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ABSTRACT

This is a study of farm-to-school programs in the Chequamegon Bay Area in northern Wisconsin and Madison, Wisconsin. Farm-to-school programs are initiatives that aim to link local farmers with schools, specifically getting healthy local foods into the lunch program, and in addition, aim to educate children about food procurement and healthier food choices. These programs also foster connections among different groups within the community, which in turn builds new networks and relationships that strengthen the community: both economically and socially. Farm-to-school programs therefore function as a form of social capital. This research project examines and qualitatively assesses how farm-to-school programs build a sense of community, how rural and urban programs differ, and how effective the programs are within their respective communities. Conclusively, the research demonstrates that farm-to-school programs do build a sense of community. Additionally, both rural and urban programs deal with centralization but have different levels of flexibility. Lastly, the research show that programs are effective at nutrition education and expose students to food procurement but are working on providing students with more access to local foods in school meals.

Introduction

There is an ever increasing need for food security, better nutritional options and education, as well as the need to support local economies. It seems that farm-to-school programs are one of the federally funded services that support meeting those needs. Farm-to-school is a national program that has been expanding each year since 1990. This program allows for children and adults to work with the land by growing food in a community school garden and as a result provides an understanding of food procurement. For instance, growing your own food in a garden, harvesting, and then eating that food provides a stronger connection to that food more so then it would if one were to just go to the grocery store and buy a food item from a place that is thousands of miles away. Some schools provide just a snack with local fruits and vegetables, while others incorporate the fruits and vegetables into the meals. This strengthens the community by increasing involvement in it. Additionally, farm-to-school programs are important because they support local agriculture and develop a connection among students, farmers, and teachers within a community. Supporting local agriculture through farm-to-school programs can increase food security and nutritional options for children while they are in school. By doing this, farm-to-school programs are supporting local foods, which can help provide better food security, support healthy food options, and stimulate local economies.

Social capital theory examines how social networks, communications, and relationships within a community function. Social networks, relationships, and communication within the community strengthen and build social capital. These relationships are critical to a community to ensure that action is taken to improve the community through both community organizations and local governmental processes. The farm-to-school programs in the Chequamegon Bay Area and Madison, Wisconsin are examined to see if they enhance and build social capital.

The author will examine how urban and rural programs build a sense of community and measure found that there are new networks, relationships, and connections being made with schools and local producers and some students are connecting with their school garden. Additionally, the author discovered there are similarities and differences between rural and urban programs. Both programs have to deal with the centralization of the
school lunch programs, and it seems due to a smaller school district that rural programs have more flexibility, whereas the urban program is stuck in a more rigid structure due to an uncooperative food service director. As far as the programs meeting their goals, both struggle to actually gain access to the lunchroom to get local foods into the school meals, but have instead focused on getting fresh local snacks and teaching nutrition lessons about food production.

**Literature Review**

**FARM-TO-SCHOOL PROGRAMS**

Within farm-to-school programs, relationships are being built both with the schools and producers, as well as between children and their food. It is important for programs to find viable ways to reform their school lunch programs to build those relationships. However, there are barriers to getting local foods into the lunch programs and knowing these barriers can help them be overcome. Additionally, farm-to-school programs were created to combat nutritional and health issues that became common in school lunches. Lastly, farm-to-school programs are also meant to create social equality through their background or economic status.

**Relationship with Food**

One of the main goals of farm-to-school programs is to build relationships with local food producers. Joshi, Kalb, and Beery (2006) provide an example of how New Hampshire farm-to-school program includes direct contact with food service and school administration, direct mailings and phone calls, community events, harvest fairs, information booths at conferences, and workshops conducted by with key state departments and organizations such as the NH Department of Education, NH School Food Service As New Hampshire farm-to-school program helped build relationships with the whole community in support of their local produce and developed the appropriate relationships with schools and local apple producers to meet their needs. Another goal of farm-to-school programs is to create a better understanding of food procurement for both children and community members. Bellows, Dufour, and Bachmann (2003) discuss how the majority of people in the United States have lost a connection with their food. They have found that happiness the food they eat. Rarely do they have contact with or personal knowledge about the farms relationship with the food they buy and feed to their families. Joshi et al. (2006) describe an example of how a farm-to-school program in a Riverside, California school district allow for educational opportunities to teach the students about food procurement. The authors state that this program has the -to-school program providing important connections with the producer and the students and other schools have worked to do the same. As a result farm-to-school programs, can provide students with a better connection and understanding of food procurement and healthy eating habits.

Furthermore, there is parent education and outreach in a couple Chicago Elementary Schools
Child Healthy Eating Nights bring parents and children together to taste healthy, delicious foods, as well as bring in subject experts on child nutrition, health, and agriculture to talk to parents about parents with current health information related to diet. Fresh from the Farm program events, features on healthy foods and their health benefits, tips for making your home a healthy haven for families. All three of these programs exemplify farm-to-school programs filling the gap for parents and students knowledge of where their food comes from and how to choose healthy, local foods.

Reforming School Lunches

Another component to farm-to-school programs is learning how to successfully reform school education program focused on understanding the relationships between food, culture, health, and the all the ways to reform a school lunch. The Center of Ecoliteracy (2010) produced this guide to help schools figure out how to build relationships with their local farmers and through those connections get food into school lunch programs. They suggest ten points that will help improve the school lunch and the school environment.

effective education about nutrition so that students can achieve their full academic potential and learn to evaluate policies that offer a vision and framework for providing healthy meals as well as teaching about wellness policy. Third, school programs should spend at least 50 hours , and attitudes related to where our food comes from; how it is behavioral change. Fourth, the Center of Ecoliteracy (2010) also suggests creating an inviting dining ambience that encourages healthy interaction and healthy eating — a place that students enjoy, that travels around 1,500 miles to get from where it was grown to the school cafeteria. School programs that leads to healthier, more nutrition services, staff, and teachers with the professional training and support they need to offer meals featuring fresh and local food and to teach students about the relationship between food, health, and the environment. Lastly, school districts should work on be able to incorporate healthy, fresh, local foods into their school lunches and provide a unique relationship with food and understanding the roles of ecology.
Structural Barriers

Kloppenburg et al. (2007) suggests that there can be barriers to getting enough local food to meet generation ago relied heavily on local products for meal planning and preparation, the majority [of -to-school programs focus on accessibility to resources and facilities that would support this program and foster better access to local produce and products to be able to incorporate them into the programs (Center of Ecoliteracy food service companies, thus eliminating the need for (2). In order for farm-to-

whereas the distributors need the security of knowing the farmers can meet that demand (Bellows et al., 2003:2). Kloppenburg et al. (2007) also acknowledge that there are larger, structural barriers that inhibit these programs from being completely successful, whether it be funding or clashing food and health standard policies. These examples explain the shift that has occurred from being a more local, decentralized system to a highly centralized and national system.

Another aspect that equally affects local foods, community, and farm-to-school programs is policy. Morgan and Sonnino (2008) provide an argument that in order to change school food, policy though geographic preference already looks to be legal, [farm-to-school (FTS)] campaigners believe that many food service managers will recoil from using it unless they receive a clear mandate from USDA, the federal agency that provides the reimbursement for the s rendered more sustainable and that means committing more money in the Farm Bill to local and regional produce an clearly affects how farm-to-school programs can continue to function, but also their ability to meet their goal of providing local and regional foods within school lunch programs.

SOCIAL CAPITAL THEORY

Social capital theory measures whether or not a community is progressive and stable, both economically and socially. A large part of what the author is using social capital theory as is its relation to community development and additionally, local foods as a way to promote community development. illustrate how relationships develop and are fostered.

in point is to address how a community develops. Gittell and Vidal being. Community-based partnerships can be viewed as a path to generate social capital through creating collaborations within the community, enabling community members to participate in aspects of community development and community life that concern them by

Furthermore, Green and Haines (2012) mention a focus in localizing to create sustainable community and [therefore] have proposed more localized and regional systems to meet our needs for food and new opportunities to support small- and medium-sized farms, reduce the environmental footprint of agriculture, and
community through building social capital (272).

Social capital theory expands on community development to address how networks build social capital which in turns strengthens their community. Gittell and Vidal (1998) illumine the importance of social relationships because of the capital they create and how social relationships all for more productivity which improves the well-being of community members (144). Additionally, social relationships provide both emotional and material aid support for community members (148). Green and Haines (2012) propose that community organizations, as a way of promoting social gatherings, develop informal and formal networks (151). Gittell and Vidal (1998) define some important social capital terms bringing people together who already know each other with the goal of strengthening the relationships time and energy, whereas weak ties are basically acq brings together people or groups who did not previously know each other with the goal of establishing -based and controlled organizations, and facilitates respectful and mutually beneficial relationships between neighborhood-based leaders and organizations and the larger metropolitan-

Infrastruct alternative; building both inclusive and diverse networks which are affected by community projects and lead to community betterment (137). This allows for communities to work together, embrace change, and maintain a healthy level of growth, and as a result, increases both bonding and bridging capital within certain groups and within the community as a whole.

**Methods**

After successful approval through the IRB process to do research, the author began to contact individuals connected and involved with farm-to-conducting in-depth interviews with key leaders and stakeholders in farm-to-school programs in the Chequamegon Bay Area and Madison, WI. She conducted these in-depth interviews to qualitatively assess how farm-to-school programs build a sense of community, how they differ from rural versus urban programs, and how effective the programs are within the community. In other words, the author assessed the successes and failures of farm-to-school programs. Despite farm-to-school organizers coming from a variety of occupations and professions (e.g. nutritionists, teachers, food service directors, principals, and farmers), the author identified the following occupations and people to be both knowledgeable and involved in a farm-to-school program.

The author then contacted and interviewed the following individuals: a UW-Extension nutritionist from Ashland, Wisconsin; the Americorps nutrition educator and director working with elementary school in Washburn; the Americorps community outreach coordinator working with all three elementary schools in the Chequamegon Bay; the Americorps nutrition educator and director working with elementary school in Ashland; the principle of Ashland Elementary School; four farm-to-school Americorps nutrition educators and a director in Madison, Wisconsin; a UW-Madison graduate student studying Wisconsin farm-to-school programs; and Head Director of Farm-to-School Programs for Wisconsin.

The author first contacted the UW-Extension nutritionist from Ashland, Wisconsin, and due to her knowledge of farm-to-school programs in Wisconsin enabled her to gain access to key individuals in farm-to-school programs in the Chequamegon Bay Area and Madison Area. She implemented snowball sampling technique to identify other key leaders and stakeholders through first interviewing the UW-
Extension nutritionist, and then continued snowball sampling technique to connect with other key individuals. Once other key individuals were identified, the researcher contacted the people suggested by the initial interviewees and asked them to participate in an in-depth interview. If they agreed, she set up a time to interview and proceeded to ask if they knew anyone else within farm-to-school programs who they think would be helpful to this research. The author then contacted those people, set up interviews, and continued the snowball sampling technique, until she conducted a total of eleven interviews.

The author developed an interview schedule with thirteen interview questions (see Appendix A). The interview questions deal with: (1) how farm-to-school programs build a sense of community, (2) how rural and urban programs differ, and (3) how effective the programs are within the community. Once the author had made contact with each key person, the in-depth interviews were conducted. Interviews lasted twenty-five minutes to a little over one hour. With consent from the participant (see Appendix B for informed consent form), interviews were recorded with a digital tape recorder. Following each recorded interview, the author transcribed the interview in full.

Organizing Data and Coding Scheme

The author read through the transcriptions two times. In the initial view, the author looked for themes that would meet the three stated goals of the paper through open coding. Within these three sections, she found other prominent themes. Within the effectiveness of farm-to-school program, there were multiple levels of coding units that emerged: what type of nutrition education programs they did; whether farm-to-school programs had a school garden, snack program, or any access to the lunch program; also, where the programs purchased their food for both snack and lunch programs. When the author viewed them again, she used selective coding. For the effectiveness of the program, there were different coding unit levels found: farm-to-school programs that had just a snack program once a week paired with nutrition education and farmers visiting school and those who had gardens and farmer visits at different schools and at different farms, along with a snack program and nutrition education, and finally, programs that had a garden, farmer visits at the school and at a farm, snack program, nutrition education, and local foods incorporated into lunch program.

For how rural and urban programs relate and differ, there were several coding units found. Ones that were found in both were centralization, economic barriers, and lack of processing infrastructure. Coding units that revealed differences were rural programs have more flexibility and less people to manage, whereas urban programs had a large school district that was very hard to manage and very rigid, and there was also different policy influence and growing seasons. The author synthesized the coding units pertaining to how rural and urban programs relate and differ: both deal with centralization and economic, policy, and structural barriers. The urban programs have less influence and flexibility in their school programs, whereas the rural programs are able to uniquely address each different school needs.

Different coding units of community built by farm-to-school program were explored and found: relationships built with local farmers, businesses, restaurants, parents, students, teachers, school administrators, local food advocates, essentially all of the local rural communities as well as part of urban communities and parental support. In addition, codes that were found were chef-in-the-classroom program in Madison, students connecting with growing their own food, local government involvement, school and food policy work, and economic benefit. More coding units that were found pertaining to community building were food security for communities involved, researchers building relationships with communities involved, garden clubs and fundraisers that were involving and educating the public, and volunteer involvement. The coding units found that addressed farm-to-school programs building community were then condensed: relationships were built with all aspects of community through education, policy work, desire for food security, and by supporting local producers and businesses.

The author used memoing to develop these coding units into a coding scheme. She created a coding scheme through using the selective coding units and highlighting the central units. The final coding scheme is shown below in the results section.
Farm-to-School Programs

There are actually four different programs that the author interviewed: Ashland, Washburn, Bayfield, and Madison, Wisconsin. Ashland’s farm-to-school program has one Americorps nutrition educator and director, and it is in its first year stage. It has a daily fresh, local snack for grades k-8th in the Ashland school district through its Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program. They are also working on creating a garden that is open to the community and that will help supplement either the snack program or actually getting into the school lunch program in the future. Ashland farm-to-school program is working on having at least a salad bar in the lunch room, but are waiting until next year before they will be able to implement it.

The Washburn farm-to-school program one Americorps nutrition educator and director as well, and it has been running for three years, but the school has had a garden for ten years. This has enabled them to be successful at integrating the garden into the school lunchroom and curriculum, both in the elementary school and the high school. They are successful at incorporating what is grown in the school garden into the lunch salad bar, as well as buying about 10 percent of total food for school lunch program from local producers.

Bayfield’s farm-to-school program is also within its first year. They also have a Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Snack Program where they provide a local, healthy snack for grades k-8th in the Bayfield school district. They are also working on getting a school garden going that is open to the community to create better food security for that area. Due to structural and economic barriers, they are unable to get into the lunch program at this time.

Madison has four Americorps nutrition educators and directors working with nine schools. Since there is a shortage of resources, both humanly and economically, they are only able to produce a completely local snack, usually a vegetable, once a week, every Wednesday. They have volunteers prepare the snack every Sunday and then the snack is delivered on Wednesday. They also have a program called Chef-in-the-Classroom for two middle schools and one high school where as local chef comes in to teach them new recipes and uses only local foods.

Results

Farm-to-school programs will be analyzed and broken down into three different sections. The first section, building a sense of community, addresses how farm-to-school programs are creating connections and building networks as well as how these programs raise awareness of local food, and furthermore, the lasting impact on students and community. The second section, urban versus rural programs, discusses the differences and similarities the programs have with one another, such as barriers, different network connections, and impact on community. The last section, effectiveness of programs, attends to how farm-to-are defined and how each program meets those standards as well as the strengths and weaknesses of each program.

Building a Sense of Community

Building a sense of community entails building relationships within a community that strengthen it. The farm-to-school directors at the schools in the Chequamegon Bay Area and Madison, Wisconsin work with the farmers in their area to get local foods during the growing season, so they are both building relationships with local food producers as well as with other businesses. These working relationships with farmers, volunteers, students, teachers, businesses, and other community members strengthen the community. Furthermore, the impact of farm-to-school programs on their students affects the future of the communities in which they live in.
The relationship between local farmers and each school is one of the most essential relationships that are nurtured by farm-to-school programs. In Madison, the Americorps farm-to-school nutrition illustrate the different seasons and crops that grow in Wisconsin (Interviewee 1, 2011: 4). Furthermore, one of the Madison elementary schools has a strong relationship with Blue Moon Community Farm and

Through creating outreach to the greater community, another relationship that is fostered is volunteers from the community become involved with farm-to-school programs. In Madison, they need a lot of volunteers to help prepare the snacks for each week which allows the volunteers to connect with farmers and ideas of local foods (Interviewee 2, 2011: 5). The volunteers build relationships within the community through promoting local food, through going and supporting local business and some are parents, so having those parents be more involved and in turn their children more involved with the community.

Another volunteer relationship that is fostered are working with Bayfield County inmates that come and do work in the garden. At the Interviewee 5, 2011: 3). These special volunteers, which are low offenders, make a deeper connection with the community and when they get out can start their own garden or stay involved with local foods.

A further relationship that is fostered by farm-to-school programs is the relationship between students and teachers and local food. The farm-to-downtown to these different school and neighborhoods throughout the city, in a lot of different parts of-to-school program, they incorporate the garden into the academic curriculum. For the pre-k, kinderga and for the past two springs they have gone out to a local farm, and the third graders are involved through 1: 1). The fourth grade focuses on Native Americans studies, so (Interviewee 5, 2011: 1). The fifth grade is going to be focusing on a Colonial garden where they are -to-school program has a fresh fruits and vegetable program, and they have been able to source and Madison, as part of the farm-to-school program there, they have chef-in-the-classroom programs where a because [she] would say that the chefs and the farmers and [other community members]

Farm-to-school programs are also expanding relationships between local producers and local businesses. During the first year of the Washburn farm-to-to-which was all the local farmers who wanted to come, and a lot of local businesses, and then the schools. And they all came to the Washburn elementary cafeteria with signs [to identify themselves], and they
2011: 4). Also local Washburn businesses help out the garden program by donating things, like me Restoration Company, they have given [them] wood for raised beds for the last (Interviewee 5, 2011: 5). The Chequamegon Bay Community Outreach Coordinator says that locally she Minnesota that has done a longer term study on the economic advantages of farm-to-
es benefit from increasing our farm-to- Coordinator also discussed the wide variety and abundance of partnerships and relationships farm-to-school programs have in the Chequamegon Bay Area: Northland College (including students), both tribes in Bad River and Red Cliff (and whole tribal community), Ashland and Bayfield making school gardens more community gardens, Chartwell Food Service through Northland, UW-Extension family, wellness, and agricultural branches, Master Gardeners, county inmates, Lake Superior Farming Association (to support beginning farmers to then supply more local food), Troller After School program in Bayfield, After School Kids in Washburn, the White House After School program in Ashland, Agriculture and Ed Research Center (ARC), Bayfield Regional Growers Co-Op, local CSA (Community Supported Agriculture), Chequamegon Food Co-Op, Americorps VISTAs (that work in the Red Cliff gardens), farm-to-school nutrition educators presenting models to other schools in Price County and Barron County, and also CT Seed Exchange (a national seed company that is working on raising funds for and donating seeds to farm-to-school programs) (Interviewee 6, 2011: 5-6).

Furthermore, it was examined how students from this program would later become involved with their own communities and how farm-to-school programs affect their students. The Washburn farm-to-school nutrition educator and director found that farm-to-school programs are set up in way that really -on community interviewee 5, 2011: 9). Additionally, she continues to say that relationships with healthy foods that they will hopefully, in turn, have a higher standard o will be more inclined to do so (Interviewee 5, 2011: 9-10). The Chequamegon Bay Community Outreach Coordinator agrees that gardens are the best starting point that the program has to encourage children to

One of the Madison nutrition educators and directors found si schools are now creating kind of school gardens and [she] thinks that as the kids get involved in at least conjuncture (Interviewee 7, 2011: 6). A different farm-to-school nutrition educator and director found that since she is working with younger students that they may find interest in the sch necessarily the wider community, but [she] thinks it gives them an interest in learning more about where -to-school program found that gardens play a large role in connecting the students with their community utilized by the food service director, but sometimes they
kids are kind of re-educating their pare -8). Another
Madison nutrition educator and director finds that students make connections with the community and
the chefs and they

market and buying the same spinach
nutrition educator and director felt that the impact on the students really vary and finds that if she were
able to orchestrate more field trips to different local farms that the students would be able to connect more
to the ideas that farm-to-

appreciation for ag

Urban versus Rural Programs

The Chequamegon Bay Area and Madison farm-to-school programs have similarities and
differences. They both struggle with economic and infrastructural barriers, and in addition, they struggle
with centralization and a lack of trust between farmers and food service directors. Madison has a longer
growing season but a larger student body and stricter standards, and in addition, they have more students
to feed. Whereas, Chequamegon Bay Area although they lack the infrastructure currently, are able to
work with food service directors because they have a smaller student body and less people to work with
allowing their programs to be more flexible, and they can get access to local food more easily to meet the
demands of the student body.

Both in the Madison Area and the Chequamegon Bay Area, struggle to work within the bounds of
centralization which controls how business is conducted within school lunch programs. In Madison, they
are restricted to only producing one snack a week for just those schools because of funding issues and not
being able to get into school lunch program due to centralization of school lunches in Madison. In one
kitchen, they produce 25,000 meals for a number of schools in the Madison area, and they also were
unable to get local foods into the school lunches because the food service director for the area did not
want to work with the farm-to-school directors. Additionally, due to the barriers

(Interviewee 1, 2011: 3). The

(10).

In the Madison Area, it is a combination of centralization, economic, and political barriers. In
Madison, they work to produce a year round local snack once a week, every Wednesday, mostly with a
volunteer base. They distribute the snacks to nine elementary schools that qualify for USDA grant to
snack the rest of the week which is not local. Farm-to-school nutrition educators and directors really
dire
in the effort (Interviewee 2, 2011: 2). However, that food service director retired at the end of this past
tart off with trying to get more fresh fruits and vegetables and

Both the Ashland Elementary School and Bayfield Elementary School are in their first year
building the connections with the farmers, setting up a school garden, and trying to work with the kitchen
staff and food director. In Ashland, the farm-to-school nutrition educator and director is working on
getting a garden started and then incorporating carrots and other things grown in the garden over this summer into a salad bar. However, she has stated that these kitchens are really not equipped to handle any farm-to-school director, they have no working stoves or storage spaces big enough to make all the meals that they need or incorporate any food that is not already pre-cut and pre-cooked. So their biggest issue is infrastructure.

The Washburn Elementary School has been able to overcome some of those structural barriers of kitchen infrastructure because they have a food service director that is very passionate about getting local food into the lunchroom. The Washburn farm-to-school program is able to incorporate their garden food into the salad bar and even buy local produce to incorporate into the meals, but they still face economic barriers and a bit of centralization that makes it impossible to buy 100 percent local food. Even the rural communities suffer from centralization.

Effectiveness of Programs

The purpose of farm-to-school programs varies from each person’s explanation. Each interviewee had a slightly different interpretation. Furthermore, with each program being different, the interviewee had varying results of just how effective their programs were at meeting their interpretation of the purpose. Despite the differences in the interpretation of the purpose of the program, the interviewees generally agreed that farm-to-school programs are there to make connections with local producers to get local, healthy food options into school lunches while teaching the students about food procurement and healthy food choices. Most interviewees agreed that the programs were successful at nutrition education and some exposure to healthier, local foods, however most programs lacked the ability to really reform the lunch program by getting any local foods into it.

The interviewees each discussed what the farm-to-school purpose was to them. The director of Wisconsin Americorps farm-to-school programs feels that the purpose is “to do educational activities with students and increase the exposure and access to local healthy foods in order to change the school environment so that students are making the healthier choices, food choices, and hopefully, it will decrease obesity in the future, and also to support our local farmers” (Interviewee 1, 2011: 7). One of the Madison nutrition educators and directors believes that the purpose of farm-to-school programs is “to support local farmers in the local community to get local produce in the schools…[and to introduce] kids to the things that they can buy from local farmers and things that are good for them and that will sustain them and the planet and the economy” (Interviewee 2, 2011: 10). Another Madison farm-to-school nutrition educator and director sees the purpose of farm-to-school as a way “to connect schools with the farmers, ultimately in supporting local farmers and the local economy, while at the same time getting healthier foods into the schools, ultimately school lunches” (Interviewee 3, 2011: 5). The Washburn farm-to-school nutrition educator and director finds the purpose to be “to increase awareness of local food and to increase local food in the school system by supporting farmers, local producers, to address the obesity epidemic…but, it’s also to address the farmer issues of our country; not enough farms and not enough local food…[which means] not having enough food for a lot of families, so, access” (Interviewee 5, 2011: 6).

The interviewees then discussed how successful they were at meeting those goals. The director of Wisconsin Americorps programs feels that “as a whole, our Americorps program has been very successful at providing increased exposure to fruits and vegetables but not necessarily increased access…we have increased the access by providing snack programs, but within the school meal program…only minor changes” have happened (Interviewee 1, 2011: 7). Interviewee 2 believes that they “do a pretty good job, especially when they’re teaching kids who have never been to a farm, [and] doesn’t really know what vegetables look like…but having the kids remember what we talked about [in the nutrition lessons] is really encouraging, too” (Interviewee 2, 2011: 10). Interviewee 3 finds that the program is “pretty successful, but would be a lot more successful if they were actually getting food into the school lunch program…[furthermore] interacting more with parents, [she] really thinks it’s
Food on our dinner plates, and a fast change one bit at a time and overcome the boundaries of the school yard to start change in the farm fields, community as a whole to create change. The farm generations to get involved in food culture change which then moves beyond the school grounds into the local f

community life, they are a great venue in which to provide space for discussion about the importance of and the ability to have a market that will support them. In addition, since schools can be so central in these potential school food policy changes allow for more suppor

food policy change that will allow their children to be guaranteed healthy, local food options. As a result, further increase higher nutritionally valued food availability for students regardless of their socioeconomic background. Furthe

increase higher nutritionally valued food availability for students regardless of their socioeconomic background; this would become more advanced the older the students got. Additionally, it teaches the children about how farming fits into the larger scale of the national and global economics and politics; this would become more advanced the older the students got.

Social Capital Theory helps illuminate the research by providing a way to define what it means to build community. Since the results prove that farm-to-school programs do in fact build community, in the sense that the programs help build networks and relationships within the community, this theory supports explaining how farm-to-school programs are effective at building community. Farm-to-school programs are creating those relationships with the farmers, local businesses and restaurants, schools, parents, teachers, gardeners, local foods movement, and students, which is in fact building support of and for local food security in communities. Social Capital Theory helps to explain why building these relationships and networks with organizations in and outside the community is so important. By farm-to-school programs creating these networks and relationships, the programs are strengthening the community because they are creating a way in which more groups and people can connect in order to promote growth and sustainability in a community. Social Capital Theory elucidates the significance farm-to-school programs have in their community because it is really important to have a healthy, vibrant, and connected community and that is what farm-to-school programs help create.

In conclusion, farm-to-school programs affect the community in multitudinous ways. It builds relationships with the community through building bridges between the farmers and the schools, between the students and the farmers, and in turn between the parents with school food policies. Additionally, the school programs affect the community in multitudinous ways. It builds relationships with the community through building bridges between the farmers and the schools, between the students and the farmers, and in turn between the parents with school food policies. Additionally, the school programs help create.

Significance/Conclusion

Farm-to-school programs are significant to their communities for many reasons. For one, they bring a new level of awareness of nutrition and health. They provide access to healthier food and knowledge of how to cook with different foods. They teach children to live a healthy lifestyle and in turn, can help change their parents lives. This program is giving the next generation the opportunity to live a longer, healthier life and also, to engage with their community at a more intimate level. Furthermore, farm-to-

also into the lives of the farmers. Additionally, it teaches the children about how farming fits into the larger scale of the national and global economics and politics; this would become more advanced the older the students got.

Social Capital Theory helps illuminate the research by providing a way to define what it means to build community. Since the results prove that farm-to-school programs do in fact build community, in the sense that the programs help build networks and relationships within the community, this theory supports explaining how farm-to-school programs are effective at building community. Farm-to-school programs are creating those relationships with the farmers, local businesses and restaurants, schools, parents, teachers, gardeners, local foods movement, and students, which is in fact building support of and for local food security in communities. Social Capital Theory helps to explain why building these relationships and networks with organizations in and outside the community is so important. By farm-to-school programs creating these networks and relationships, the programs are strengthening the community because they are creating a way in which more groups and people can connect in order to promote growth and sustainability in a community. Social Capital Theory elucidates the significance farm-to-school programs have in their community because it is really important to have a healthy, vibrant, and connected community and that is what farm-to-school programs help create.

In conclusion, farm-to-school programs affect the community in multitudinous ways. It builds relationships with the community through building bridges between the farmers and the schools, between the students and the farmers, and in turn between the parents with school food policies. Additionally, the school programs increase higher nutritionally valued food availability for students regardless of their socioeconomic background. Furthermore, the programs create opportunity and motivation for parents to demand school food policy change that will allow their children to be guaranteed healthy, local food options. As a result, these potential school food policy changes allow for more support of small to middle size farms to grow and the ability to have a market that will support them. In addition, since schools can be so central in community life, they are a great venue in which to provide space for discussion about the importance of local foods and the role local foods hold in the community. Starting in the schools allows for all generations to get involved in food culture change which then moves beyond the school grounds into the community as a whole to create change. The farm-to-school program has the ability to support policy change one bit at a time and overcome the boundaries of the school yard to start change in the farm fields, food on our dinner plates, and a fast-food culture to a local, slow-food culture.
APPENDIX A. Questions Included in the Interview Schedule

**Farm-to-School Program:**
1. I am interested in how your farm-to-school program operates, so I would like to start with a general discussion about how your program functions. Could you please describe what your program consists of (i.e. snack programs, school gardens, nutrition education, etc.)?
2. Do you have local farmers visit the classrooms? If so, can you provide an example or two of what students have learned from the farmers or what the farmers have taught?
3. Who supplies the food for school lunches and snack programs? How much food within school lunches and snack programs comes from local farmers, farmers within a 90-mile-radius?

**Building Community:**
1. How has your farm-to-school program built new relationships within the community? As well as with other programs outside the community?
2. How has your program encouraged participation in your community? Can you describe any instances where you saw this happening?
3. Can you provide an example or describe how your farm-to-school program has encouraged involvement in government policy at the local, state, or national level?
4. -to-school program? Could you offer any examples of this?
5. How have parents shown involvement with the program? Could you illustrate an instance or two of this?

**Effectiveness of Farm-to-School:**
1. What do you consider the purpose of farm-to-school programs?
2. How successful do you consider your program to be at meeting those goals? Why?
3. What do you consider the strongest parts of your program?
4. What do you consider the weakest parts of your program?
5. How will farm-to-school programs encourage the children within the program to engage in their community? Through participating in local programs and initiatives?
APPENDIX B. Informed Consent Form

INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

Title of Study: How Farm-to-School Programs Build Social Capital: A Case-Study of the Chequamegon Bay Area and Madison, Wisconsin Elementary Schools

Investigators: Emily Stephenson

This is a research study. Please take your time in deciding if you would like to participate. Please feel free to ask questions at any time.

INTRODUCTION

You are being invited to participate voluntarily in the above-titled research project. The purpose of this study is to assess how farm-to-school programs build a sense of community, how they differ from rural versus urban programs, and how effective the programs are within the community. You are being invited to participate in this study because you are knowledgeable about farm-to-school programs.

DESCRIPTION OF PROCEDURES

If you agree to participate in this study, your participation will last for a half hour to an hour. During the study you may expect the following study procedures to be followed: You will be asked to answer a series of questions that pertain to farm-to-school programs and then you will be asked to give a list of names of people that you feel are also knowledgeable of farm-to-school programs and would be helpful to this research study.

The investigator will use a digital voice recorder to record and then transcribe the interview. The audio will be erased once the interview is transcribed. If you do not wish to have your interview recorded, then the investigator can write your answers to the questions down on a pad of paper.

RISKS

There are no foreseeable risks at this time from participating in this study.

BENEFITS

If you decide to participate in this study there may be no direct benefit to you. It is hoped that the information gained in this study will benefit society by helping other schools improve their programs, seeing how the farm-to-school programs benefit the community, and to understand how rural and urban programs differ.

COSTS AND COMPENSATION

You will not have any costs from participating in this study, beyond the time that you take to do the interview. You will not have any direct compensation; however, you will have access to my final report.
PARTICIPANT RIGHTS

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you may refuse to participate or leave the study at any time. If you decide to not participate in the study or leave the study early, it will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Records identifying participants will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by applicable laws and regulations and will not be made publicly available. To ensure confidentiality to the extent permitted by law, the following measures will be taken. The names will not be used in the paper; rather, only titles of participants and region of program will be used to identify individuals. The investigator is the only person who will have access to the study records and will kept in a closed digital file under password. The audio recordings will be erased once interviews are transcribed. If the results are published, your identity will remain confidential.

QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS

You are encouraged to ask questions at any time during this study.

● For further information about the study contact: Emily Stephenson by phone: (314) 599-1359 or by e-mail: stephensone01@myemail.northland.edu. Or contact: Dr. Brandon Hofstedt (faculty research mentor) by phone: (715) 682-1311 or by e-mail at: bhofstedt@northland.edu.

● If you have any questions about the rights of research subjects or research-related injury, please contact Dr. Brandon Hofstedt by phone: (715) 682-1311, by e-mail: bhofstedt@northland.edu, or by mail: 1411 Ellis Avenue Ashland, WI 54806.

******************************************************************************************

PARTICIPANT SIGNATURE

Your signature indicates that you voluntarily agree to participate in this study, that the study has been explained to you, that you have been given the time to read the document and that your questions have been satisfactorily answered. You will receive a copy of the written informed consent prior to your participation in the study.

__________________________________________

(Date)

INVESTIGATOR STATEMENT

I certify that the participant has been given adequate time to read and learn about the study and all of their questions have been answered. It is my opinion that the participant understands the purpose, risks, benefits and the procedures that will be followed in this study and has voluntarily agreed to participate.

__________________________________________

(Signature of Person Obtaining Informed Consent) (Date)
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