

University of British Columbia

Social Ecological Economic Development Studies (SEEDS) Sustainability Program

Student Research Report

Foundations for Campus Food Policy Council

Prepared by: Christine Janusz

Prepared for:

Course Code: VOL 400

University of British Columbia

Date: 26 June 2020

Disclaimer: "UBC SEEDS Sustainability Program provides students with the opportunity to share the findings of their studies, as well as their opinions, conclusions and recommendations with the UBC community. The reader should bear in mind that this is a student research project and is not an official document of UBC. Furthermore, readers should bear in mind that these reports may not reflect the current status of activities at UBC. We urge you to contact the research persons mentioned in a report or the SEEDS Sustainability Program representative about the current status of the subject matter of a report".



UBC Social Ecological Economic Development Studies (SEEDS) Sustainability Program

Student Research Report

Foundations for Campus Food Policy Council

Christine Janusz

University of British Columbia

Dietetics Population & Public Health Placement

June 26, 2020



Disclaimer: "UBC SEEDS Sustainability Program provides students with the opportunity to share the findings of their studies, as well as their opinions, conclusions and recommendations with the UBC community. The reader should bear in mind that this is a student research project/report and is not an official document of UBC. Furthermore, readers should bear in mind that these reports may not reflect the current status of activities at UBC. We urge you to contact the research persons mentioned in a report or the SEEDS Sustainability Program representative about the current status of the subject matter of a project/report".

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
1. Introduction.....	5
1.1 Food Policy Councils.....	5
1.2 Campus-Wide Food Coalition.....	6
2. Methods.....	6
2.1 Literature Review.....	7
2.2 Environmental Scan.....	7
2.3 Interviews.....	7
2.4 Data Analysis.....	9
3. Results.....	9
3.1 Food-Related UBC Initiatives.....	9
3.1.1 UBC Food Security Initiative.....	9
3.1.2 UBC Food and Nutrition Committee.....	10
3.1.3 UBC Food System Project Steering Committee.....	10
3.2 Structure.....	11
3.2.1 Staff.....	11
3.2.2 Members.....	12
3.3 Connection to Government.....	13
3.4 Functions.....	15
3.4.1 Policy.....	15
3.4.2 Programs.....	17
3.4.3 Education.....	18
3.5 Priorities & Priority Setting.....	19
3.6 Challenges.....	20
3.6.1 Lack of Effective Communication & Self-Evaluation.....	20
3.6.2 Insufficient Funds.....	21
3.6.3 Presence of Opposition.....	22
3.7 Best Practice Approaches.....	22
3.7.1 Background Work Prior to Establishment.....	23
3.7.2 Governmental Integration.....	24
3.7.3 Staff Support.....	25
3.7.4 External Consultants.....	25
3.7.5 Members.....	26
3.7.6 “Champions”.....	26
3.7.7 Incentives.....	27
3.7.8 Clearly Defined Roles.....	28
3.7.9 Internal & External Relations.....	28
3.8 Interview Results.....	29
3.8.1 Interviews with FPC members.....	29
3.8.2 Interviews with UBC staff.....	32
3.9 Food and Nutrition Committee Meeting.....	36
4. Recommendations.....	37
5. Limitation & Future Research.....	41
6. Conclusion.....	41
7. References.....	43
Appendix A: American & Canadian FPCs from the Environmental Scan.....	46
Appendix B: Contacted FPC Members Outside of UBC.....	52
Appendix C: Primary Email Sent to University FPC Members.....	53
Appendix D: Interview Questions.....	54
Appendix E: Interview Responses from the Food Advisory Committee.....	57

Executive Summary

The University of British Columbia (UBC) has a number of initiatives including the Food and Nutrition Committee, the Food Systems Project, and the Food Security Initiative, which work towards achieving a healthier local food system. While the forenamed coalitions are united in their interest to advance food system sustainability, they remain as separate entities and strive to meet different agendas. Due to the absence of an overarching campus strategy, these groups have recently expressed interest in strategic alignment to strengthen the collective work on campus. While many express eagerness to begin formulating plans for the creation of a campus-wide food coalition, there remains a profound need to first acquire a better understanding of the operations of existing food policy councils (FPC) across jurisdictions.

To inform the preliminary efforts in creating a campus-wide coalition, an environmental scan on food committees was conducted along with a literature review on best practice approaches to food policy council systems and governance. Furthermore, key informant interviews were performed with university FPC members outside of UBC and UBC staff involved in the campus food system for insight and feedback to further inform foundational work in the development of a university-wide FPC.

The literature review and environmental scan revealed that one of the greatest strengths of FPCs is their unique ability to be locally relevant and as such, coalitions take on a myriad of different forms and formulate varying agendas to address the needs and issues of their local food system. While the communities of each FPC possess their own unique assortment of issues, the ways in which FPCs tackle those issues are similar across the board. In most cases, FPCs design their agenda to include at least one the following three activities:

(1) Influencing policy: Make a contribution by spearheading research and initiating community education campaigns that indirectly enable policy creation and change.

(2) Launching programs: Implement their own program or serve as a catalyst by sharing their networks and resources with other organizations.

(3) Educating on sustainability and food systems: Communicate principles of sustainable food systems with the public by participating in events and releasing information materials.

However, while coalitions regularly hold gatherings to discuss these projects, many do not dedicate a time during their meetings to collectively evaluate their actions. When examining the structure of FPCs and their connection to government, multiple variations exist between the current coalitions. For example, organization structures vary from groups that depend entirely on volunteer time to groups capable of hiring full-time staff and from those that include a representation from the full range of food sectors to those that choose to restrict membership to certain food sectors. In the majority of cases, FPC have a solid representation from the production, distribution and consumption sectors of the food chain but lack input from processing and waste organizations sectors. Moreover, most food coalitions employ no staff or only one part-time staff person and heavily rely on volunteers to move their agenda forward. The environmental scan and literature also revealed the following eight approaches which notably contribute to a FPC's ability to achieve its goals:

1. **Background Work:** Prior to coalition establishment, background research is conducted in an effort to pinpoint the local food system's most pressing needs for reform.
2. **Governmental Integration:** Reserving seats for government officials which helps with acquiring human and financial resources as well as expanding discussions to a wider food system.
3. **Staff Support:** Support the council with administrative functions and other tasks such as networking and education.
4. **External Consultants:** External consultants are included in the planning stages of projects as they are an invaluable source of ideas and provide an unbiased, independent perspective.
5. **Members:** The FPC members represent a broad spectrum of interests in the local food system.
6. **Champions:** One or two individuals who possess experiences and connections in the local community are given a leadership position.
7. **Incentives:** Incentives are introduced as a method to ensure that the membership base of a FPC remains active and stable.
8. **Clearly Defined Roles:** A clear outline of each individual's roles is provided following formation to achieve a high level of organisation capacity and effectiveness.
9. **Internal & External Relationships:** Effective conflict resolution procedures and a friendly work environment are in place to strengthen connections between member

Interviews with key informants provided further insight by revealing a number of effective approaches to governing food coalitions. For example, interviews with UBC staff revealed the importance of creating a guidance document that would include a shared mission, an action plan framework and a priority list. Interviews with FPC members added a different point by advising a new council to inform its community of their actions and plans.

Recommendations:

Assessment: Conduct an assessment on the campus food system prior to official establishment.

Clear Vision & Roles: Dedicate the first meeting towards the creation of a clear job outline for each member and a shared vision that is agreed upon amongst all coalition members.

Strong Leadership: Select 1-2 individual(s) to form a leadership committee who possess a deep understanding of the local community and multiple networks.

Presence of Staffing: Recruit 1-2 individual(s) that can provide on-going assistance with clerical duties and tasks outside of the administrative domain, such as those related to education and research

Support from External Consultants: Invite external consultants to meetings to acquire an unbiased opinion on issues

Development of Healthy Internal Relationships: Implement effective conflict resolution procedures and identify as a team the key characteristics of a positive, friendly work environment.

Incentives: Introduce incentives which give members the opportunity to build their knowledge base.

Evaluation: Incorporate a time for evaluation in meetings to openly discuss *what worked*, *what didn't work* and *what can be improved*.

Funding: Secure adequate funds prior to the start and implementation of any major project

1. Introduction

Over the course of several centuries, the conventional food system evolved from a simplistic structure of local small-scale production, to one that is highly complicated with numerous interwoven networks and globalized, reaching all four corners of the earth (McCullough, Pingali & Stamoulis, 2008). As its complexity grew, the vital connections between humans and food became more severed, giving rise to a myriad of food system related problems which plague human, environmental and overall ecological health to this day (Brunelle, Dumas & Souty, 2014). Initially, while notable efforts were made to combat these detrimental complications, policies that influenced the food system were ineffective as most were “scattered across a disparate array of government departments and agencies without coordination or recognition of the linkages between food related sectors (Fox, 2010).” More specifically, it was common for governmental bodies to separate food policy in terms of agriculture, food safety and nutrition and disregard the essential links that were connected to other food system domains such as waste management, land use and transportation (Borron, 2003). Resultantly, due to the absence of comprehensive food systems planning, numerous gaps and inadequacies were left in food-related decision-making processes (Fox, 2010). After recognizing the existence of cross-regional linkages between food system sectors, a more integrated approach began to materialize in political discussions as an attempt to more effectively solve food issues (Pothukuchi & Kaufman, 1999). In due time, a permanent shift was made from traditional, fragmented conceptualisations of food and agriculture activities to more comprehensive food systems approaches (Neff, Merrigan & Wallinga, 2015). In an effort to further address the inadequacies in food policy and planning, a concept of a council, committee or coalition engaging members from a diversity of food system sectors and employing a food systems approach emerged which gave rise to the first “Food Policy Councils (FPCs)” (Schiff, 2007).

1.1 Food Policy Councils

A FPC is a voluntary body made up of representatives and stakeholders from many sectors of the food chain that examine the operations of a local food system and develop innovative courses of action that tackle pressing issues within it (Fox, 2010). The FPC itself acts as an important platform for seemingly disparate sectors to discuss, share tools and information, strategize and develop close relationships with one another (Elsharkawy & La Forge, 2017). Through this alliance of knowledge and resources, FPCs acquire insight into avenues for food system improvement and

promotion not readily identified in non-collaborative efforts (Harper, Shattuck, Holt-Gimenez, Alkon & Lambrick, 2009). This cross-sectoral communication also then enables FPCs to connect a number of public policy and development goals, including environmental sustainability, food security and public health. Ultimately, the primary goal of FPCs is to work towards the creation of a food system that is ecologically sustainable, economically viable and socially just (Borron, 2003). Current FPCs strive to achieve this long-term goal through a variety of different projects involving policy enactment, program implementation and the provision of education on sustainable food systems (Harper et al., 2009).

1.2 Campus-Wide Food Coalition

With the aim of moving towards the achievement of a healthier food system, the University of British Columbia (UBC) established numerous initiatives in the recent past including the Food and Nutrition committee, the Food Systems Project, and the Food Security Initiative. Although the forenamed coalitions are united in their interest to advance food systems sustainability, they remain as separate entities and strive to meet different agendas. With the absence of an overarching campus strategy that addresses food system issues, various groups have expressed interest in strategic alignment to strengthen the collective work on campus and advance food system sustainability.

Prior to the establishment of a university-wide food policy council, there remains a profound need to acquire a better understanding of the operations of existing food policy councils across jurisdictions, particularly in university settings. To guide the efforts in creating a campus-wide coalition, an environmental scan on food policy councils was conducted along with a literature review on best practice approaches to food policy council systems and governance. Furthermore, key informant interviews were performed for insight and feedback to further inform foundational work in the development of a university-wide FPC. In this report, a summary of the data collected from the environmental scan, literature review and interviews is provided along with recommendations on how to move forward in creating a campus-wide coalition.

2. Methods

The research conducted to inform foundational work in developing a university-wide food policy council took place in four distinct phases: (1) literature review (2) environmental scan (3) key informant interviews and (4) data analysis.

2.1 Literature Review

The first phase was a thorough literature review, comprising of books, peer reviewed journal articles, theses, blogs, and reports of FPCs. Existing literature was explored initially to acquire a better understanding of the operations of past and current FPCs and to identify practices that were deemed as “best practice approaches.” During this phase of the project, the following academic search engines were utilized to acquire more information on FPCs: Google Scholar, Educational Resources Information Center, and Refseek. As a UBC student, the writer also was able to expand her search by logging into the online UBC library.

2.2 Environmental Scan

During the second phase of this project, an environmental scan was conducted of present-day FPCs in both Canada and the United States to gain greater insight into their practices, framework and activities. Initially, the John Hopkins University “Food Policy Council Directory” was utilized to identify existing FPCs and to acquire their website URL. Their websites along with their “Terms of References (ToF)” were the sole sources of information for this scan. In an effort to best organize the information gathered from each FPC’s website and ToF, a data collection table was created. Due to temporal limitations, only FPCs which were recurrently found in the literature review were chosen to be a part of the environmental scan. A list of these FPCs along with their website URL and contact information is provided in Appendix A.

The environmental scan also included an internet search of FPCs that operate within the university setting. A data collection table, similar to the one previously mentioned, was applied to gather information on these on-campus FPCs. Furthermore, a table was created for the purpose of gathering their contact information which is presented in Appendix B. While all FPCs within universities were prospective candidates for this research project’s sample, many did not have a website. Resultantly, the writer was unable to acquire detailed information for a number of FPCs.

2.3 Interviews

Throughout this research project, interviews were conducted with two groups of people: (1) on-campus FPC members outside of UBC and (2) UBC staff involved in the campus food system.

When trying to contact the first group, a list including the email address of each coalition was initially created while conducting the environmental scan (Appendix B). Afterwards, using this publicly available contact information, each identified FPC was sent a brief email explaining the research project and the purpose and scheduling details of the interview. The email itself can be found in Appendix C. Within the message, FPC members were asked if they were willing to participate in an interview and were given the option to submit their answers via email, or to schedule a time to be interviewed by telephone. After 4 days, a revised email was resent to those who had not responded. The second email sent was modified to include the suggestions of the UBC Food Insecurity Project Manager, SEEDS Sustainability Program Manager, and SEEDS Project Coordinator. Prior to contacting the second group, a Google Doc was created by the writer which included a list of potential interview candidates and a section asking for advice on how each person should be reached. The document was shared with the three forenamed individuals to acquire their input. Afterwards, each individual listed in the shared document was contacted via email and then by telephone 4 days later if there was no response.

The interview question sets utilized during the third phase of information gathering were created through the guidance and adaptation of surveys found in Backer (2003) and Schiff (2007) and through the supplementation of questions applying specifically to this research project. The formulation of these questions was also made possible through collaboration between the UBC Food Insecurity Manager, the SEEDS Project Coordinator, the SEEDS Sustainability Program Manager, and the report writer herself. Out of this collaboration, a brief 9 question set was developed to gain operational information of each FPC, to acquire their perspective on best practice approaches for FPC systems and to acquire advice on how UBC should move towards the creation of its own campus-wide food policy council. The second interview question set contains 7 questions and posed similar questions; however, they were more UBC-specific and aimed to gather information on potential campus engagement avenues. The material in Appendix D presents the questions used in all the interviews of this research project.

The interview phase of this project transpired from June 10th to 24th, 2020. During the interviews, the writer collected the data by recording the interviewees' responses using Otter; a voice recorder app that offers automatic transcription. At the end, the writer asked each interviewee if they would like to receive a summary of the interview prior to submission and if they preferred to remain anonymous. All interviewees consented to having their name within the report. Following

the completion of interviews, the writer replayed each recorded conversation in an effort to accurately summarize the data.

2.4 Data Analysis

Since all the interview questions produced open-ended responses, an analysis of the answers included a review of the text, followed by the organisation of the responses into similar categories. After arranging all the answers into their respective categories, they were analyzed carefully to recognize any recurring patterns. A similar procedure was applied when analyzing the information collected from the literature review and the environmental scan. During this stage, the writer focused her effort on identifying certain FPC characteristics which were considered as “essential” to the success of a FPC. By combining the findings from the literature review and the environmental scan with the interviewees’ responses, the writer was able to formulate her recommendations for the creation of a campus-wide FPC at UBC.

3. Results

3.1 Food-Related UBC Initiatives

As food-related issues within the UBC campus become more apparent and recognizable over the years, a number of initiatives have been established in an effort to better tackle these problems. In this section, a brief description of the structure, composition and projects of three food coalitions from the UBC campus will be provided.

3.1.1 UBC Food Security Initiative

The UBC Food Security Initiative (FSI) is an interdisciplinary coalition of students, academics and practitioners that collaborates to formulate interventions aimed at decreasing food insecurity on campus. Guided by the Wellbeing Strategic Framework, the FSI strives to “reduce the prevalence of food insecurity at UBC by 2025” through three categories of action (1) deepening their understanding of food security with the university context (2) alleviating immediate pressures of food insecurity and (3) fostering knowledge exchange with UBC and beyond. Each member within the coalition is associated with one of three sub-groups: the backbone, core team and advisory group. Individuals that represent that “backbone” play an essential role of providing their

coalition with foundational support by scheduling meetings, distributing agendas and reporting results to the Vice President of Students (VPS). Members within the “core team” contribute by adding capacity, expertise and decision-making capabilities to the coalition. Lastly, the “advisory group” is given the responsibility of providing feedback and recommendations on various areas of focus.

3.1.2 UBC Food and Nutrition Committee

The Food and Nutrition Committee (FNC) is the UBC-lead initiative which focuses its efforts on increasing awareness and facilitating action towards creating a more nutritionally sound campus. According to the FNC, a nutritionally sound campus is one that “increases accessibility to and intake of safe, healthy food, promotes skill and knowledge development for all members of the UBC Vancouver and Okanagan communities and models an integrated food system which promotes health, wellbeing and sustainability.” Currently, a number of efforts are being made by this coalition to achieve such a campus such as the Healthy Beverage Initiative, the Food Insecurity Baseline and Action Plan Project and the Swipe Out Hunger Feasibility Project. With regards to composition, the FNC possesses a diverse membership that includes faculty, students and staff from both the Vancouver and Okanagan campus. The majority of participants are assigned the role “committee member;” a role in which one is expected to actively participate in committee meetings and functions, inform and engage others about the work of the committee and support the development of other ad-hoc working groups that are aligned with the FNC’s annual priorities. In addition to the role of “committee member,” there also exists the “chair” position, which must be occupied by an individual that is part of the Wellbeing Strategic Support Team (SST).

3.1.3 UBC Food System Project Steering Committee

The UBC Food System Project Steering Committee is a collaborative, cross-campus initiative which focuses its actions towards increasing the sustainability of UBC’s food system. The members of the initiative are faculty, staff and students from the Vancouver and Okanagan campus which represent various facets of each campus food system such as production, purchasing, distribution, education and research. Currently there are five working groups within this committee: (1) climate friendly food systems, (2) biodiverse food systems, (3) urban food production (4) food justice and sovereignty and (5) zero waste and circular economy. Similar to the FNC, the committee

members themselves are expected to attend meetings and functions, inform others about the work of the committee and serve on other sub-working groups as needed to advance specific projects.

3.2 Structure

There are multiple structural variations between the current functioning FPCs. Organization structures vary from groups that depend entirely on volunteer time to groups capable of hiring full-time staff and from those that strive for consensus-based decision making to those that abide by majority rules. Since the context in which FPCs form is rarely the same, creators of such coalitions highly depend on their understanding of trade-offs between structure models to strike the right balance and form a FPC that can successfully tackle the issues of the local food system (Schiff, 2007). In this section of the report, the various structures of current FPCs and the pros and cons of each composition will be discussed.

3.2.1 Staff

While members represent and share the state-of-affairs of their food sector, there still remains an indispensable need for the management of administrative tasks and many other responsibilities of a FPC. Due to the time-consuming and onerous nature of the supplementary tasks, there recurrently exists a considerable demand to have another person, a “staff” member, involved in the completion of those remaining duties (Yeatman, 1994). In this regard, staff people are a vital force within an organization since their presence obviates members from being overburdened and overwhelmed with council workload and allows them to solely focus their attention on their work alone (Burgan & Winne, 2012). They provide this support by being assigned numerous roles and responsibilities in the administrative domain such as recruiters of members, developers of meeting agendas and schedulers of various events, workshops and retreats. While administrative functions are the most common form of work reserved for staff, interviews and the environmental scan reveal that certain FPC staff also engage in networking, education and research. For example, staff interviewees in Schiff’s (2007) report disclose that staff are involved in writing some or all of the research material for publications in addition to their administrative contributions.

Despite the importance of staff involvement in FPC longevity and effectiveness, data from the environmental scan suggests that the vast majority of FPCs have either no staff or only one part-time staff person. Of the FPC’s with a staff member on board, their staff are typically assigned

restricted amounts of time to participate in the council in addition to their usual government duties. Furthermore, since many coalition members deem staff resources as essential in the proper functioning of FPCs, a number of FPCs seek the support of volunteers to complete tasks originally assigned to staff and heavily rely on their assistance in moving their agenda forward (Fitzgerald & Morgan, 2014).

In literature, it is revealed that the lack of staff is one of the biggest challenges for many councils (Borron, 2003). The primary cause cited remains lack of funding to pay for a staff person, while the secondary cause is disinterest among community members. Since staff are such an indispensable component of the FPC framework, it is therefore unsurprising that many FPCs have closed their doors due to the inability to move activities forward with only volunteer support (Fox, 2010).

3.2.2 Members

Food Policy Councils make a concentrated effort to work from a food systems perspective, integrating the various issues and interests that shape the food system (Borron, 2003). In an effort to best achieve this, FPCs include representatives from the full range of food sectors in their discussions – from production to waste management (Harper et al., 2009). Although the inclusion of all food sectors' perspectives is regarded as an invaluable quality as it enables a deeper understanding of the interconnectedness of subsystems, how well each of these sectors is represented notably varies between FPCs.

While the achievement of acquiring representation from the whole food system is a top priority for most FPCs, only a small minority has succeeded in doing so. The vast majority of coalitions include a solid representation from the production, distribution and consumption sectors of the food chain; however, representation from food processors or waste management organizations is often lacking or nonexistent. Within these coalitions, it is most common to find the following members: small to medium size farmers, community gardeners, urban agriculturists, food distributors and wholesalers, grocery retailers, farmers market managers, chefs and restaurant owners. Aside from lacking the viewpoints of certain food sectors, FPCs also seem to exclude membership from individuals who are negatively influenced by inequality within the food system such as residents from “food dessert” neighbourhoods (Fox, 2010). Finally, Harper et al. (2009) points to a final trend which shows that FPCs are regularly one-sided in their outlook because

“FPCs tend to come from the anti-hunger/poverty world, and stay isolated in that world.” According to this study, this lack of a comprehensive representation does not stem from disinterest or unawareness of the issue but rather, it is a reflection of the limited availability of resources to most councils. In addition to this, some members are simply opposed to having wide representation in their FPCs by refusing to recruit certain individuals. A good example of this is the rejection of corporate retail chains or agribusiness companies to participate due to historic mistrust of those entities among community members.

In addition to membership diversity, the method in which members are selected also differs between organizations. Within the environmental scan, three main ways in which FPC members are typically selected were revealed: (1) self-selection (2) application (reviewed by the existing council, an executive board, or the initiating community members) and (3) election, nomination or appointment (chosen by a governmental official). During the selection process, certain FPCs also apply a combination of two or three of the forenamed methods, depending on which seat is going to be filled. Positions with high decision making power are often selected via an election, while those which harbor less responsibility are often recruited by self-selection or application. Research conducted in the United States offers some insight into the distribution of member-selection methods amongst FPCs at various levels of government. At the local level, more than half of FPCs have their members self-select, 36% appoint their members and 10% have prospective members apply for seats (Harper et al., 2009). Contrastingly, at the state level, two-thirds of FPCs have their members appointed, with the remaining FPCs allowing members to self select.

Lastly, FPCs also regularly seek the advice and expertise of individuals employed by the government (Borron, 2003). Government workers that participate in FPCs become integrated through voluntary and appointed positions as well as staff support and often come from departments of environment, education, health, social services and economic development (Fox, 2010). Further information on the involvement and influence of government on the activities of FPCs will be provided in the following section.

3.3 Connection to government

Historically, FPCs maintained a formal relationship to government and were established under orders, ordinances and mandates to function primarily as a government organization (Clancy,

Hammer & Lippoldt, 2008). This relationship would often take on the form of a joint government-citizen commission, an advisory body consisting of citizens appointed by elected officials, a task force composed of city officials, or an advisory group housed under a special government department. This connection was viewed as highly advantageous as closer ties to government placed FPCs in a position where they were supported and able to influence policy through research and recommendations (Harper et al., 2009). Over time, as people began to recognize the limitations of full-fledged government associations, several organizations developed as non-government, often non-profit organizations.

In current times, certain FPCs have emerged which represent “hybrid” forms of past FPCs by sustaining more distant relationships with the government. These coalitions function by enjoying some support from the government while being community-driven and oriented. By straddling both worlds, these types of FPCs are able to become a “mechanism to translate the voice of the people to government (Fox, 2010).” Furthermore, by avoiding being swayed by the priorities of one particular group, “hybrid” FPCs are able to formulate their own, unbiased stance on an issue.

Although the hybrid model offers many benefits, there are individuals which repudiate governmental linkages and state that any form of political association brings forth a number of limitations. Firstly, those opposed to this connection strongly claim that a FPC is more likely to be politicized and to be “pushed and pulled according to the priorities of the current mayor if such an association exists (Fox, 2010).” Contrastingly, the absence of such a relationship gives FPCs the freedom to create their own agenda and move forward when they see fit (Borron, 2003). Secondly, since the political landscape continuously changes, the government’s support to the FPC will regularly shift, evoking a certain degree of instability (Fitzgerald & Morgan, 2014). If a FPC were to become too reliant on governmental support, such an unstable provision of assistance may cause disbandment. Thirdly, others argue that independence from the government empowers FPCs to hold public officials accountable, which in certain situations, enables a policy agenda to progress forward (Fox, 2010).

An analysis of current FPCs in the United States reveals that there are organizations that function with varying degrees of governmental intervention. According to Harper et al. (2009), half of state level FPCs are located in government agencies, approximately a third are independent and a small fraction of those not part of the government were created by government action. Comparing

these results to the local level, 60% of FPCs are entirely independent from the government and only 20% are independent but created by the government. A good example of a purely independent FPC is the “Detroit Food Policy Council” which continues to avoid forming any relations with its government due to financial and political instability in the city.

3.4 Functions

The central aim of most Food Policy Councils is to identify and propose innovative solutions to make the food system more environmentally sustainable and socially just. While this is a common goal shared amongst many FPCs, the method of conquering such an objective varies between each organization. These coalitions take on many forms and formulate different agendas depending on the local context and the project plans of its creators. In most cases, the environmental scan revealed that FPCs execute at least one of the following three functions while trying to achieve the forenamed main priority: (1) evaluate and influence policy, (2) launch or support programs and services that address local needs and (3) educate on sustainability and food systems. In the following section, this report will discuss how FPCs perform these three functions in greater detail.

3.4.1 Policy

Policy addresses structural changes—changes to the rules and institutions that shape our food systems (Harper et al., 2009). Introducing structural changes to a sector of the food system is a high priority for many FPCs since changing regulations is one of the more permanent ways of instilling change; however, only a few possess the capability to directly make policy alterations.

When speaking of policy change, FPCs most often contribute by advising or partnering on policy formulation and implementation. In the majority of cases, they provide support by spearheading research, initiating community education campaigns, and formulating education programs that inform and indirectly enable policy creation and enactment. For instance, in the City of Vancouver, the Vancouver Food Policy Council (VFPC) initiated a two-year long research project called “Food Secure Vancouver,” which sought to “identify, review and analyze the key factors that support and enhance Vancouver’s food security (Vancouver Food Policy Council, 2011).” Following completion, the recommendations and conclusions drawn from this study were

utilized to inform the City of Vancouver's food policies, including the goals of the Greenest City 2020 project.

This indirect approach that FPCs take can be attributed to a variety of challenges that FPCs face that impede their capacity to directly make policy change. A study conducted on 56 U.S. FPCs by Scherb et al. (2012) was able to investigate such barriers to FPC involvement in policy work and shed some light on this matter. Overall, it was revealed that 76% of respondents cited lack of time, 66% reported lack of financial support, and 46% stated lack of training or skills as barriers to engaging in the policy process. Other more minor barriers included inconsistent government support, lack of members' trust of government, and difference of opinion across sectors of the food industry on how to approach policy. When comparing newly formed FPCs to long-standing ones, those operating for three or more years worked for federal policy issues more often than newer FPCs. Given these results, it is likely that most organisations, during the first few years of existence, simply do not possess the resources, stability and networks to pursue making policy recommendations to the government.

While many FPCs work in an indirect manner by assembling the necessary players and information to advance their policy vision forward, a few organizations exist that possess the ability to enact policy change more directly. These FPCs most often accomplish their policy-altering objectives by having the active support of City Council, the Office of the Mayor or other high-level government officials who are willing to champion their ideas. Once given this political support, the tasks of these FPCs branch out to involve writing, amending, advocating, recommending or even monitoring policy. In this role, FPCs are given the responsibility to bridge the divisions in public policy making and make certain that the government is more aware of how their policies influence the food system (Harper et al., 2009).

Currently, there are no well-research studies exploring how many FPCs have succeeded in changing policy based on their input and recommendations; however, there are a number of anecdotal stories which remind us that FPCs have the potential to make policy amendments. For example, the Seattle King County Food Policy Council played a huge role in pushing forward the "Local Farms, Healthy Kids" bill which set up the infrastructure for farm to school programs, expanded markets for farmers around the Washington state and increased locally grown food in food banks. The same FPC also collaborated with the City Council to draft and pass the "Local

Food Action Initiative,” a resolution that created a “policy framework” which brought together issues of local agriculture, community gardens, urban-rural community connections, public health and greater food self-sufficiency.

3.4.2 Programs

As mentioned previously, it is uncommon for FPCs to single-handedly develop and implement policy. Alternatively, many FPCs avoid sticking exclusively to policy advising and concentrate their efforts on creating and implementing programs instead. In doing so, they themselves are able to address current issues and see the fruits of their labor directly. In addition, since direct experience is crucial in informing policy making, many newly-established FPCs firmly believe that they first must gain greater experience in the field prior to proposing policy recommendations.

As one of the more common pathways chosen by FPCs, most coalitions have initially taken upon their hands to create or help form programs that address various issues in the food system. While some coalitions implement their own programs, others serve as catalysts by sharing their network connections and alternative resources required by other organizations for program initiation and maintenance. Some of the more popular and recurring programs that have been launched by FPCs include farm to school, school garden, composting and institutional food purchasing programs.

According to Butterfoss et al. (1993), one of the many strategies employed by FPCs to elevate their local presence are “quick wins” in the form of successful programs. These meaningful projects that are achievable in a short time period are also one of the keys to building credibility along with member motivation for a FPC (Harper et al., 2009). Resultantly, in an effort to increase their prestige and attain success, many councils launch programs that are one-time successes, such as getting food stamps accepted at farmers markets, creating student nutrition literacy classes, building affordable housing for farm workers or securing land for community gardens.

Amongst the current FPCs, the Toronto Food Policy Council (TFPC) is one of the more celebrated organizations for its contributions in supporting the development of food programs. In addition to championing the City of Toronto’s “Declaration on Food and Nutrition,” the TFPC also designed Canada’s first “Food Access Grants Program” which provided \$2.4 million towards the

purchase of kitchen hardware for 180 schools and social agencies. Furthermore, this FPC initiated the “Buy Ontario” food program which increased hospital purchase of local food (Toronto Food Policy Council, 2016).

3.4.3 Education

Education is a primary element of the organisational role and functions of food policy councils (Burgan & Winne, 2012). Typically, FPCs contribute to the realm of education by becoming themselves both the educators and the communicators of sustainability and food systems. The environmental scan revealed that this occurs at two different levels: (1) the first level involves the sharing of knowledge to and amongst participants of the FPC and (2) the second level encompasses the spread of knowledge to entire communities including government agencies, business and other organisations.

When speaking of the first level, food policy council meetings are the primary method in which this is accomplished. Aside from serving as an event to assist participants in establishing priorities and agendas, and to sustain members’ interests, FPC meetings also function as an effective platform for discussion, brain-storming and information exchange (Elsharkawy & La Forge, 2017). Oftentimes, the conversations arising from FPC meetings enable people from varying food sectors and backgrounds to develop a better understanding of each co-member’s role and the state-of-affairs of their respective food sector (Fox, 2010). In acquiring this knowledge, they better understand how their sector’s decisions and actions impact other components of the food system (Schiff, 2007). The inclusion of guest speakers in meetings further assists with the deepening of knowledge, the generation of ideas and the instigation of discussion.

With regards to the second level, FPCs often communicate principles of sustainable food systems with the public by participating in events, releasing information materials and using communication technologies. Information material published by FPCs typically includes resources such as educational guides, brochures and guidebooks which often provide information about the activities of the FPC, opportunities for involvement and overall explanations of various issues within the food system. In addition to this, FPCs reach the public’s eyes and ears by maintaining websites, sending emails, creating listservs and distributing electronic newsletters. For example, the Toronto Food Policy Council designed a listserv which notably contributed to increasing the public’s awareness of its agenda (Toronto Food Policy Council, 2016). The last common outlet for

communicating information involves hosting conferences and holding information stalls which act as excellent avenues for attracting the public's attention and raising awareness.

3.5 Priorities & Priority Setting

The global food system necessitates a diverse assortment of approaches and initiatives to effectively tackle its present issues. Accordingly, organizations working to address these obstacles such as food policy councils, encounter a multifarious array of potential programs and projects.

As coalitions form, there are many factors which exert an influence during the selection of priorities and the creation of the initial agenda (Burgan & Winne, 2012; Dahlberg, 1994). Firstly, the perceived needs and concerns of the community within which a FPC is located have a significant impact on the organization's overall course of action (Schiff, 2007). Secondly, certain factors also exist which to some extent, serve as a pre-determining influence in the establishment of priorities. Food sector alignment, community consultation outcomes and government mandates all prove to be influential in swaying a FPC's priorities towards one general direction. For example, it is common to see FPCs contain a disproportionately high number of agricultural representatives and as such, they tend to become aligned with institutions related to this forenamed sector of the food system (Bassarab, Santo & Palmer, 2019).

While the priorities of FPCs are based on a variety of external factors and outside expectations, the environmental scan revealed that priorities overlap between FPCs, enabling the creation of a list of the 10 most common priorities of FPCs. The list is as follows with decreasing popularity: (1) community engagement (2) advocacy and policy capacity building (3) strategic or policy planning (4) education (5) networking (6) member recruitment and retention (7) communication and marketing (8) research and data collection (9) member diversity (10) fundraising. When examining the prevalence of the top three priorities, community engagement was one of the top 3 priorities for 60% of the FPCs, while advocacy and strategic/policy planning was one of the top 3 priorities for 40% and 35% of the FPCs, respectively.

An examination of trends within the data also revealed a few noticeable differences in the priorities of FPCs of varying ages and locations. Newly-established organizations are more likely to report membership recruitment, research, data collection and governance structure as a top priority than older FPCs. As FPCs mature, advocacy and policy capacity building become their new top

priorities while the importance of membership recruitment and retention declines. The oldest coalitions show the most interest in membership diversity when compared to their younger counterparts. When assessing FPCs from different locations, coalitions embedded in universities tend to focus more on education and less on advocacy compared to all the other coalition types. Contrastingly, FPCs within the government prioritize strategic planning and research more than any other organization type.

The environmental scan also explored priorities specifically pertaining to policy and identified healthy food access as the top policy priority for the majority of FPCs. Moving down the list, the next two commonly identified policy areas were economic development and anti-hunger. A similar examination of FPC maturity revealed that newer FPCs are more likely to prioritize economic development while FPCs over 10 years of age are most likely to prioritize food labor.

3.6 Challenges

Food policy councils face a wide range of challenges, limitations and points of tensions related to administration, internal organisational issues, and to external political, corporate and social pressures (Harper et al., 2009). Although the successes of FPCs always present a unique story, the challenges that councils must overcome are similar over a broad geographic and time scale. According to current literature, the lack of effective communication, the presence of opposition and insufficient funding are some of the main and most frequent barriers to success of FPCs (Harper et al., 2009; Schiff, 2007). A closer examination of these challenges will follow to offer insight and lessons for the strategic development of new food policy councils.

3.6.1 Lack of Effective Communication & Self-Evaluation

Within food policy councils, the lack of self-evaluation gives rise to significant setbacks in operation (Burgan & Winne, 2012). Oftentimes, communication protocols of a FPC disengage participants from discussing organisational difficulties, resulting in members becoming reluctant and unwilling to communicate problems to the team (Schiff, 2007). Instead, detailed evaluations of the coalition's structure and effectiveness are only undertaken when it faces notable threats to establishment. Resultantly, the absence of evaluative discussions within a FPC prevents members from recognizing their organization's flaws and procedural inefficiencies and from introducing appropriate modifications for improvement (Burgan & Winne, 2012). By not being able to progress

forward and raise group productivity, councils may also experience further difficulties with acquiring funds and support from decision makers, since their work may not be able to attract their attention (Schiff, 2007). Lack of effectiveness in communication also manifests as lack of clarity regarding the roles of staff and members and the mission of the council (Harper et al., 2009). Role ambiguity often leads to increased dissatisfaction within the coalition since misunderstandings arise as to the type and amount of work expected from each member. Furthermore, if members work without a well-defined mission, “they get lost in the committee jungle,” loose core focus and are unable to collectively meet the council’s final goals and objectives (Harper et al., 2009).

3.6.2 Insufficient Funding

Food policy councils are a budding novelty for food system governance, but like every niche innovation in its infancy, they are fragile (Ilieva, 2016). While most FPCs achieve many successes during the first years of operation, many succumb to opposing forces and burn-out due to the lack of support, often being financial support (Fitzgerald & Morgan, 2014).

Food coalitions acquire monetary support through funding which comes in a variety of forms such as direct financial or in-kind support (Burgan & Winne, 2012). It can be derived from the sponsoring government agency, a private sponsor, government sourced grants and indirect sources such as outside contacts. Despite there being many funding sources available, one of the most common challenges faced by FCSs is securing adequate and continuous funds (Borron, 2003). The primary concern echoed by most FPCs is the need of financial support to pay for staffing hours; however, money is also frequently required for administrative costs, publishing reports, attending conferences and events and program implementation.

The lack of financial backing is a major setback for FPCs since limited staff prevents members from having the time to maintain a level of activity consistent with the desires of the council’s membership (Burgan & Winne, 2012). Furthermore, without sufficient funds, FPCs are constrained to only complete certain tasks within their budget, which may hinder their ability to reach their final goals. Finally, staff people also face a challenge by needing to regularly write grant applications to secure continued funding for their position which decreases the amount of attention they can provide specifically to council activities (Schiff, 2007).

Whether or not associated with a government office or department, it is recommended for FPCs to secure adequate funding prior to their establishment or the implementation of any major project (Schiff, 2007). In most cases, contacting any potential interested government department and drafting a statement demonstrating the need for financial support is a promising first step.

3.6.3 Presence of Opposition

In addition to the two forenamed obstacles, FPCs also commonly experience challenges in the form of opposition from external entities (Fitzgerald & Morgan, 2014). At the state level, FPCs typically encounter opposition from industry interest groups and corporate entities. According to Schiff (2007), newly-formed FPCs at this level experience resistance to specific programs or member selection while more established coalitions receive opposition that predominantly targets broader objectives and goals. In contrast, at the local level, opposition arises from within the local government due to “changing attitudes of elected officials towards FPC and the amalgamation of local government areas (Schiff, 2007).”

The presence of resistance poses a great threat to the agenda of FPCs. In some cases, resisting forces may only slow down the pace of task completion; however, the lack of approval from influential and dominating bodies such as the government has the potential to modify a FPC’s project or eliminate it from the plan entirely (Harper et al., 2009).

In an effort to minimize opposing forces, FPCs employ a variety of methods to adapt to confrontation, such as creating new “affiliate” member positions or tweaking the framework of programs to better align with external preferences (Schiff, 2007). While those methods have shown to be successful to varying degrees, according to Clancy et al. (2008), the best course of action involves the avoidance of confrontation by shrinking a FPC’s public profile and agenda. In doing so, it can notably reduce pressure in an unsupportive, hostile environment and allow members to focus on alternative projects that will enable them to gather sufficient strength to tackle former project.

3.7 Best Practice Approaches

There is no one single recipe or one-size-fits-all formula for running a successful council. One of the greatest strengths of FPCs is their unique ability to be locally relevant and as such, councils are unable to apply a specific method of operation from another locality (Harper et al.,

2009). Food Policy Councils are best known to thrive and succeed when they build off the momentum of groups in their own communities, when they address issues that have already been identified at the local level, and when they formulate locally-based policies and programs (Burgan & Winne, 2012). As a result, there is no appropriate method to identify what model is most effective for all FPCs as that largely depends on both the organizational goals of each council and its perception of success (Elsharkawy & La Forge, 2017).

While it is not feasible to formulate an “ideal” FPC model, a close examination of commonalities and arising trends of influential FPCs can provide invaluable information into how an FPC could potentially strengthen their influence. Recent literature reveals that there are certain FPC approaches to operations which have shown to be very effective in areas such as goal completion, healthy internal relationship development, and the fulfillment of organisational roles. A summary of these approaches will be discussed below with the intention of providing a basis for identifying models for council management that would help illuminate the path towards achieving greater success for both newly-established FPCs and for those FPCs wanting to evolve and instill change.

3.7.1 Background Work Prior to Establishment

The impetus for triggering establishment and the processes involved in creating FPCs vary significantly from one FPC to another. Amongst the various steps involved, one is of particular importance in the formation of a strong and impactful FPC. According to Yeatman (1994), the creation of a successful FPC primarily begins with substantive “background work” which takes place prior to the establishment of a FPC. In the majority of cases, this preliminary work entails background research such as a needs assessment focusing on food insecurity in the respective area, a comprehensive study of the food system as a whole or the creation of an extensive historical record of a region’s community-based actions (Burgan & Winne, 2012). After completion, the accumulated data resulting from this work becomes a powerful tool, as it serves as “a foundational text from which to ground both platforms for change and community engagement (Harper et al., 2009).” Following analysis, the newly-compiled data will pinpoint the most pressing local needs for reform (Yeatman, 1994). If shared amongst various groups within a food system, including policy makers, education, residents, and business, such data has the potential to stimulate thought and

action, open up public dialogue, and create collaborations between groups (Bortoletti & Loman, 2019).

3.7.2 Governmental Integration

A government's role in helping FPCs can take on a variety of forms: a city council could pass a resolution recognizing and supporting the FPC, officials could be seated on the council or the government could provide funding (Harper et al., 2009). The degree of governmental involvement is regarded as an essential factor related to FPC's structural development and effectiveness since such a connection proves to be very advantageous (Borron, 2003). Firstly, the establishment of the food policy council by an act of local government helps to assure the longevity of the council (Yeatman, 1994). Recognition under a governmental ordinance helps to achieve this continuity due to three reasons: (1) once created by a city ordinance, the disbandment of a food policy council would need another city ordinance (2) by formally creating a food policy council in this manner, its role and function must be clear, as must be its official position with regard to powers and responsibilities for action (3) formally creating a council also involves identifying where the council is administratively positioned, with what staff support and budget. According to Yeatman (1994), when this is clear, it is much easier to develop plans of action and to monitor actions accordingly.

Secondly, the physical presence of governmental officials in a FPC can assist the coalition by identifying and acquiring human resource needs as well as providing authority to fulfill the mandate due to their decision-making authority and widespread access to resources (Borron, 2003). In many noted cases, this support also provides instant status within a community and office space necessary to function. Thirdly, the inclusion of government representatives from a variety of food sectors enables a FPC to broaden their focus and expand their discussions to a wider food system (Schiff, 2007). In doing so, the greater diversity of viewpoints, expertise and experiences can yield creative solutions, ones that might not have arisen without such a collaboration.

Lastly, an association with the government brings in financial support in the form of funds, which in most cases, is spent on salaries, projects, administrative costs, publishing reports, and attending conferences (Borron, 2003). Since a common cause of disbandment is typically lack of funding to pay for staff support, financial backing from the government is a crucial form of support which holds the coalition together.

3.7.3 Staff Support

Due to the large quantity of administrative work that is involved in running a FPC, staff are also considered to be a valuable asset and a critical component of the operations of a food policy council. In most cases, it is imperative that food policy councils have support from staff that can provide on-going services to the council and its members since many crucial tasks are often left incomplete in their absence (Yeatman, 1994). According to Schiff (2007), acquiring adequate staff still remains one of the biggest challenges that FPCs continue to face. Due to insufficient funds, many FPCs solely rely on volunteers and in-kind support to function and while doing, due to the volunteers' low amount of hours, the coalitions often are unable to make significant accomplishments and eventually disband (Fox, 2010). Furthermore, councils that are highly dependent on volunteers also reveal to be more demanding compared to those with paid staff. In the end, the pressure of the high workload on the volunteers leads to the straining of relationships and ultimately, has a detrimental influence on the functioning of the council (Burgan & Winne, 2012). Of the FPCs that operate with staffing assistance, the majority require their staff to seek grant funding to fund some paid hours (Schiff, 2007). Since grants are rarely a continuous form of financial support, these FPC's struggle to maintain a stable staff workforce.

3.7.4 External Consultants

In addition to staff, external consultants are also considered to be one of the four critical human resource components of a FPC since they play a critical role in guiding the coalition towards goal achievement (Yeatman, 1994). External consultants, also known as advisors, are essential as they are an invaluable "source of ideas and avenues for gaining an outside, broader perspective and a source of evaluation (Schiff, 2007)." Due to their ability to provide an independent, unbiased and often broader perspective of the issues involved in the food system of the respective area, they are capable of reducing the dominance of any one sector during the discussions (Yeatman, 1994). In doing so, the members are able to progress towards achieving a more collective, whole food-systems approach that takes into consideration the interconnectedness and the interdependencies between key parts of food systems at various scales (Neff et al., 2015). In turn, this holistic approach enables members to more easily recognize win-wins, manage trade-offs and mitigate less desirable outcomes. Furthermore, external consultants or advisors in certain FPCs extend their role by giving an objective view on the maintenance requirements of the council, such as the need for

scheduling annual retreats, or for submitting annual reports to city government (Yeatman, 1994). Not only does this contribution provide an extra opinion, but it guarantees that the coalition stays on course, progresses towards goal achievement, and maintains a strong presence within the community. Lastly, certain external consultants have also been known to provide a historical perspective to the work of the council which is of great importance when there remains a high staff and member turnover rate.

3.7.5 Members

While staff employees are largely regarded as the neck of the FPCs for managing the necessary administrative services of the organization, the members are the brain as they formulate plans that solve pressing issues and are an essential component of diverse food system representation (Schiff, 2007). The composition of the council in terms of member diversity plays an influential role in its ability to effectively address food system-related issues (Borron, 2003). The members of a successful FPC typically represent a broad spectrum of interests in the local food system since a council dominated by only a handful of sectors will develop agendas focussing primarily or exclusively on their own professional, public health oriented interests (Yeatman, 1994). According to Dahlberg (1994), a coalition running in such a state will be “less effective in terms of their ability to remain active and in existence.” A study conducted by the forenamed researcher supports this statement by also revealing that FPCs with a narrow focus on hunger did not succeed compared to those that took a wider food systems approach. Furthermore, once individuals representing different organizations become members of a FPC, this also increases the FPC’s access to a variety of skills necessary to run the organization and carry-out its activities (Schiff, 2007).

3.7.6 “Champions”

Building on the various roles involved within the framework of a FPC, the internal structure of a prominent FPC also includes one or two individuals in a leadership position. In the majority of FPCs investigated to date, there existed one or two people without whom the FPC would have ceased to exist (Yeatman, 1994). In the FPC context, these individuals are often referred to as “champions” because they possess incredible qualities, skills and networks that enable them to stand at the forefront of decision-making. “Champions” are commonly described as individuals who possess experiences and connections in the community in addition to having a deep understanding of how the local community functions as a whole (Gupta & Feenstra, 2019). By having these

networks with community members, the “champions” are able to more easily bring forth opportunities to establish credibility or prestige for the work of the council (Yeatman, 1994). When speaking of their skills, these leader-type members of a FPC excel in management, in evoking motivation and possess a good feel for the nuances involved in effective political organizing (Burgan & Winne, 2012). These members are also known to always be actively involved in the activities of their FPC, and possess a personality that encourages sharing and community building. Given all of these points, one can describe these “champions” as the backbone of each FPC since their presence plays a notable role in pushing the FPC forward toward goal attainment. When seeking to appoint a “champion” in a FPC, Yeatman (1994) provides her outlook as to how the selection process should occur:

- a. If this person was the Mayor, the council would be created, but its longevity would be short, as political demands would divert this person's attention or a new Mayor may be elected.
- b. An external consultant could fulfil this role, but probably would not, as they would be most useful in an objective, professionally supportive role.
- c. A member of the council could fulfil this role very well, provided that they did not dominate the council's activities, leading to inactivity on the part of other council members.
- d. A staff person could fulfil this role, providing impetus from below, through on-going guidance regarding new and innovative strategies for the council's work, and through the efficient turn-around of council's administrative tasks.

3.7.7 Incentives

As members and the organisations they represent usually possess varying, but closely related goals, the maintenance of each member’s interest in the mission and final goal of the FPC is critical to its success (Burgan & Winne, 2012). In working to retain the interest of each member, successful FPCs often make certain that their membership base continues to be active and stable (Schiff, 2007). The existence of incentives for participation helps to address this matter by bolstering member capacity and keeping members’ interests continuously ignited. According to Foster-Fisherman et al. (2001), there are three types of incentives for participation which most commonly arise within most FPC operations: material, solidary and purposive. The material incentives involve members gaining material returns through participation, solidary incentives refer to gaining or increasing favourable status through participation and lastly, purposive incentives

which relate to intrinsic value where accomplishing the coalition's project objectives is perceived as meaningful.

In addition to the incentives used to increase participation, there are also certain incentives introduced for the purpose of building members' skills and knowledge base which typically take on the form of a workshop or retreat (Schiff, 2007). This category of incentives maintains members' interest by ensuring that members understand and stay engaged with the issues. In addition, these incentives serve a critical function in ensuring a continuous availability of members with the necessary skills to carry out the functions of the organization.

3.7.8 Clearly Defined Roles

A clear outline of each individual's roles is an essential step in achieving a high level of organisation capacity and effectiveness for coalitions like FPCs. According to Feighery and Rogers (1990), FPCs with well-defined roles are more capable of quickly achieving their goals and therefore, the act of clarifying each individual's roles and responsibilities immediately following coalition formation is recommended. Echoing the previous statement, Butterfoss et al., (1993) also notes that coalitions operate more efficiently when staff and members have clearly understood and defined roles. In the opinion of Butterfoss et al. (1993), this arises due to the fact that role clarity enables participants to better understand their position and therefore, more readily execute the necessary tasks associated with that position.

A secondary effect stemming from precise role delineation is the clearer understanding that individuals acquire of other participants' roles, which enables them to better target their actions (Schiff, 2007). Finally, once roles and positions are properly defined and differentiated for staff, members and other participants, healthy internal relationships can more easily form. In turn, both collaboration and cooperation increase within the FPC which ultimately, gives birth to greater creativity, motivation, unity and productivity.

3.7.9 Internal & External Relationships

The development of healthy internal relationships remains one of the highest priorities of successful FPCs. Since healthy internal relationships "ensure effective channels for information sharing, conflict resolution and create satisfaction and commitment among members," coalitions dedicate a profound amount of time towards facilitating and fostering the growth of such

relationships (Schiff, 2007). In addition to creating clear and easy-to-follow role descriptions to achieve this goal, strong FPCs also make a pronounced effort to implement effective conflict resolution procedures and create a friendly work environment in hopes that relations between members will strengthen. Other efforts to further nurture such connectivity involve acknowledging and addressing the diverse interests of each and every individual. Finally, a cornerstone of positive internal relationship building always necessitates the creation of a vision and agenda that is shared and agreed upon among all the participants of the coalition (Borron, 2003). Once a common goal is set into place, the focused and collective pursuit of its completion enables the FPC to conquer that objective in a much quicker pace.

In addition to healthy internal relationships, FPCs also endeavor to create and preserve healthy relationships with external groups of people. Since a FPC's access to resources is often limited, the creation of strong external associations often helps a FPS acquire those much-needed resources and other forms of external support (Butterfoss et al., 1993). According to Foster-Fishman et al. (2001), there are four key types of external groups that FPCs are encouraged to interact with: (1) groups from sectors not represented in the collaboration (2) the community, in respect to the broader public (3) the community, in respect to officials and policy makers and (4) other communities or collaborations struggling with similar issues. By creating connections and networks in all four groups, a FPC organisation also is more capable of identifying innovations and best-practice approaches to the problems at hand.

3.8 Interview Results

3.8.1 Interviews with FPC members

Interview #1 – Portion Balance Coalition

The Portion Balance Coalition (PBC) is a multi-sector collaborative housed within Georgetown University's McDonough School of Business whose members have come together to identify, co-create, and implement innovations in support of a balanced, healthy diet. More specifically, this group of government, corporate, non-profit, and academic leaders strives to address the prevalence of obesity by focusing on portion balance, defined as the food volume (size), proportionality (variety), and quality (nutrient density) of foods and beverages. They do so through the following activities: (1) building consumer awareness and demand for portion balanced food (2) identifying supply side collaboration opportunities for industry, policymakers and public health

groups to offer balanced portions and (3) sharing best practices, case studies and scientific research within and across sectors to develop consensus for common action.

During its formative stages, the coalition made a profound effort to formulate a mission and vision statement as well as guiding principles that resonated with everyone in the group. This preliminary step was a multi-step process involving the creation of a draft which was sent to an Advisory board, a survey to acquire input from members and a large meeting to enable members to share their thoughts with each other and debate. In doing so, the Portion Balance Coalition was able to get everyone on the same page from the very beginning despite having members with different viewpoints and perspectives.

At present, the group meets on a quarterly basis to discuss its projects, strategies and goals. According to Diane Ty, the leader of the Portion Balance Coalition, good communication is one of the best practice approaches to a multi-sector food coalition and as such, the group also shares information via email, one-on-one phone calls and Zoom conferences. Aside from sharing the perspectives of their associated sector, the members themselves take on a variety of different roles. Some members provide financial support and network with various industries while others are involved in research. Within the Portion Balance Coalition, Registered Dietitians (RD) also play a vital role by contributing their knowledge of nutrition and by providing a practical approach to tackling various issues. Many RDs come from a variety of domains such as food companies, restaurants, and the American Heart Association, which

Throughout its operation, the Portion Balance Coalition has faced two main obstacles that have made it a challenge to advance its action plan forward. Since the group convenes individuals from varying sectors, it becomes a location that houses a myriad of different viewpoints and as a result, it is a challenge to reconcile these viewpoints. Recognizing its inability to please everyone, the coalition makes an effort to hear everyone's opinion and once a decision is made, it notifies the individuals who have contributed that their voices were heard and respected prior to making an announcement. This can be time consuming, but all members understand the need for this intentional effort. The second major challenge is fundraising, where the Portion Balance Coalition must raise money each year for its staff operations and to fund its activities.

Interview #2 – Resident Food Committee

The Resident Food Committee at the University of Toronto St. George campus has been established to provide a structured and open forum for university members to evaluate and review various policy and operational aspects of the Food Services department. The members discuss various requests and suggestions made by the community members and recommend changes to the policy where such changes are warranted and calculated to benefit the community.

The coalition's membership is highly diverse in an effort to include a variety of different perspectives. Firstly, there is a chef to acquire input from a culinary point of view and a number of professors from a variety of different faculties. The university students are selected from each level of their residence to further diversify the composition of members. One student member in particular is given the responsibility of gathering and compiling feedback from students through various communication mediums such as Facebook Messenger, email and in-person conversations and reporting the feedback to the larger group. The committee also includes a paid staff member which commonly is the Assistant Dean or a professional within the Student Life department.

The committee's meetings are scheduled to occur once a month except during certain months such as December, when students are busy with their exams, and September, when the committee is in the process of selecting new members. The best time for student members to convene is 8 am, 1 hour prior to the beginning of the first class. The meetings include breakfast as an incentive for participation and transpire for 45 minutes to enable students to reach their classes on time. The next best time to meet is 9pm; however, the non-student members are unable to participate then and as such, a meeting is scheduled the next business day for the purpose of acquiring their feedback while the meeting minutes are still fresh.

According to Mustafa Nalwala, the Manager of the Resident Food Committee, a diverse membership is of great importance and should include at least one faculty member and one administrative staff person. It would be most beneficial if the majority of members were students who possess different backgrounds i.e. first years, fourth years, campus students, commuting students, etc. While achieving a high diversity is one of the many priorities of a committee, the number of members also cannot be too large since it will become a challenge to bring everyone together. Secondly, Mustafa Nalwala advises new councils to find time during their first meeting to explain the details on how the group is run and its limitations to enable members to formulate plans

that will always be feasible. Lastly, the Resident Food Committee has been very successful in letting the students of the University of Toronto St. George campus know that their voices are being heard. Once they make a change, the committee advertises it on social media channels and posters to notify students that their feedback has reached the committee's discussions. In the end, this inspires students to continue to voice their thoughts and motivates them to contribute to the efforts of the committee. Resultantly, Mustafa Nalwala advises new food policy councils to develop a method to communicate the results of their work with the campus audience.

Interview #3 – Food Advisory Committee

The Food Advisory Committee from Queens University was able to inform this project by providing their responses through email. The coalition's answers to the interview questions are provided in Appendix E.

3.8.2 Interviews with UBC staff

Interview #1 – Liska Richer

At present, Liska Richer shares her expertise in food systems by being the UBC SEEDS Sustainability Program Manager, the chair of the UBC Food Systems Project (UBCFSP) Steering Committee, the chair of the Climate Action Plan (CAP): Climate-Friendly Food Systems Action Team, a member of a number of the campus committees and working groups pertaining to food system sustainability, such as “Biodiverse Food System Action Team”, “Healthy Beverage Initiative Committee”, “Food and Nutrition Committee”, “AMS Sustainability Action Plan Sub-Committee” and others. She is also an instructor in the Faculty of Land and Food Systems for the capstone LFS 450 “Land, Food and Community III” course. Liska also played a foundational role in campus food system sustainability efforts, spearheading the development of the UBC Food Systems Project (UBCFSP) with Faculty of Land and Food systems; a collaborative, cross-campus initiative which focuses its action towards increasing the sustainability of UBC's food system. The initiative has resulted in many accomplishments supporting the creation of the first campus gardens, first farm to institution purchases, first local organic produce contract, Fair trade products, sustainable food labelling initiatives, strategy with specified food targets, zero waste guidelines, garden guidelines and more. The UBCFSP has a strong presence to this day and continues to make a solid effort to achieve their goals which stem from their 6 main priorities and supporting actions teams:

(1) climate friendly food systems (2) zero waste and circular economy (3) biodiverse food systems (4) food justice and sovereignty (5) urban food production and (6) systemic food knowledge and skills.

According to Liska, UBC has greater opportunity for integrating and centralizing actions that advance food system-related issues such as creating an integrated campus wide food sustainability/resilience policy, food policy council and research and advocacy hub. While food sustainability efforts are being carried out across the campus, from our campus food providers, SEEDS Sustainability Program, UBC Wellbeing, and UBC Farm, Botanical Gardens, AMS and others that tackle areas such as food production, zero waste, climate-friendly foods, food insecurity and healthy food and beverages. Other areas not as represented include food justice and sovereignty. Furthermore, current ways of collaborating and moving projects forward have opportunities for greater representation and involvement from other key campus food stakeholders. For example, UBC Food Services is a large food provider consisting of many people and plays a key role in many of the food system sustainability initiatives, while other food stakeholders such as AMS (Alma Mater Society) and independent groups of food outlets (UBC Central, Village, Wesbrook, and more) could also have a greater opportunity to collaborate in efforts.

Resultantly, Liska believes that the creation of a campus food policy will be able to pursue these opportunities by bringing individuals from a variety of areas of campus to the table to discuss and tackle pressing food system issues in a more collaborative, integrated manner. By possessing a mandate, clear operational policy alignment, and sufficient resourcing to develop a food system resilience strategy, the group will be able to move the dial for greater collective impact in advancing towards a just and sustainable food system. Drawing on her experiences as a member of many different committees, Liska also believes that the new campus-wide food policy should strive to be highly process-oriented. Prior to implementing any projects, the group must co-create a process framework, with the communities in which food system issues affect, with the aim to reach its goals while continuously seeking input from a variety of stakeholders. Resultantly, this approach will prevent the group from jumping to solutions but rather, it will enable the coalition to formulate a collaborative and inclusive action plan that best addresses the issue at hand more effectively.

Interview #2 – Matt Dolf

Matt Dolf is the UBC Wellbeing Director who plays an important role in supporting stakeholders across both campuses to think strategically about embedding well being in the work of the university. In addition, he actively participates in the Food & Nutrition Committee; a UBC-lead initiative which focuses its efforts on increasing awareness and facilitating action towards creating a more nutritionally sound campus.

Matt Dolf considers the creation of a campus-wide food policy council to be a significant and much-needed undertaking. Currently, many UBC groups operate on campus which strive to reach similar goals and have common priorities in place and as such, to strengthen their work, Matt believes that a more collaborative approach should be applied. During the formative stages of a food coalition, Matt also recommends that a guidance document be created; one that includes a position statement, a priority list, an action plan framework and above all, one that everyone can point towards at the end of the day.

Secondly, Matt believes that following the formation of the group, the coalition should make an effort towards making its presence known in the campus community and becoming a “high-visibility” group. Once the group can spread its wings, both its connections and opportunities will grow. Throughout the interview, it was also made clear that the interventions of a FPC must be evidence-based, which shed light on the importance of having a member in the group that is well-versed and active in research.

Interview #3 – Natasha Moore

At this moment in time, Natasha Moore works with UBC Wellbeing as a Planning and Evaluation Advisor. Her role involves engaging with UBC in a conversation about the value and impact of an embedded approach to wellbeing which is guided by the Okanagan Charter. In the past, Natasha was also a Research Analyst for Wellbeing at UBC which involved providing strategic support for programs and projects that focus on wellbeing of community members.

Echoing the previous interviews, Natasha Moore also believes that there is energy and momentum on campus to galvanize disparate groups together in a way in which there is a shared focus and purpose. Currently, various UBC coalitions aiming to tackle food-related issues are working “as silos,” independently from one another and as such, there is a great need to bring them

together. By doing so, members will achieve a “wider scope across multiple issues” and will become more coordinated. Similar to Matt’s advice, Natasha also recommends new food policy councils to formulate a document that would provide guidance to members which lays out their coalition’s boundaries and limitations and delineates their priorities and objectives.

During initial stages of formation, Natasha also strongly believes that groups should make a concentrate effort to create a highly diverse membership. While certain groups such as food services, SEEDS and UBC Wellbeing are essential to include in the discussions surrounding food system issues, Natasha thinks it is also important to include groups which do not directly play a role in the food system such as Student Services and the First Nation House of Learning since such groups also possess a voice that must be heard. Furthermore, Natasha also believes that groups should try alternative ways of meeting and discussing. Instead of scheduling the conventional “office” meeting, she encourages new coalitions to explore different spaces and practices of getting together. Since a food coalition convenes various different people, it is unlikely that one particular setting or way of discussing agenda items suits each member. By assembling in changing environments and utilizing different approaches to convening, it is possible that members may become more involved and willing to participate.

Interview #4 – -----

_____ is the ___ of Nutrition & Wellbeing at the UBC Okanagan campus (UBCO) and _____ of the UBCO Food Strategy Committee; a committee that discusses all things food and nutrition that occur on the campus once a month. According to ____, UBC food policy council should include both the Vancouver and Okanagan campuses because this will break down the silos between the work that is currently being done. The creation of a food coalition that spans both campuses would bring everyone together under the same roof and would provide that invaluable opportunity to discuss the food system at large as one team. Furthermore, the agendas of various groups would merge which would enable work to be completed at a much quicker pace as there would be less overlap.

Prior to the formation of such a group, ___ believes that it is important to get everyone of the same page and to formulate clear and solid definitions to better guide the work of the team. Once it is established, ___ envisions a council that is structured, effective and capable of applying a holistic

lens to its work. Furthermore, the geographic distance between both campuses is an ongoing barrier to communication; however, ___ states that virtual meetings have the potential to tackle this issue.

In the past, ___ was also a member of the Thunder Bay and Area Food Strategy group which was at the time, co-chaired by a Public Health Nutritionist and a Municipal Councillor. Drawing from that experience, ___ believes that there is great value in having senior leadership at the university to help lead the food policy council. By appointing strong leaders, their high level of influence and expertise will greatly help in making positive change and in moving project agendas forward.

Lastly, many projects assigned to students are presently either focused on the Vancouver campus or the Okanagan campus. In the near future, ___ hopes that with the unification of various campus food initiatives, more projects will arise that will focus on collecting data from and for both campuses.

3.9 Food and Nutrition Committee Meeting

On the 25th of June, the writer was given the opportunity to present her findings to the members of the Food and Nutrition Committee. Following the presentation, there was time for members to discuss the results and provide feedback. A major topic of discussion was the question of whether the food policy council should include membership from both the Vancouver and the Okanagan campus. Many participants of the meeting believed that having one FPC that would involve both campuses would be the best way to create this group. Although the distance between the two campuses is considered to be a barrier to communication, members believe that it can easily be overcome by scheduling meetings in a form of a video calls. Another question posed by one of FNC's members was whether the name of the group should be "Food Policy Council," and specifically, whether the word "policy" should be included in the name. A follow-up question also arose which asked if the council would have to take on projects related to policy-making if it were to have the forenamed word in its name. In the end, members collectively agreed that the group does not necessarily have to be called a "Food Policy Council" but rather, it can take on a different name that will better reflect its agenda.

4. Recommendations

4.1 Short Term

ASSESSMENT

Prior to the official establishment of a coalition, it would be advantageous to conduct an assessment and gather historical data on the campus food system. This preliminary work can take on a variety of different forms such as a needs assessment which focuses on food insecurity of UBC students, a comprehensive study of the campus food system as a whole or an extensive historical review of the campus' past initiatives. In doing so, new members will be able to identify what are the *most* recent food-related issues on campus and what past approaches have succeeded, giving them the ability to more strategically formulate their action plan. Armed with that knowledge, the future actions and projects of the FPC will create greater food justice on campus and generate more favourable results.

CLEAR VISION & ROLES

Once the assessment phase is complete, it is essential to dedicate the first few meetings towards the establishment of a clear outline of responsibilities for each member. A descriptive breakdown of each individual's position is a crucial step in achieving a high level of organisation capacity and effectiveness for coalitions like FPCs. Role clarity enables committee members to better understand what is expected of them and also what are the duties assigned to others on the team. If this step were to be skipped, misunderstandings would surface as to the type and amount of work expected from each member, leading to increased dissatisfaction within the coalition. Secondly, the initial meetings should aim to create a vision, primary goals and an agenda that are agreed upon among all the participants of the coalition. These discussions would benefit if everyone would share their opinion on what they think are the most pressing issues on campus that need to be addressed first. Once established, the focused and collective pursuit of achieving those goals will move the FPC's agenda forward at a much quicker pace.

STRONG LEADERSHIP

During the formative stages of the FPC, coalition members must identify several worthwhile candidates to run for the "leader," "champion" or "chair" position to ultimately, select one to two

individual(s) to form a leadership committee. During the selection process, it is important to consider the length of time each candidate intends to stay within the FPC, since a council's stability and effectiveness, in part, rests on having structured and steady leadership from the beginning. The search committee is also highly encouraged to consider candidates who have certain qualities, such as:

- Exceptional skill in managing and facilitating meetings
- Ability to evoke motivation and inspiration in the hearts of members of the FPC
- Encourages reflective thinking and knowledge building
- Possesses multiple networks within the local community
- Holds a deep understanding of how the local community functions as a whole

PRESENCE OF STAFFING

Staff people are essential for the longevity, the effectiveness and the proper functioning of FPCs. Due to the large amount of administrative work that is involved in running a FPC, it is highly encouraged that food policy councils recruit 1-2 people that can provide on-going assistance with clerical duties. It is also recommended to employ staff members capable of providing a helping hand with tasks outside of the administrative domain, such as those related to education and research. In doing so, members will not be overburdened with council workload and will be more capable of solely focusing their attention on the responsibilities assigned to their role. This will also prevent crucial tasks from being unfinished and lessen the probability of committee disbandment. The developed skill set of staff people is also critical to the success of a FPC. The following text provides a list of essential qualities to look for during the recruitment phase of a staff person:

- Ability to access and effectively utilise multiple local media platforms
- Possesses working knowledge and strong commitment of local food issues
- Ability to provide effective and efficient administrative support to the council
- Proficient in communicating effectively with council members, both verbally and in written form
- Able to prioritize work and manage time effectively

SUPPORT FROM EXTERNAL CONSULTANTS

While many ideas are thrown back and forth during committee meetings, they remain biased as members often share information using the lens of the sector/group of people that they represent. An effective way to combat this is to include “external consultants/advisors” in committee meetings as they will provide an independent, unbiased and often broader perspective of the issues involved in the food system of discussion. Resultantly, their presence will enable members to progress towards achieving a more collective, whole food-systems approach that takes into consideration the interconnectedness and the interdependencies between key parts of food systems at various scales. It is also advised to extend their role by requiring them to provide an objective view on the maintenance requirements of the council, such as the need for scheduling annual retreats, or for submitting annual reports to city government. In doing so, it guarantees that the coalition stays on course and progresses quickly towards goal achievement.

DEVELOPMENT OF HEALTHY INTERNAL RELATIONSHIPS

The development of healthy internal relationships between members should remain as one of the highest priorities of a FPC. By fostering the growth of such relationships, effective channels for information sharing will be created and both satisfaction and commitment will increase among members. From the first day of operation, it is highly encouraged to identify as a team some of the key characteristics of a positive, friendly work environment. By having this conversation, it is more likely that members will choose to act in ways that better promote the creation of this type of work environment. Furthermore, an effort should be made to implement effective conflict resolution procedures. Since coalitions are a meeting-place for a diverse array of personalities, it is not uncommon to have conflicts of interest and as such, a fair method for resolving such disputes is much needed.

4.2 Long Term Goals

INCENTIVES

The maintenance of an active and stable membership base is one of the keys to achieving success in a FPC. An effective way of ensuring ongoing attendance from committee members is to retain their interest in wanting to participate. The use of incentives helps to address this matter by bolstering member capacity and keeping members’ interests continuously ignited. One type of

incentive that is highly recommended involves giving members the opportunity to build their skills and knowledge base. Since learning is an enjoyable activity for many, these incentives are helpful in motivating members to continue making a contribution to the FPC. In addition, these incentives ensure a continuous availability of members with the necessary skills to carry out the functions of the organization and enable members to develop a deeper understanding of the current subjects on the council's agenda. The following are a few suggestions on ways to best introduce these incentives into the agenda of a FPC:

- Annual retreats
- Interactive workshops
- Online courses
- Guest speakers

EVALUATION

Ongoing critical reflection is an essential component of a FPC's development, as it enables the coalition to evolve into a more stronger, efficient and impactful group. Coalitions are advised to incorporate evaluation meetings at regular intervals into their schedule and during both the development and implementation stages of projects. During such meetings, it is essential for members to evaluate the current and past actions and activities of the FPC and to openly discuss *what worked, what didn't work* and *what can be improved*. In doing so, members will recognize their organization's flaws and procedural inefficiencies, enabling them to better understand what modifications are needed for improvement. Furthermore, it would be of great benefit to the FPC to receive input from individuals outside the coalition who are in some way impacted by its projects.

FUNDING

The lack of adequate funding is a common limiting factor in the realization of many plans for FPCs. Most often, FPCs lose the ability to employ a staff person which places a higher workload on committee members and reduces their availability to collaborate on projects. In certain cases, insufficient financial support may also delay project completion as certain stages of implementation may be more costly than others. Funding notably contributes to the achievement of a coalition's goals and as such, FPCs are encouraged to secure adequate funds prior to the start of any major project. The attainment of funds would involve contacting any potentially interested organization or government department and drafting a statement demonstrating the need for financial support. Prior

to doing so, it would also be beneficial for the FPC to think broadly and creatively about which local organizations and institutions may have common interests with the FPC and to investigate the funder in terms of their interests, guidelines and what causes they have supported in the past.

5. Limitations & Future Research

The “Foundations of a Campus Food Policy Council” research project was completed as part of a year 5 dietetic practicum and was conducted within the following time period: June 1st to June 26th, 2020. Due to temporal limitations, a total number of 43 food policy councils were identified and analyzed in this project’s environmental scan. Furthermore, during this allotted time frame, only 10 food policy councils operating within a university setting were contacted and included in the environmental scan, with only four agreeing to schedule an interview. Resultantly, the recommendations provided in this report are limited to those 53 FPCs that were found during the 26 days of research which is by no means a conclusive sample size. Recognizing that many other food policy councils are currently operating within Canada and the USA, the generalizations presented in this report should be refined by later studies covering a larger selection of FPCs. While doing so, a longer time period should be allotted to give food policy councils sufficient time to reply and find a time to partake in an interview. Furthermore, it would be of great benefit to extend the study beyond North America’s borders to gain insight into the operations of FPCs outside the continent.

6. Conclusion

Food Policy Councils are important centres of knowledge and catalysts for positive change for food systems globally. Through their vibrant character, diverse representation, partnership with decision makers and their innovative ways in which they address food-system related issues, FPCs will continue to play an important leadership role in improving the health and sustainability of our food systems. As a result, it is not surprising that FPCs are beginning to spread across North America, including the ones within a university setting.

As plans to establish a campus-wide food policy council at UBC are beginning to emerge, this research project was initiated to help guide coalition founders in the development of action steps to help move the project forward. After conducting a literature review, an environmental scan and direct interviews with key informants in the growing network of FPCs, this research study was

able to formulate key recommendations for the creation of such a coalition. Final recommendations were made by identifying similarities between FPC that lead to their effectiveness in terms of achieving project objectives and long-term goals. The recommendations of interviewees also greatly contributed to the formulation of these recommendations. Since this report's recommendations are limited to those FPCs that responded and were within the environmental scan and literature review, future studies covering a larger sample of FPCs are warranted to refine this study's results and to further guide efforts to create a campus-wide FPC at UBC.

7. References

- Bassarab, K., Santo, R., & Palmer, A. (2019) Food Policy Council Report 2018. Retrieved from https://assets.jhsph.edu/clf/mod_clfResource/doc/FPC%20Report%202018_FINAL.pdf
- Borron, S. M. (2003). Food policy councils: Practice and possibility. Congressional Hunger Center Hunger-Free Community Report. Retrieved from https://assets.jhsph.edu/clf/mod_clfResource/doc/Food%20Policy%20Councils%20Practice%20and%20Possibility.pdf
- Bortoletti, M., & Lomax, J. (2019). Collaborative Framework for Food System Transformation - United Nations Environment Programme. Retrieved from https://www.oneplanetnetwork.org/sites/default/files/un-e_collaborative_framework_for_food_systems_transformation_final.pdf
- Brunelle, T., Dumas, P., & Souty, F. (2014). The impact of globalization on food and agriculture: The case of the diet convergence. *Journal of Environment & Development*, 23(1), 41-65. doi:10.1177/1070496513516467
- Burgan, M., & Winne, M. (2012). Doing food policy councils right: A guide to development and action. *Mark Winne Associates*. Retrieved from <http://www.markwinne.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/FPC-manual.pdf>
- Butterfoss, F. D., Goodman, R. M., & Wandersmann, A. (1993). Community coalitions for prevention and health promotion. *Health Education Research*, 8(3), 315-330.
- Clancy, K., Hammer, J., & Lippoldt, D. (2008). Food policy councils-past, present, and future - Remaking the North American Food System: Strategies for Sustainability. *University of Nebraska Press*, pp. 121-143.
- Dahlberg, K.A. (1994). Food policy councils: The experience of five cities and one county. Paper presented at the Joint Meeting of the Agriculture, Food, and Human Values Society and the Society for the Study of Food and Society, Tuscon, AZ.

- Elsharkawy, O., & La Forge, S. (2017). Food Policy Councils: Governance, Success, Challenges. Retrieved from: <https://sustainontario.com/custom/uploads/2012/05/Municipal-Food-Policy-Network-Research-2017-.pdf>
- Feighery, E., & Rogers, T. (1990). *Building and Maintaining Effective Coalition*. Stanford Health Promotion Resource Center, Palo Alto, CA.
- Fitzgerald, N., & Morgan, K. (2014). A food policy council guide for Extension professionals. *Journal of Extension*, 52(2). Retrieved from <http://www.joe.org/joe/2014april/a6.php>
- Foster-Fishman, P., Berkowitz, S., Lounsbury, D., Jacobson, S., & Allen, N. (2001). Building collaborative capacity in community coalitions: A review and integrative framework. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 29, 241-260.
- Fox, C. (2010). *Food Policy Councils: Innovations in Democratic Governance for a Sustainable and Equitable Food System*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Gupta, C., Campbell, D., Munden-Dixon, K., Sowerwine, J., Capps, S., Feenstra, G., & Van Soelen Kim, J. (2018). Food policy councils and local governments: Creating effective collaboration for food systems change. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, 8(B), 11-28. doi:10.5304/jafscd.2018.08B.006
- Harper, A., Shattuck, A., Holt-Gimenez, E., Alkon, A. & Lambrick, F. (2009). Food Policy Councils: Lessons Learned. *Institute for food and development policy*. Retrieved from <https://foodfirst.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/DR21-Food-Policy-Councils-Lessons-Learned-.pdf>
- Ilieva, R. T. (2016). *Urban food planning: Seeds of transition in the global north*. New York: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781315658650
- McCullough, E. B., Pingali, P. L., & Stamoulis, K. G. (2008). The transformation of agri-food systems: Globalization, supply chains and smallholder farmers. *Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations*. doi:10.4324/9781849773331

- Musick, M., Kantor, S., Embleton, M., & Gray, E. (2018). A Legacy of Action – King County Food Policy Milestone. Retrieved from http://www.tilthalliance.org/about/a-legacy-of-action-chronicle-of-the-local-food-movement/at_download/file
- Neff, R. A., Merrigan, K., & Wallinga, D. (2015). A food systems approach to healthy food and agriculture policy. *Health Affairs (Project Hope)*, 34(11), 1908-1915. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2015.0926
- Pothukuchi, K., & Kaufman, J. L. (1999). Placing the food system on the urban agenda: The role of municipal institutions in food systems planning. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 16, 213-224.
- Scherb, A., Palmer, A., Frattaroli, S., & Pollack, K. (2012). Exploring food system policy: A survey of food policy councils in the United States. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, 2(4), 3-14. doi:10.5304/jafscd.2012.024.007
- Schiff, R. (2007). Food policy councils: An examination of organisational structure, process, and contribution to alternative food movements. (Doctoral dissertation). Murdoch University, Perth, Western Australia. Retrieved from <https://researchrepository.murdoch.edu.au/id/eprint/293/>
- Toronto Food Policy Council. (2016). Introducing the Toronto Food Policy Council : Who we are, what we do and how we do it. *Toronto Food Policy Council*. Retrieved from <https://sustainontario.com/greenhouse/custom/uploads/2019/07/Introducing-the-TFPC-Who-We-Are-What-We-Do-How-We-Do-It.pdf>
- Vancouver Food Policy Council. (2011). Food Secure Vancouver. Retrieved from <http://foodsecurevancouver.ca/>.
- Yeatman, H. (1994). *Food Policy Councils in North America- observations and insights*. Final Report on a World Health Organization's Traveling Fellowship. Wollongong, Australia: University of Wollongong.

APPENDIX A: American & Canadian FPCs from the Environmental Scan

AMERICAN FOOD POLICY COUNCILS

<u>FOOD POLICY COUNCIL</u>	<u>CONTACT INFORMATION & WEBSITE</u>
ALASKA	
Alaska Food Policy Council	Contact: Lorinda Lhotka (907)-451-2119 https://www.akfoodpolycouncil.org/
ARIZONA	
Maricopa Food System Coalition	Contact: Jayson Matthews (602)-631-4837 https://marcofoodcoalition.org/
Pima County Food Alliance	Contact: PCFA Leadership Council info@pimafoodalliance.org http://www.pimafoodalliance.org/
CALIFORNIA	
Berkeley Food Policy Council	Contact: Carle Brinkman (510)-548-1005 carle@ecologycenter.org https://ecologycenter.org/berkeley-food-policy-council/
Santa Clara Food System Alliance	Contact: Julie Hutcheson (408)-459-6403 scc.alliance@gmail.com http://fsa-scc.squarespace.com/
Los Angeles Food Policy Council	Camille de la Vega (213)-473-3528 cdelavega@goodfoodla.org https://www.goodfoodla.org/
San Francisco Food Security Task Force	Contact: Paula Jones (628)-206-7689 Paula.jones@sfdph.org https://sfgov.org/sffood/
CONNECTICUT	
Connecticut Food Policy Council	Contact: Stephen Anderson (860)-713-2592 stephen.anderson@ct.gov https://portal.ct.gov/DOAG/Boards/Boards/CT-

	Food-Policy-Council
FLORIDA	
Florida Food Policy Council	Contact: Rick Hawkins (727)-688-2787 rick.h@flfpc.org
IDAHO	
Palouse-Clearwater Food Coalition	Contact: Colette DePhelps (208)-855-4003 cdephelps@uidaho.edu https://pcfoodcoalition.idahofoodworks.org/
ILLINOIS	
Chicago Food Policy Advisory Council	Contact: Rodger Cooley (773)-354-2091 rcooley@chicagofoodpolicy.com https://www.chicagofoodpolicy.com/
IOWA	
Johnson County Food Policy Council	Contact: Ilsa DeWald idewald@co.johnson.ia.us https://www.johnson-county.com/dept_supervisors.aspx?id=10645
Linn County Food Systems Council	Contact: Michael Tertinger (319)-892-5141 Mike.tertinger@linncountyorg https://www.linncounty.org/735/Food-Systems-Council
KANSAS	
North Central Kansas Food Council	Contact: Emily Benedick (785)-738-2218 ebenedick@nckcn.com https://www.ncrpc.org/nckfoodcouncil/
Eat Well Crawford County	Contact: Brad Stroud (620)-704-0019 bstroud@crawfordcohd.org http://www.livewellcrawfordcounty.org/eat-well.html
MARYLAND	
Baltimore Food Policy Action Coalition	Contact: Alice Huang (410)-396-3899 Alice.huang@baltimorecity.gov https://planning.baltimorecity.gov/baltimore-food-policy-initiative
MASSACHUSETTS	

Boston Food Access Council	Contact: Elizabeth Miller (617)-635-0708 Elizabeth.miller@boston.gov https://www.boston.gov/departments/food-access
Franklin County Food Council	Contact: Joanna Benoit (413)-774-7204 joannab@fccdc.org https://justroots.org/programs/fc2/
MICHIGAN	
Greater Grand Rapids Food Systems Council	Contact: Cynthia Price (231)-670-6059 skyprice@gmil.com http://ggrfoodsystemscouncil.org/
Livingston County Hunger Council	Contact: Michelle Ounanian (734)-707-4995 mounanian@gmail.com http://www.livingstonhunger.com/
Detroit Food Policy Council (Michigan)	Contact: Winona Bynum (313)-833-0396 winona@detroitfoodPC.org
MINNESOTA	
Crow River Food Council	Contact: Constance Carlson (612)-709-6790 Constance.carl@gmail.com http://crowriverfoodcouncil.org/
NORTH CAROLINA	
North Carolina Local Food Council	Contact: Angel Cruz (919)-513-0954 nclocalfoodcouncil@gmail.com http://www.nclocalfoodcouncil.org/
OHIO	
Summit Food Coalition	Contact: Beth Knorr (234)-706-2508 summitfpc@gmail.com https://www.summitfoodcoalition.org/
OREGON	
Oregon Community Food Network	Contact: Matthew Buck (503)-267-4667 matt@foodalliance.org http://ocfsn.net/
Treasure Valley Food Coalition	Contact: Janie Burns (208)-863-6947 meadowlarkfarm@q.com https://www.treasurevalleyfoodcoalition.org/

TEXAS	
Food Policy Council of San Antonio	Contact: Leslie Provence (210)-213-9631 info@foodpolicysa.org https://www.foodpolicysa.org/
VIRGINIA	
Lynchburg Area Food Council	Contact: Phillipp Gabathuler (434)-845-3491 phillippgabahuler@cvpdc.org https://www.lynchburgareafoodcouncil.org/
WASHINGTON	
Jefferson County Local Food System Council	Contact: Meghan Mix (360)-344-2207 jclocalfoodsystemcouncil@gmail.com https://12020.org/local-food/
Washington State Food Policy Council	Contact: Leslie Zenz Program Manager (360)-902-1884

CANADIAN FOOD POLICY COUNCILS

<u>FOOD POLICY COUNCIL</u>	<u>CONTACT INFORMATION & WEBSITES</u>
ALBERTA	
Calgary Food System Alliance	Contact: Kate Stenson info@yycfoodalliance.ca https://www.yycfoodalliance.ca/
Edmonton Food Council	Contact: Dustin Bajer info@edmontonfoodcouncil.org https://edmontonfoodcouncil.org/
BRITISH COLUMBIA	
Vancouver Food Policy Council	Contact: Sarah Carton (604)-871-6031 foodpolicy@vancouver.ca http://www.vancouverfoodpolicycouncil.ca/
Burnaby Food First	Contact: Kimberly Barwich (604)-431-0400 kimberlyb@burnabynh.ca http://burnabyfoodfirst.blogspot.com/
Squamish Food Policy Council	Contact: Krystle Tenbrink (604)-562-0446 Krystletenbrink@gmail.com http://www.squamishfoodpolicycouncil.com/
Surrey/White Rock Food Action Coalition	Contact: Deirdre Goudriaan (778)-891-8948 deidre@teamplyconsulting.com http://surreywhiterockfoodactioncoalition.ca/
MANITOBA	
Winnipeg Food Council	Contact: Jeanette Sivilay (204)-943-0822 Jeanette@foodmattersmanitoba.ca
NOVA SCOTIA	
Halifax Food Policy Council	Madeleine Waddington (902)-717-8386 Madeleine.waddington@nshealth.ca https://halifaxfoodpolicy.ca/
ONTARIO	

Ottawa Food Policy Council	Contact: Gillian Dawson info@ofpc-cpao.ca http://www.ofpc-cpao.ca/
Toronto Food Policy Council	Contact: Lori Stahlbrand (416)-338-8154 Lori.stahlbrand@toronto.ca https://tfpc.to/
Toronto Youth Food Policy Council	Contact: Emma Tamlin (705)-821-3855 etamlin@tyfpc.ca http://www.tyfpc.ca/
QUEBEC	
Consiel du Systeme Alimentaire Montrealais	Contact: Anna Marie Aubert (514)-952-3505 Amaubert.sam@mtimetropolesante.ca https://sam.montrealmetropoleensante.ca/
SASKATCHEWAN	
Saskatoon Food Council	Contact: Gord Enns (306)-221-9942 Saskatoon.foodcouncil@usask.ca http://www.saskatoonfood.ca/

APPENDIX B: Contacted FPC Members outside of UBC

<u>EMAIL</u>	<u>INSTITUTION</u>	<u>GROUP NAME</u>
maja.osmanagic@ualberta.ca;	University of Alberta	Sustainable Food Working Group
food.centre@ussu.ca	University of Saskatchewan	USSU Food Centre
umanitoba@mealexchange.com;	University of Manitoba	Campus Food Strategy Group
food.beverage@utoronto.ca; mealplan.utm@utoronto.ca;	University of Toronto	U of T Food Advisory Committee
info@foodsystemslab.ca;	Simon Fraser University	Food Systems Lab
gfi@ucop.edu;	University of California	Global Food Initiative
DLT40@georgetown.edu;	Georgetown University	Portion Balance Coalition
food@virginia.edu; <td6n@virginia.edu>;	University of Virginia	Food Collaborative
provost@queensu.ca;	Queens University	Food Insecurity Working Group
wagnerfpa@gmail.com	Wagner College	Wagner Food Policy Alliance

APPENDIX C: Primary Email sent to University FPC Members

Hello,

My name is Christine Janusz and I am a 5th year Dietetics student from the University of British Columbia (UBC) who is completing her “Population and Public Health” placement.

Currently, I am conducting a comprehensive environmental scan and review of best practice approaches of food policy councils to help guide UBC in the creation of its own campus-wide food committee. I strongly believe that the past experiences and knowledge of current coalitions within a university setting are an invaluable source of information that would really help steer this project forward. As a result, I am reaching out to various food policy councils across US and Canada to acquire more insight into this matter.

I would be incredibly grateful if a member of the " _____ " would be willing to answer a few questions and provide some input on what they think are best practice approaches to food policy council systems.

The questions will not take any more than 20 minutes to answer. Furthermore, I am very flexible; any mode of communication is fine with me, from emailing to telephone interviews.

I am looking forward to your response,

APPENDIX D: Interview Questions

Interviewees: Members of FPCs Outside of UBC

1. Prior to starting the interview, it would be wonderful to hear a little bit about your FPC: its purpose, mission, current projects, membership, how long it has been in operation, etc.
2. According to our current understanding of best practice approaches, it is a good practice for FPCs to conduct an assessment of the local community & campus prior to establishment. In the case of your council, were there any steps or strategies that contributed to the success of its establishment? Would you recommend any of them to groups who are beginning to form a coalition?
3. Since UBC is planning to form its campus-wide coalition, I would like to know what FPCs look like in terms of membership size and structure. Would you be able to tell me how membership looks like in the context of your FPC?
 - a. What are some of the roles members undertake aside from participating in discussion and how are these roles assigned to them?
 - a. Do you think it is valuable to identify a set number of members? If so, what membership size would you regard as “optimal” for a FPC?
 - b. Are there any membership requirements in place in the FPC? For example, are there formal seats reserved for certain representatives.
4. In addition to membership size and structure, knowing the schedule and activities of other FPCs will also greatly help UBC in the formation of its FPC. Would you be able to describe to me what the typical operations/functions of your FPC look like?
 - a. How often does the FPC meet and when it does, how frequently are new priorities discussed and established?
 - b. Are there times when the FPC has working groups outside of standard meeting times? If so, how does the coalition move the work forward?

- c. Are there any steps to successful planning that would you recommend to newly-formed FPC that plan to formulate an agenda and establish priorities?
5. Aside from members, our current understanding is that certain FPCs also hire staff to support the operations of the coalition. Does your FPC employ any staff at this moment in time?
 - a. If no, what is the reason for not having any staff people on board?
 - b. If yes, how does their role help the FPC progress and move forward towards the completion of its project goals?
 - c. If you were given the opportunity to re-establish the committee, would there be anything related to staff, that you would want to change?
6. What have been some of your committee's greatest successes so far and what do you think contributed to their success?
7. In the past, what were some of the challenges that your coalition had to collectively face? Why do you think they become an obstacle to the operations of the FPC?
 - a. Were there any projects in particular that your council has completed which were less successful? What factors do you think played a role in making those projects unsuccessful?
8. According to you, what are some of the best practice approaches to food policy councils systems?
9. What other advice would you recommend to other groups interested in establishing a food policy council?

Interviewees: UBC Staff Involved in the Campus Food System.

1. Can you please describe your role at UBC, how it relates to the local food system, and any current collaborative food-related work that you are involved in?
2. Food Policy Councils are an avenue that cities and some campuses have launched to align work across sectors to attain a more healthy, sustainable food system. A good example of this is the Vancouver Food Policy Council which has brought together representatives from a variety of food sectors to inform the City of Vancouver on how to best achieve the goals of the “Greenest City 2020” project. Knowing this, do you think UBC could benefit from the creation of a campus-wide food policy council? If yes, in what ways?
3. What are some key considerations (critical steps) that you think are important to take into account before creating a campus food policy council? (e.g. scope - 2 campuses, operational alignment - who stewards the FPC?)
4. What do you think a campus-wide FPC would look like? (for example: in terms of membership, policy alignment, etc.)
5. If a new campus-wide coalition were to form, in what way could the formation of such a food coalition benefit your area of food related work?
6. What are your thoughts on the current ways of collaborating and moving projects forward on campus. What aspects can be improved
7. Based on your experience/knowledge, are you aware of any best practice approaches for running a food policy council? If so, can you speak to a few of these?

APPENDIX E: Interview Responses from the Food Advisory Committee

1. Prior to starting the interview, it would be wonderful to hear a little bit about your FPC: its purpose, mission, current projects, membership, how long it has been in operation, etc.

Our Food Advisory Committee began as a result of the efforts of a Food Insecurity Working group established by the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic) in June 2019. This working group consisted of stakeholders from key sectors of the university who generated a Food Insecurity Report, detailing the current food insecurity situation on our campus and developing recommendations for improvement.

The Food Advisory Committee (our FPC) was created in January 2020 in order to implement the recommendations generated in our Food Insecurity Report, more specifically working towards:

- Enhancing communication between key stakeholders on campus who may be working towards initiatives focused on food insecurity and provide guidance to these stakeholders on their initiatives using best practices
- Reviewing ongoing research on campus food insecurity (including student surveys, faculty research etc.) and comparing our current policies and initiatives to best practices for preventing and mitigating food insecurity
- In the long-term, the FPC hopes to use best practices to reduce the stigma associated with student food insecurity, and work towards a “food culture” on campus where food insecurity is understood widely

Current Projects of the FPC include:

- Researching the current state of programs and policies aimed at mitigating and preventing student food insecurity, and reviewing how these programs have adapted in the face of COVID-19, as well as what they will be able to offer during a remote fall semester
- Finding ways to promote food insecurity initiatives to students over one accessible platform
- Establishing a Student Food Collective, which will bring together student representatives from various clubs and associations on campus which focus on or are interested in food insecurity – the collective will begin with education on food insecurity for student leaders and then provide a forum for joint creation and promotion of initiatives focused on student food insecurity

Current Membership:

- Vice Provost and Dean of Student Affairs delegate (chair)
- Representative from Student Wellness Services
- Representative from Hospitality Services
- Representative from the School of Graduate Studies
- Representative from Student Financial Aid
- Representative from the Division of Student Affairs
- Representative from the Alma Mata Society
- Representative from the Society for Graduate and Professional Students

- One Graduate Student-at-Large
- One Undergraduate Student-at-Large

2. According to our current understanding of best practice approaches, it is a good practice for FPCs to conduct an assessment of the local community & campus prior to establishment. In the case of your council, were there any steps or strategies that contributed to the success of its establishment? Would you recommend any of them to groups who are beginning to form a coalition?

As mentioned above, before the establishment of our FPC, Queen's created a Food Insecurity Working Group in June 2019 which operated for several months in order to:

- Gather data on food insecurity in our own population (from Queen's specific food insecurity questions on the National College Health Association Student Health and Wellness Survey) and data on Canadian/Ontario universities overall.
- Have a student researcher complete an environmental scan of existing programs available to address food insecurity, food skills, and food access on campus and in the surrounding community. This researcher conducted interviews with campus partners, including faculty involved in related research, student leaders of clubs and services involved in food insecurity, and staff involved in overseeing student populations at a higher risk of experiencing food insecurity (ex. international students). She also researched food insecurity/food access programming at other Canadian institutions.

The Working Group's research culminated in the Food Insecurity Report previously described. The information in the report helped to provide us with a more comprehensive picture of what food insecurity looks like at our institution and how we are currently addressing it, while providing thoughtful consideration (backed by research and best practices) on how we could improve. The Food Insecurity report outlined recommendations for improvement in our approach to dealing with food insecurity in the domains of: Education, Environment, Policy, Skill Building and Community. Each of these areas had specific goals associated with them.

Having the recommendations and the report in place when the Food Advisory Committee was established provided us with the knowledge and direction we needed to set clear goals and begin working towards them immediately. We believe it would be very beneficial for any institution interested in starting an FPC to investigate the state of food insecurity on their own campus and current resources available to students.

3. Since UBC is planning to form its campus-wide coalition, I would like to know what FPCs look like in terms of membership size and structure. Would you be able to tell me how membership looks like in the context of your FPC?

a. What are some of the roles members undertake aside from participating in discussion and how are these roles assigned to them?

An important role of every FPC member outside of participating in discussion is providing their respective school department with updates on the initiatives and guidelines spearheaded by the FPC. They serve as the connection between ideas of programming and policy generated in FPC meetings and the resources available to support these ideas. The way in which each

member is able to provide resources is dependant on their department and staff role outside of the committee. The Chair of the meetings is responsible for setting meeting dates, determining the focus of discussions and goals for the committee, and overseeing students hired to implement some of the goals of the FPC.

b. Do you think it is valuable to identify a set number of members? If so, what membership size would you regard as “optimal” for a FPC?

Our FPC currently has around 12 members who represent a range of services and departments within Queen’s. A group of this size has been working well for us, it allows for comprehensive representation of key stakeholders while remaining small enough for meaningful discussion to take place.

c. Are there any membership requirements in place in the FPC? For example, are there formal seats reserved for certain representatives.

We added some additional students positions subsequent our experience on the working group – we have prioritized international and graduate students experiences as we know that mature female identified graduate students with parental or caregiver responsibilities are some of the most insecure folks on our campus.

4. In addition to membership size and structure, knowing the schedule and activities of other FPCs will also greatly help UBC in the formation of its FPC. Would you be able to describe to me what the typical operations/functions of your FPC look like?

a. How often does the FPC meet and when it does, how frequently are new priorities discussed and established?

Our FPC has met approximately once a month since January (with some interruption due to COVID-19) although there is only a requirement that we meet once per term. Currently we are meeting over zoom and plan to continue meeting monthly through the summer

b. Are there times when the FPC has working groups outside of standard meeting times? If so, how does the coalition move the work forward?

The FPC has hired a student to meet with food insecurity programming organizers and students to begin the process of creating a comprehensive list of food insecurity supports for students, and to begin the Student Food Collective. This student checks in at regular meetings with the FPC in order to update and get their insight on the progress of these goals and next steps.

c. Are there any steps to successful planning that would you recommend to newly-formed FPC that plan to formulate an agenda and establish priorities?

As previously mentioned, it is beneficial to begin the FPC with clear goals in mind based on a prior analysis of the current state of student food insecurity at your institution. Ensuring that every member of the FPC has an understanding of these goals, and an understanding of how the group that they are representing can contribute or benefit, is also imperative to ensure that

meaningful discussions take place during meetings. Ensure that there is a set amount of time at the beginning of each meeting for stakeholders to voice their general updates or suggestions, but that each meeting has specific policies or initiatives to address (stick to one or two) so that meaningful action items can come out of discussions.

5. Aside from members, our current understanding is that certain FPCs also hire staff to support the operations of the coalition. Does your FPC employ any staff at this moment in time?

a. If no, what is the reason for not having any staff people on board?

b. If yes, how does their role help the FPC progress and move forward towards the completion of its project goals?

Our FPC has hired a summer undergraduate student to begin working on prioritization and implementation of short-term goals for the committee derived from recommendations in the Food Insecurity Working Group Report.

This student will predominantly be responsible for the goal of establishing a Student Food Collective, which will bring graduate and undergraduate student representatives from different clubs and organizations across the university together to get a diverse student perspective on campus food insecurity, and implement initiatives which help to mitigate it on campus.

The student hire will also continue to explore current programming options and how they have changed for the 2020-2021 year; and find innovative and accessible ways to market them to students.

Many of the FPC members have important insight but busy schedules, and may not have the time required to implement FPC goals on their own. Hiring a staff member allows the FPC to appoint someone who ensures that goals are being reached in a timely fashion, and can put time towards the implementation portion of initiatives which are suggested

6. What have been some of your committee's greatest successes so far and what do you think contributed to their success?

Although our committee is newly formed, the Food Insecurity Report which our previous Food Insecurity Working Group devised was a major success in terms of helping to educate members of our institution on student food insecurity specifically on our campus. It also demonstrated the commitment that Queen's has made to preventing and mitigating food insecurity through specific actions, and led to the creation of our current FPC. We are very hopeful already about the collaborations and ability to prioritize this work

7. In the past, what were some of the challenges that your coalition had to collectively face? Why do you think they become an obstacle to the operations of the FPC?

One of the challenges we are working through right now is finding a way to structure our meetings efficiently so that updates from members can be addressed while still leaving enough

time to thoroughly discuss new initiatives and policies. We want to make sure that we leave each meeting with attainable action items in order to continue the momentum of our work, but it can sometimes be challenging to discuss and make plans for multiple initiatives in a limited amount of time.

8. According to you, what are some of the best practice approaches to food policy councils systems?

Ensuring that a thorough scan of resources at your institution is completed before the FPC is established - Reaching out to experts in the field to understand the complexity of food insecurity- there are faculty members at many institutions who have dedicated their careers to understanding this issue and are also experienced educators. Having an expert sit on your FPC or act as a consult would be very beneficial - Establishing meeting times early on so that as many members of the FPC are able to attend as possible, and sending an agenda with clear initiatives or policies to discuss, along with any relevant resources - Focusing on new policies and initiatives that attempt to prevent food insecurity, by addressing root causes like poverty and student finances, while continuing to support current food access resources that help students in the short term

9. What other advice would you recommend to other groups interested in establishing a food policy council?

Ensuring that you carefully consider the groups which are represented by the council is imperative to its success. Food insecurity is a complex issue that extends beyond immediate food access into poverty, social justice, and diversity. Selecting representatives who can provide a voice for marginalized groups on campus that may be at a higher risk for student food insecurity is particularly important.