2). Notably, these are incredibly complex issues that can reach beyond the scope of this paper. However, the key point for the purpose of this memo is to understand that the industrial

agrofood model often neglects the humane and ethical treatment of people throughout the supply chain.

Issues such as unfair compensation for farm labour are not new phenomenon (Meal Exchange, 2017, pp. 5). This pattern can be tied to the trend of off-farm labour or, for example, migrant workers who work on farms across Canada, the United States and Europe. Often workers have long hours with little remuneration, in exchange for room and board, with little protection or rights from their host governments (Ekers M et al., 2015). Moreover, from 1990 onwards, agricultural policies in Canada emphasized marketing, international trade development, diversification, and adding value to products by encouraging farmers to lower production costs, increase production through the use of new technologies, and become more market responsive (Roppel C., et al., 2006). As a result, adequate labour treatment both domestically and abroad has lacked meaningful engagement with the values of ethical and humane treatment.

A migrant worker picks peaches in Niagara-on-the-Lake (Maclean, 2018)

Lastly, community-based principles serve as a critique of the industrial agrofood system based on locality and transparency. Community-based food is defined by Meal Exchange as "foods that can be traced to nearby farms and businesses that are locally owned and operated. Sourcing these foods supports the local economy by keeping money in the community and builds community

relations" (Meal Exchange, 2017, pp. 1). In this light, defining the meaning of 'local' is a first step for identifying Community-based foods. This has in some cases proven problematic, as there are variances amongst current definitions used by governments, NGO's and First Nations (pp. 3). UVic (to name one example) has often defined local food in relation to local *businesses (e.g. vendors)*, rather than producers (i.e. farmers). For example, the OCPS has identified a significant percentage of food as 'local' based on its proximity to the vendors it sources from, rather than the farms from which food is originally produced (as seen in the 2017 Aashe stars report explored below). This is problematic, as a definition of local which focuses on business operations alone instead of production (i.e. farming), ignores the issues long food miles pose within the globalized agrofood system; such as its contribution to global climate change, and the increasing dependence on fossil fuels for food transports (Freidmann, 2006, pp. 391). It is not the intention to leave out large farms from the GFC, rater, the goal is to redistribute power and profit toward SMEs that are often disadvantaged. The GFC also encourages larger farms with greater capacity to meet criteria in another pillar (i.e. Ecologically Sound, Humane, or Socially Just).

Further reasoning for which distance-based criteria as the primary element of community-based is insufficient:

A. Distance is a colonially embedded mode of analysis; as concepts of boundaries can further devalue indigenous conceptualizations of land and dispossession (Meal Exchange, 2017, pp.3);

B. Agriculture without consent or benefit to local Indigenous communities on unceded territory is perceived by some to be unjust altogether;

C. Many bureaucratic steps in the agrofood system can muddy definitions of distance;

D. Emissions from food miles are incomparable to those of other facets of the agrofood system;

E. The local community does not necessarily see the benefits due to close proximity alone" (Meal Exchange, 2017, pp. 4).

In his book *Small is Beautiful: a Study of Economics as if People Mattered*, E.F Shumacher argued that our focus on the economic bottom line alone is responsible for producing harmful waste, and disrupting both social and global ecological processes. The solution he saw was *both* the scaling down and localization of economies, because Small to Medium Sized Enterprises which produce for their local communities enable transparency at a greater rate than large globalized production can. They do so because local production enables communities to experience and witness the shocks of environmental degradation or social conflict by way of their proximity to them (Shumacher, 1999). In addition, communities can more easily eliminate facets of the production process that may be ecologically unsound, or unjust when production practices are more visible to consumers, and power and profit are diversified along the production chain (Meal Exchange, 2017, pp.2).

The concentration of economic rent/profit capture determines the influence a company will have on a given community, and within current agrofood supply chains, it is largely derived from intangible activities such as marketing and 'skilled labour'; as opposed to the primary production processes (e.g. farming) (Kaplinsky & Morris, 200, p. 35). Currently for example, large transnational food producers have more power over what food is produced globally and how, because they capture the majority of profit, in relation to SME's and the farms they source from (Feenstra et al, 2011). This power is expressed for example, in terms of production organization and the flow of social capital, which *often* focus on profit maximization and efficiency as opposed to environmental sustainability and social justice (pp.6).

As such, the community-based pillar highlights the issues associated with the current concentration of power, and favours SME's that align with environmental sustainability and social justice values.

Figure 5. TOPSOIL: A Community-based farm in downtown Victoria, B.C.

Value chain analysis (VAC) or the study of "...the full range of activities which are required to bring a product or service from conception through [all] stages of production" (Kaplinsky & Morris, 200, p.4), is a tool used to study the consequences of the industrial agro food system. It is offered by many researchers as a conceptual point of departure for Private Standards Initiatives (PSI's)[8]; such as Meal Exchange's 'Good Food' standards. PSI's are informed by VAC by way of analyzing the food system as a chain of interconnected actors. Then, standards are created based on values associated with those connections, in order to influence the supply chain 'positively' (Tallontire 2009, p.428). As the food system's impact on the environment, people and livestock are vast and complex, the GFC has diversified its values into several pillars, four of which are included in this section. Notably, the pillars of 'Wellness' and 'Indigenous Food Sovereignty' are also part of the GFC, and are currently being piloted by the national office. To date, certifications for these two pillars do not exist in numbers and capacity necessary for Calculator Audits, nor may certifications be appropriate for identifying these kinds of Good Food. As such, they have not been included in the early stages of the GFC audits.

---

[8] PSI's refer to all standards that fall outside the realm of the public sector (i.e. outside government regulated standards) (Tallontire 2009, p.428)

In addition, a given food item purchased by a University must only meet one of the pillars criteria in order to count as Good Food. For example, a food item that is certified 'Fair Trade' and meets Socially Just criteria but does not meet the criteria in any other pillar, will still count as Good Food. This is a realistic goal for universities to achieve given the dominance of the industrial agro food model and the lack of Ecologically Sound, Humane, Socially Just and Community-based foods currently being produced. The following section highlights efforts being made to increase sustainable food procurement despite this difficulty, across campuses participating in the GFC.

Cross Campus Comparison on Sustainable Food in Canada

This section will focus on a cross campus comparison between Universities currently participating in the GFC which include: the University of Victoria, the University of British Columbia (UBC), the University of Manitoba, St. Jeromes campus at UWaterloo, the University of Ottawa, and Simon Fraser University (SFU). The purpose of this section is to provide context and justification for the recommendations explained at the end of this memo. In addition to providing a comprehensive cross-campus analysis, for use by both UVic Food Services and the OCPS. Table 1 sets out several areas of comparison between campus including: GFC participation (both 'Calculator Audits' (explored on pages 2-3) and the presence of campus lead Meal Exchange chapters),[9] additional sustainable food initiatives (Aashe Stars ratings and Fair Trade Campus designation[10]), Food Services operations including: whether they are self operated, or utilizing a third-party food service provider, if the university utilizes franchise tenure, the presence of specific sustainable food policies within contracts between food services and its vendors,

---

[9] Meal Exchange chapters are lead by students participating in the GFC. Their purpose is to engage students on the importance of 'Good Food', and mobilize them to create increases in sustainable food procurement on campus.

[10] Fair trade Canada both certifies products when they meet Fair Trade International Standards, and designates Canadian campuses as 'Fair Trade Campuses' when they carry a certain percentage of Fair Trade certified products (Fair Trade Canada, 2018).

chains, or providers, and finally, the presence of campus farms including whether they sell produce to food services and donate to the food bank. To maintain brevity and relevance to the recommendations in this memo, this section will explore in more detail the status of 'Calculator Audits' across each campus, Food Service operations relating to sustainable procurement and Aashe stars ratings. The points of comparison not included in the analysis but included in table 1, can be referred to for additional insight on the broader circumstances of food sustainability on each campus.

Table 1)

Campus	UVic	UBC	UManitoba	St. Jeromes UWaterloo	UOttawa	SFU
Student population	21,700	55,887	29,987	900	30, 800	30, 000
GFC Progress a)_audit b) student chapter?	a) running second round b) yes	a) ran during pilot b) yes	a) running second round b) yes	a) to run second round b) yes	a) completing first and second round b) yes	a) completing first round b) inactive
Food services: a) self op? b) restaurant chains? c) sustaina-bility clauses? (contracts with vendors)	a) self op b) yes (but only bento sushi, booster Juice) c) no	a) self op (primary contract) & student op (secondary contract) b) yes c) yes	a) Aramark b) yes c) not clear	a) Dana Hospitality b) no c) not clear	a) Chartwells b) yes c) not clear	a) Sodexo b) yes c) not clear
Additional sustainable food initiatives: **a) Aashe Stars**: - overall rating - Dining Services overall score - Food and	a) **Rank:** Gold (2017) **Dining Services:** 4.52/8 **Food and**	a) **Rank:** Gold (2014 expired) **Dining Services:** 4.11/7 **Food and**	a) **Rank:** Silver (2015 expired) **Dining Services:** 1.68/7 **Food and**	a) n/a	a) **Rank:** Silver (2018) **Dining Services:** 2/8 **Food and**	a) **Rank:** Gold (2014 expired) **Dining Services:** 2.12/7 **Food and**

Beverage Purchasing score	**Beverage Purchasing:** 2.52/6	**Beverage Purchasing:** Expired	**Beverage Purchasing:** Expired		**Beverage Purchasing:** 0/6 (not pursuing)	**Beverage Purchasing:** Expired
b) Fair Trade designated campus?	b) yes	b) yes	b) no	b) no	b) yes	b) yes
Campus farm/garden a) selling to food services?	a) community garden for: students, faculty, staff and advocacy groups	a) yes (50,000$ committed in summer 2018 alone)	a) Degrees restaurant only (separate from Aramark)	a) no (UWaterloo yes)	a) learning garden & 'Enactus' farm producing for the university	a) community garden
b) donations to the food bank?	b) yes	b) yes	b) yes	b) no (UWaterloo yes)	b) yes – Enactus	b) not clear

1) GFC Status Report

With the exception of UBC, this section will focus on those universities currently running the 'Calculator Audit' in 2018. UBC ran a 'Calculator Audit' in its pilot phase in 2016-2017, and continues to run a Meal Exchange chapter on campus. UBC has been included because of its exemplary use of a sustainable food policy, its campus farm and proximity to UVic. Campuses that ran the 'Calculator Audit' in its pilot phase, but are not included in this comparison because they are not running 'Calculator Audits' in 2018, are Langara College and McGill. Campuses being onboarded to the GFC include: the University of Calgary, Concordia University of New Brunswick, York University, Algoma University, St. Francis Xavier University and Lakehead University.

The University of Victoria was among the first to run the Good Food Challenge Calculator in its pilot phase. In the summer of 2016 researchers conducted a preliminary audit of Mystic Market for items purchased during the month of 2016, the result of which was a finding of 12% 'Good food'[11]. Currently,

---

[11] Good food: food which possesses an approved organic, fair trade or humane certification or is local (within or 50 km outside of a researched province).

UVic is in the final stages of its second audit for the items purchased at the Cadboro Commons in 2017, which will likely result in a similar score. This is a comparatively high score to other Universities in the GFC, that often fell below 10%. The reasons for these lower percentages include (but are not limited to): lack of awareness on campuses regarding sustainable food and its importance, lack of support from University staff and third-party Food Service Providers (initiatives are most often lead by students), the current high prices for sustainable food and a lack of availability for certain sustainable food in some provinces (most notably, a lack of local farms) (Rojas, 2007).

Because of these relatively low scores, many participating universities have asked Meal Exchange to keep results confidential for the time being which is not atypical for this kind of research, as it involves sensitive information (Barlett, 2011, p.102). However, among the pool of universities running the calculator in 2018, one has already signed the president's commitment to increase Good Food to 20% by 2025. Notably, UVic has expressed interest in signing the commitment to achieve 20% by 2020; pending a clear roadmap (i.e. in depth price analysis) for achieving it. Moreover, the Good Food Coordinator position during the summer of 2018, that enabled student lead research for the Cadboro Commons (for purchases made in October 2016), was funded by the OCPS' 'Campus Sustainability Fund'.[12] UVic has thus been among the first to support an official commitment, by enabling GFC researchers to identify both barriers for increases in sustainable procurement, as well as a potential pathway forward.

In addition, the nutrition coordinators at UVic run essential dietary consultations, actively work to increase healthy food options on campus, run programs such as 'meatless mondays', nutritional cooking workshops and labelling

---

[12] "... the Campus Sustainability Fund empowers members of the university community to create stakeholder-driven projects that further the Sustainability Action Plan and advance leadership in sustainability, whether they provide a direct financial payback, or not" (The University of Victoria, 2018).

projects for ease in identifying healthy food on campus. These initiatives are in tandem with GFC values, and the nutrition coordinators have at UVic have proven to be essential to UVic's participation in the GFC. Secondly, as discussed, the OCPS funded the Good Food Coordinator position in 2018, demonstrating desire to support the GFC and both improve sustainable procurement and knowledge about sustainable food on campus. These opportunities have given student researchers the support needed to evaluate sustainable food procurement on campus, and develop a roadmap for achieving the 20% Good Food Commitment.

The purpose of this section has been to explore current participation in the GFC nationwide. UVic has demonstrated leadership in its ability to increase sustainable food procurement, and a relative ease in achieving a 20% commitment due to its relatively large Good Food percentage, as well as a willingness to participate. The following section will highlight the ways in which third party food service operators, vendors and franchises influence the capacity for sustainable procurement increases, amongst Universities participating in the GFC.

2) Food Service Operators, Franchises, Vendors and Contracts
The purpose of this section will be to compare UVic's relative capacity for an increase in sustainable food procurement, as a result of being self-operated to campuses using restaurant franchise tenure and third-party Food Service operators. In addition, it will explore the current lack of sustainable clauses within contracts between Food Service providers and food vendors across all campuses, which serves as a barrier across all campuses participating in the GFC.

Although food franchise tenure on campuses can be seen as beneficial for flavour consistency and efficiency, they can pose as a significant barrier to increasing sustainable food procurement. Firstly, the use of franchises is significant and create challenges for meeting the GFC because ingredients are pre-set to

maintain consistency across their supply chain, they are contractual and importantly, purchasing decisions are largely outside University control (Meal Exchange National Student Food Summit, 2017). For example, it has been identified by UVic Food Service staff that shifting Bento Sushi (one of two franchises on campus) ingredients would be next to impossible. Conversely, university-operated restaurants can more easily adapt ingredients utilized on their menus, as they source in aggregate from a small pool of Food Service chosen vendors. The literature is currently lacking on this topic, however it is notable that UVic has a significantly low percentage of franchise tenure in comparison to the other campuses within this comparison. With that said, it is also difficult to identify the percentage of franchises being used nationwide on campuses, as well as their impact on sustainable procurement initiatives. Aashe Stars has included the use of franchises within its Dining Services criteria for example (Aashe Stars, 2018), but data has not been adequately collected. Further analysis is as such needed with regard to this topic.

Moreover, the use of third-party Food Service operators can also impact sustainable food procurement initiatives. At UVic, Food Services has full control over ingredients and vendors used (with the exception of franchises, as discussed above) because it is self-operated. This is in contrast to Food Service operators at UManitoba, UOttawa St. Jeromes, and Simon Fraser; who utilize third-party services including: Aramark, Chartwells, Dana Hospitality and Sodexo respectively. Food service operators, in likeness with franchise operations, streamline their ingredients, source from preferred vendors, and possess nearly autonomous control over contracts with producers. Additionally, the increase in stakeholders when third-party Food Service operators are used, can pose as a significant barrier for achieving a 20% Good Food objective when values do not align.

Similarly to Meal Exchange, for example, an organization called Local Flavour Plus conducted a research and sustainable procurement project at The University of Toronto (UofT).[13] Two central goals were to coordinate between farmers, producers, vendors and institutions, and to push for local sustainable food increases (Friedmann, p. 392). The idea was to "scale up the local sustainable economy" (pp. 392) through the guarantees of high-volume institutional purchasing. Local Flavour Plus found success at UofT due to enthusiastic faculty support (pp. 394). However, ten years later in 2016, after negotiations with Subway and 'Spring Rolls' franchises failed to address university concerns, UofT's St. George campus (85,000 students) did not renew its contract with Aramark. As a result, St. George campus now operates "the largest independent Food Service operation in any university in Canada" (Heck, 2016). Although not participating in the GFC, UofT's bold move demonstrates the incompatibility often found between sustainable procurement, third-party food service providers and franchises. That is, under third party contracts, it requires more effort and often, failed negotiations to increase sustainable sourcing.

Notably, not all Food Service operators are alike. For example, St. Jerome's campus uses Dana Hospitality as a Food Service operator, which values fresh (never frozen) and local ingredients (Dana Hospitality, 2016). This campus has also seen comparable momentum to UVic in terms of the GFC as a result. The takeaway is that Universities are unable to meet their sustainable food policies, and purchase food that aligns with their values if their Food Service providers do not share them. Creating relationships with third-party Food Service providers is thus a central component the GFC.

In this light, although PSI's like the GFC and university sustainability policies offer institutions clear objectives, these values can only filter into purchasing

---

[13] Uof T is examined as a case study, as literature regarding third-party Food Service Operators and their impact on sustainable procurement is also insufficient in relation to the campuses participating in the GFC.

decisions if that institution can influence those decisions. One example of policy that influences contracts can be seen in UBC's "Sustainable Food Guide". Priorities for food procurement include: produce sales from the UBC farm (explored in part 3 below), the maintenance of 100% Ocean Wise Seafood on campus, local sourcing of apples, pears, and stone fruit, sourcing from manufacturers using sustainable packaging, and the minimization contracted vendors (University of British Columbia Food Systems Project, 2013, pp.8). This policy offers a more direct and clear method for assuring sustainable procurement than on other campuses. Note that UBC is also primarily self-operated, as well as uses a student-driven food operator called the UBC Alma Mater Society or "AMS" (pp. 9)

3) Aashe Stars

Another important axis for comparison are reports emerging from the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education (Aashe). Their 'Stars' program measures self-reported sustainability efforts across campuses in North America (Aashe, 2018), and in relation to Food and Dining, there are two subcategories: 'Food and Beverage Purchasing' and 'Sustainable Dining'. Overall Food and Dining scores are compared in this section, in addition to the criteria set forth in the 'Food and Beverage Purchasing' subsection. Notably, the 'Food and Beverage Purchasing' scores are most relevant to this memo, and information pertaining to the points within this subsection are available, however overall scores are not, as most reports have expired.

The purpose of this section is to highlight a need for campuses to continue participation in the GFC nationwide, as well as increased collaboration between Meal Exchange and Aashe. Evidence to support this claim is visible when examining each campuses low Food and Dining scores, the high percentage of expired reports and inaccurate scores at UVic, and potentially nationwide. These scores are primarily the result of evaluations conducted by the universities themselves, with

the exception of the 'local and community-based food' percentages, which are intended to be third-party verified. As will be explored, however, third-party verification has not sufficiently been utilized at UVic and perhaps, nationwide.

Overall, UVic, along with UBC and Simon Fraser University have achieved gold star ratings within the STARS program. UManitoba is close behind with silver and St. Jeromes has not been evaluated. Despite these relatively high ratings in other sectors of sustainability, in relation to Food And Dining scores, one emergent theme is that every campuses have scored low. UVic's average is the second highest among the campuses, with only 56%. UBC is first with 58%, following UVic is UOttawa with 40%, then Simon Fraser University at 30%, and finally, UManitoba with 24%. UVic's higher-than-average score can be attributed to its low impact dining rating, for which it ranked 100%. However, with a score of 42% in reference to Uvic's Food and Beverage Purchasing, it is evident that sustainable food procurement has not been set as a priority.

The points of comparison in the Food and Beverage Purchasing category are: the percentage of local and community-based foods, the percentage of 'conventional meat' (i.e. meat that is not third party certified or community-based), the sustainability impacts of: meat, poultry, fish, seafood, eggs, dairy, produce, tea/coffee, a description of the methodology for evaluation, the percentage of dollars spent on [Good] Food (i.e. identified by the calculator audit, and the percentage of food with other sustainable recognitions not listed prior (Aashe Stars, 2017).

Firstly, is unclear whether third party evaluations for 'local and community-based' foods have been seriously undertaken by participating campuses. As for example, the first round of the Calculator Audit at UVic for Mystic Market's food purchases in February 2016, reflected that local and

community-based food purchased was in reality, 3.8% and not 35%. Moreover, it does not seem likely that the percentage of community-based foods will increase significantly with inclusion of UVic's Cadboro Commons audit for purchases made in October 2017. As discussed in the background of this memo, definitions of 'local' are often varied, and this could in part, explain the discrepancy. However, as Aashe has partnered with Meal Exchange to expand its conception of local to include Community-based criteria, it is important that campuses conduct their audits in this light. Moreover, this discrepancy is evident a second time in examination of the percentage of meat products which are NOT third-party verified or community based, which is outlined as 20% in this report, but above 99% in the Calculator Audit for purchases made in February 2016 at Mystic Market, UVic's second largest dining facility.

Secondly, it is difficult to analyze the accuracy of results of other campuses at this time. Firstly because UBC, UManitoba, and SFU's Food and Beverage Purchasing scores have expired, while UOttawa did not complete this section of its report in 2018. However, in examining the percentage of local and community-based foods within this subsection, and given that all GFC scores for campuses within this comparison fell around 10% or lower, it is difficult to imagine that UBC's score of 35% and SFU's score of 28% are entirely accurate. UManitoba's score of 17% is potentially most accurate, but once more, it is difficult to examine at this point.

The problem in relation to Aashe stars and the GFC is as such twofold. Firstly, the confidential nature of scores within the GFC has prohibited researchers from sharing scores nationwide and offering their respective campuses detailed comparison. Secondly, Aashe stars methodology for collecting information may need to become more stringent if accuracy is valued. A potential solution being that Aashe request third-party evaluation reports directly from GFC researchers, when

applicable. Or encourage communication between GFC researchers and those conducting the 'stars' evaluation. These problems also further support the importance for participation in the GFC, and the use of its Calculator Audits for use in Aashe stars' reports, as it will assure that scores are both third party verified and conducted using a consistent methodology. Moreover, the 'Stars' website is an accessible place to identify GFC scores conducted by Meal Exchange, in addition to the GFC Calculator website, for use by student researchers and University staff.

Overall, this campus comparison has expanded on the sustainable procurement initiatives nationwide with reference to: GFC participation, Food Service practices that serve as either barriers or entries for increasing sustainable food, and Aashe Stars Food and Dining Scores. UVic has demonstrated leadership in its support for the GFC as well as less barriers for achieving a 20% commitment, due to its relative control over its food purchasing decisions.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are a result of observations made by the UVic Good Food Coordinator, the UVic Meal Exchange club and the Meal Exchange national office. They are intended to respond to some of UVic's barriers for increasing sustainable food procurement, and offer insight into how that might be achieved. Notably, UVic's Food Service department and the OCPS have demonstrated interest in increasing sustainable procurement, as well as capacity for doing so, as has been explored in the above campus comparison. UVic's nutrition coordinators and the OCPS have also supported the GFC to date, demonstrating support for the inclusion of Good Food values and strategies for increasing sustainable food on campus. Moreover, the Sustainability Action Plan 2014 demonstrates that UVic has established 'Purchasing' and 'Dining Service' policies, which are in line with the recommendations below. It is the intention of

this section as such, to offer a clear methodology for achieving those policies, and strategies for improving them.

A) Hire a Sustainable Food Coordinator

1) Manage and Maintain Sustainable Purchasing Decisions within Food Services

This recommendation is meant as a suggestion for Food Services and the Office of Campus Sustainability at UVic. Notably, sensitive and confidential information such as budget and staff incomes have not been disclosed to Meal Exchange student researchers. However, the recommendation includes several different tasks and/or components that the 'Sustainability Coordinator' could undertake. If adopted, UVic staff can adapt the number of undertakings, and choose between fulltime or part time hours for the position based on capacity. Collaborative efforts to create the position between the OCPS and Food Services, may ease financial concerns. Moreover, is recommended that this position be filled by someone who holds a relevant degree and/or experience with sustainable food procurement and policy; as the issues being addressed are complex. Finally, this position is recommended under the assumption that current capacity of Food Service executives at UVic, cannot support the full scope of this work under their current workload. This is true nationwide as to date, initiatives regarding sustainable food procurement at Universities have become increasingly popular, however many remain in the early stages and have yet to experience long lasting results (Barlett, 2011, pp. 102).

2) Maintain UVic Sustainability Policies

Ways in which the GFC responds to UVic's sustainability policies have been outlined throughout this memo. Hiring a Sustainable Food Coordinator at UVic would support these goals, in addition to maintaining them in future years. For example, it would be possible to ensure UVic's Purchasing Mission in section 5.6 of

the Sustainability Action Plan 2014; "to provide purchasing and supply management services to the campus community that achieve best value and apply triple bottom line principles to procurement initiatives, incorporating financial, social, and environmental considerations to supply management decisions (University of Victoria, 2014, pp. 15), in the realm of food procurement. In addition, students have taken the lead in these initiatives across North America to date. However, staff and administrative support are now needed to validate these initiatives into long-term fruition (pp. 111). For example, increasing sustainable procurement on an ongoing basis requires access to sensitive financial information and contracts, relationships with vendors, and influence over governing sustainability policies. As such, the creation of a position dedicated to doing so will commit the university into tangible action in the form of staff and administrative support.

3) Implement sustainability clauses within contracts between Food Services and its vendors;

One tangible example of support needed within UVic Food services, are sustainability clauses within contracts between Food Services and its vendors. To date, it has proven difficult to determine the presence of sustainability clauses within contracts, as a result of confidentiality concerns between student researchers and Food Service staff. With that said, it is evident that there is a discrepancy between many UVic's sustainable food policies and the tangible reflection of that policy within contracts. At UVic for example, 'Discovery Organics' has disclosed to Food Services that they can provide fair trade bananas and avocados at the current cost of non-fair trade options. However, because 'Islands West' holds the right to first bid on produce at UVic, they have responded with a much higher price on the same product in order to capture above a 50% profit margin (Fetterly, N. personal communication, July 2018). Conversely, if UVic Food Services were to include sustainability clauses in their contracts with vendors, it would enable them to make sustainable changes in a timely fashion, without being

charged for 'unfair' profit margins. One primary means of achieving this goal, is having a Sustainable Food Coordinator negotiate sustainability clauses with UVic's food vendors.

4) Maintain Relationships with Key Stakeholders

In addition, maintaining relationships with key stakeholders in the sustainable food movement will likely be a core component of a Sustainable Food Coordinator position. For example, managing and utilizing third party sustainability standards will require connections to relevant nonprofits such as Meal Exchange. In addition, the coordinator will bridge the current gap between Food Services and the OCPS; notably, the gap between current policies in the Sustainability Action Plan 2014, and the reality of sustainable purchasing on campus. An example of an important partnership with regard to the institutional sustainable procurement movement is the CRFAIR (Capital Region Food and Agriculture Initiatives Roundtable) which aims to "identify the opportunities and hurdles for changing the current imbalance in the supply of local food compared with global sourcing" (Mitham, 2018, pp. 1). The coordinator can also seek to build relationships with local First Nation's on whose traditional territory UVic resides. This is vital, in that UVic "...acknowledges with respect the Lkwungen-speaking peoples on whose traditional territory the university stands and the Songhees, Esquimalt and WSÁNEĆ peoples whose historical relationships with the land continue to this day" (The University of Victoria, 2018). Finally, the coordinator can act as a liaison between Food Services and students, on issues surrounding sustainable procurement (e.g. increased pricing, student perceptions about sustainable food, and direct marketing to support initiatives like the GFC on campus).

5) Partner to implement a pilot project for an organic educational farm that produces for sale to Food Services (long term goal)

Hiring a Sustainable Food Coordinator gives UVic an opportunity to become an incubator for the wider sustainable food movement. That is because University staff have the potential to inspire students to care about sustainability, who and to take those lessons beyond the University's walls (Bartlett, 2011, pp. 100). Training students in practical food systems knowledge is important so that when they graduate, they can manage the problems arising from our current dominant agrofood system (outlined in the background of this paper). A campus-coordinated farm which can simultaneously educate students on organic and local food practices, while providing sustainable community-based food to the university, supports this opportunity. Through experiential learning on campus farms students become connected to place and the food supply chain on a deeper level (Bartlett, 2011, pp. 102). In this light, and as depicted in Table 1, several campuses such as Uottawa and UBC have created campus farms that sell directly to food services. This summer (2018) alone, 50,000$ was committed to purchasing produce from the UBC farm (Delumpa, M. Personal Communication, July 9, 2018). In addition, UOttawa's Enactus club started a campus farm that produces around 3000 plants indoors using hydroponics, for sale at UOttawa (Ellis, C. Personal Communication, August, 2018).

A primary implication of a campus-coordinated farm will be a need to source external funding to cover start up costs. Notably, TOPSOIL[14] Innovative Urban Agriculture currently operates a summer course on how to run an urban agriculture business, conducted through the Geography department at UVic, with visits to TOPSOIL's downtown location. If TOPSOIL's model[15] is to be used for a site that provides produce to the university, potential funding has already been

---

[14] TOPSOIL innovative urban agriculture "converts underutilized urban spaces into productive food growing areas. We supply fresh premium produce direct to local chefs and restaurants in Victoria B.C" (TOPSOIL, 2018).

[15] TOPSOIL uses a unique model for production as it grows above ground in 'geotextile' containers. This enables production on otherwise contaminated ground, and rooftops. Moreover, the business has proven efficient and successful in its mission to provide fresh, organic and "hyper-local" produce to over 10 local restaurants in Victoria.

identified to initiate start up costs from: Maple Leaf[16], Grow B.C[17], and 'Enactus'[18] UOttawa. The final option was discovered upon interviewing Enactus on their indoor organic campus farm initiative at UOttawa. They disclosed that UOttawa's food service department saves on average 30% of procurement costs by sourcing from a campus farm they created. The organization also has a one million dollar reserve to fund similar initiatives, and has expressed doing so for campus farm at UVic. Enactus is funded primarily through private investment for example, by RBC bank. Similarly, TOPSOIL has received funding from Van City in Victoria, as well as other private sources for its downtown location. This demonstrates the availability of private investment, and an interest within communities in Canada for urban farms.

Notably, a campus-coordinated farm would also directly increase UVic's Good Food percentage, while also providing educational opportunities for students. As such, it responds to a 'key strategy' within UVic's strategic plan to "design and operate campus systems in a manner that allows for the integration of academic, teaching and research activities as appropriate" (University of Victoria, 2014, pp. 5). In addition, extending this farm beyond education to procurement, also enables the university to meet several actions within its Sustainability Action Plan such as: triple bottom line principles and the reduction of ecological footprints from purchased goods (University of Victoria, 2014, pp. 15).

Moreover, a campus-coordinated farm placed on the UVic campus would echo ongoing efforts to increase edible landscapes on campus. Barriers for doing so identified thus far include: lack of leadership and coordination, lack of continuity, potential vandalism, deer/wildlife browsing, and funding (Huggins & Park, 2016, pp.

---

[16] The 'Feed Opportunity Fund' ranges from 25,000$-150,000$ (Stern, S, 2018).

[17] "Grow B.C. will help young farmers access land, and support fruit and nut growers and processors to expand local food production" (Government of British Columbia, 2018).

[18] Enactus UOttawa "[e]mpowers students to use entrepreneurial action to make change economically, socially and environmentally" (Enactus UOttawa, 2018)

6-7). However, if a Sustainable Food Coordinator piloted the creation of a campus-coordinated farm and sourced external funding for its creation, this would seemingly address the first three, and last barrier identified by Huggins and Park. Vandalism and deer/wildlife browsing would have to be addressed with careful consideration. Lastly, it is not *necessary* for the farm to exist on the Uvic campus. However, the farm should be close enough in proximity that it is accessible to students and able to provide produce in an efficient manner.

B) Adopt the GFC at UVic

Incorporating a third-party PSI into sustainability policies at UVic by adopting the GFC, will provide a clear, tangible methodology for UVic to meet both the 'Purchasing' and 'Dining Services' missions it set out in its Sustainability Action Plan in 2014. Moreover, accountability can be maintained throughout the evaluation and procurement process if the GFC is adopted, which can ensure credibility for the OCPS and Food Services at UVic. Lastly, signing the 20% Good Food Commitment will create a multiplier effect within the sustainable food economy, due to UVics large purchasing power. This multiplier effect is important according to the issues explored in the Background, as well as many others that reach beyond the scope of this memo.

Incorporating Good Food Challenge Benchmarks Into the Sustainability Action Plan and Signing the 20% Good Food Commitment are good starting points for increasing sustainable food procurement at UVic. However, it is unclear whether coordination needed to maintain these objectives can be maintained without an assigned position, due to current workload restraints within UVic's Food Services. In addition, the lack of coordination between the OCPS and Food Services has meant that sustainable food policies have not been seriously undertaken to

date. As such, it is highly recommended that both UVic Food Services and the OCPS, adopt recommendation A and collaborate to create a Sustainable Food Coordinator position at Uvic. The potential objectives outlined in this recommendation include: policy coordination, maintaining UVic's sustainability policies, maintaining relationships with key stakeholders in sustainable food procurement, and collaborate to pilot an educational campus farm that provides food for the university. Notably, policy coordination and a campus farm are objectives that will need ongoing attention and long term planning.

Conclusion

Meal Exchange's GFC has is a useful 'Value Chain Analysis (VAC)' and 'Private Standards Initiative (PSI's)' for increasing University food procurement nationwide. The problems with the dominant industrial agro food model was explored in this memo using the GFC's Ecological, Humane, Socially Just and Community-based criteria. Following, the paper outlined a cross campus comparison to identify sustainable procurement initiatives being made across campuses in Canada that are participating in the GFC Calculator Audit in 2018. Following, two recommendations were explored for the University of Victoria to consider, including methodologies for increasing sustainable food procurement on the UVic campus. Recommendation B, which calls on UVic to formally adopt GFC values into policy and practice, is a beneficial starting point. However, through analysis of the the ramifications associated with current procurement practices, a cross campus comparison, and several tangible action-based needs for increasing sustainable food, the star policy recommendation A to hire a Sustainable Food Coordinator is highly recommended.

Sources

Aashe Stars. (2018). STARS *Institutions*. Philadelphia. Retrieved from: https://stars.aashe.org/institutions/participants-and-reports/

Aashe Stars. (2017). University of Victoria O-P 7 *Food and Beverage Purchasing.* Retrieved from: https://stars.aashe.org/institutions/university-of-victoria-bc/report/2017-01-27/OP/food-dining/OP-7/

Barlett, P. F. (2011). *Campus Sustainable Food Projects: Critique and Engagement.* American Anthropologist, 113(1), 101-115. doi:10.1111/j.1548-1433.2010.01309.x

BLACKMAN, A., & RIVERA, J. (2011). *Producer-level Benefits of Sustainability Certification.* Conservation Biology, 25(6), 1176-1185. doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2011.01774.x

Blay-Palmer, A., Ikerd, J., Qualman, D., Sumner, J., Winson, T., Khachatourians, G., … Boyle, E (2012). *What's On Your Plate? The Hidden Costs of Industrial Animal Agriculture in Canada.* World Society for the Protection of Animals. Retrieved from: http://www.worldanimalprotection.ca/sites/default/files/ca_-_en_files/wspa_whatsonyourplate_fullreport.pdf

Campus Operations. (2014). *Sustainability Action Plan.* The University of Victoria. Retrieved from: https://www.uvic.ca/sustainability/assets/docs/policy/action-plan-2014.pdf

Dana Hospitality. (2016). *I Can Eat.* St. Jerome's University. http://stjeromes.icaneat.ca/

Delumpa, M. (2018). Personal Communication. University of British Columbia Campus Farm Coordinator.

Ellis, C. (2018). Personal Communication. University of Ottawa's 'Enactus' Club.

Enactus UOttawa. (2018). *About Us.* Univesity of Ottawa Tefler School of Management. Retrieved from: http://www.enactusuottawa.ca/

Ekers M., Levkoe, C., Walker, S., & Dale, B. (2015). *Will Work for Food: Agricultural Interns, Apprentices, Volunteers, and the Agrarian Question. Agric Hum Values,* 33: 705. Retrieved from http://www.foodandlabour.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/Will-Work-For-Food.pdf

Fair Trade Canada. (2018). *What we do.* Retrieved from: http://fairtrade.ca/en-CA/What-is-Fairtrade/Who-is-Fairtrade-Canada/What-we-do

Feenstra, G., Allen, P., Hardesty, S., Ohmart, J., & Perez, J. (2011). *Using a supply chain analysis to assess the sustainability of farm-to-institution programs.* Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development, 1(4), 1-16. doi:10.5304/jafscd.2011.014.009

Fetterly, N. (2018). Personal Communication. Nutrition Coordinator at the University of Victoria's Food Services.

Figure 1. *The Good Food Guide Version* 1.0. Meal Exchange. (2018). PDF

Figure 2. Agriculture extension agents applying pesticide to a field in Afghanistan. *Dafung, D. (2015).* UN *agencies release updated guidelines for countries on pesticide legislation and labelling. United Nations. Retrieved from: https://news.un.org/en/story/2015/11/516462-un-agencies-release-updated-guidel ines-countries-pesticide-legislation-and*

Figure 3. An Industrial Chicken Farm in the United States. Mercola, Dr. *The High Price of Cheap Factory Farmed Chicken.* The Waking Times. Retrieved from: https://www.wakingtimes.com/2014/07/31/high-price-cheap-factory-farmed-c hicken/

Figure 4. A migrant worker picks peaches in Niagara-on-the-Lake. Maclean, D., & Janet M. (2018). *Migrant Workers and the Cruel Trade off.* Macleans.

Figure 5. TOPSOIL: A Community-based farm in downtown Victoria, B.C. Printed with Permission.

Food Secure Canada. (2010). *Discussion Paper one: Indigenous Food Sovereignty* (pp. 10). Montreal, Canada. Retrieved from: https://foodsecurecanada.org/sites/foodsecurecanada.org/files/DP1_Indigenou s_Food_Sovereignty.pdf

Friedmann, H. (2007). *Scaling up: Bringing public institutions and food service corporations into the project for a local, sustainable food system in Ontario.* Agriculture and Human Values, 24(3), 389-398. doi:10.1007/s10460-006-9040-2

Gliessman, S. R., & Gliessman, Stephen R. Ecological Processes in Sustainable Agriculture. (2007). *Agroecology: The Ecology of Sustainable Food Systems* (pp. 347-349) (2nd ed.). London;Boca Raton [FL];: CRC Press.

Government of British Columbia. (2018). *GROW BC, FEED BC, BUY BC.* Agriculture and Seafood. Retrieved from: https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/industry/agriculture-seafood/growbc-feedbc-buybc

Huggins, A., & Hyeone, P. (2016). *Edible Landscapes on the UVic Campus.* Victoria, British Columbia: Office of Campus Planning and Sustainability, UVic. PDF.

Kaplinsky, R. M. (2000). A *Handbook for Value Chain Research.* Sussex: University of Sussex Institute of Development Studies.

Meal Exchange. (2017). *Good Food Categories: Community Based. Draft Version (p.1) 1.2.*

Meal Exchange. (2017). *Good Food Categories: Ecologically Sound. Draft Version 1.3 (pp.14).*

Meal Exchange. (2017). *Good Food Categories: Humane. Draft Version 1.3 (pp.*

Meal Exchange. (2017). *Good Food Categories: Socially Just. Draft Version 1.3 (pp. 1-5).*

Meal Exchange. (2017). *National Student Food Summit.* Ontario, Canada.

Meal Exchange. (2018). *The Good Food Challenge.* Toronto, Ontario. https://www.mealexchange.com/gfc/

Mitham, P. (2018). *Reclaiming Market Share in a Global Economy.* Country Life in B.C. Retrieved from: http://www.crfair.ca/newsletters-reports-videos/

Rojas, A., Richer, L., & Wagner, J. (2007). *University of british columbia food system project: Towards sustainable and secure campus food systems.* Ecohealth, 4(1), 86-94. doi:10.1007/s10393-006-0081-1

Roppel, C., Desmarais, A. A., Martz, D (2006). *Farm Women and Canadian Agricultural Policy. Status of Women Canada.* Retrieved from http://www.nfu.ca/sites/www.nfu.ca/files/Farm_Women_and_the_APF.pdf

Sage, Colin. (2012). *Environment and Food* (pp. 113, 142, 277). Routledge.

Shumacher, E. F. 1. (1999). *Small is beautiful: Economics as if people mattered : 25 years later, with commentaries* (3rd ed.). Point Roberts, WA: Hartley & Marks Publishers.

Stern, S. (2018). *The Feed Opportunity Fund.* Ontario: Maple Leaf Center for Action on Food Security. Retrieved from: https://www.feedopportunity.com/en/

Tallontire, A., Opondo, M., Nelson, V., & Martin, A. (2011;2009;). *Beyond the vertical? using value chains and governance as a framework to analyse private standards initiatives in agri-food chains.* Agriculture and Human Values, 28(3), 427-441. doi:10.1007/s10460-009-9237-2

TOPSOIL innovative urban agriculture. (2018). *About us.* Retrieved from: https://www.topsoileatlocal.com/

Tubiello, F. N., Salvatore, M., Rocio Danica Condor Golec, Ferrara, A., Rossi, S., Biancalani, R., Flammini, A. (2014). *Agriculture, forestry and other land use emissions by sources and removals by sinks: 1990-2011 analysis* FAO (pp.8). doi:10.13140/2.1.4143.4245

University of Manitoba. (2012). *Sustainability at the University of Manitoba: A Strategic Vision for Action.* http://proxycheck.lib.umanitoba.ca/campus/physical_plant/ media/Sustainability_at_the_University_of_Manitoba-A_Strategic_Vision_for_ Action-June_2012.pdf

University of Victoria. (2018). *Campus Sustainability Fund.* Retrieved from: https://www.uvic.ca/sustainability/involved/sustainability-fund/index.php

University of Victoria. (2018). *Indigenous Academic & Community Engagement.* Retrieved from: https://www.uvic.ca/services/indigenous/facultystaff/territory-acknowledgmen t/index.php