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ABSTRACT

Food rescue and redistribution, understood as the harnessing and redirection of food that would be otherwise wasted, as a food security strategy is understudied. Because this type of intervention recognizes the waste inherent to the industrial food system, potential exists for food rescue and redistribution to address immediate food needs while contributing to a progressive change in focus to community food security (CFS). As a nationally-networked, rapidly-growing effort taking place on college and university campuses (as well as two high schools), the Campus Kitchens Project (CKP) provides an opportunity to increase knowledge about food rescue and redistribution interventions. The purpose of this study was to better understand the culture of one branch of the CKP (the Campus Kitchen at Marquette University, or CKMU) and investigate its relationship to the broader community.

This research study employed a qualitative case study design. Due to the interest in culture, ethnographic methods were used in data collection, including six weeks of participant observations. Data collection also included individual and focus group interviews, pre-existing and researcher-generated documents, and photographs. Four research questions guided this study: 1) How is CKMU structured and organized? 2) How are relationships constructed and
maintained between representatives of CKMU and representatives of community partner agencies? 3) What are the cultural norms for student engagement? 4) How do CKMU stakeholder groups think about the successes, challenges, and contributions of CKMU?

Data analysis, guided by the constant comparative method and organized via Atlas.ti, revealed that CKMU’s structure and organization was jointly influenced by undergirding, institutional forces and daily routines. Relationships between CKMU and its community partners formed with an initial energy; however, data demonstrated that these relationships typically became routinized and inertia-bound. Student volunteers were found to have variable levels of participation. Their involvement stemmed from several key sources and multiple benefits of participation were identified. In addition to the perspective of students, findings from this study reported on CKMU’s impact within the social service sector as well as on the lives of its volunteers. Challenges related to organizational growth and stretching the mission of CKMU were presented from multiple stakeholder perspectives.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

“Thanks for coming to get this stuff,” Paul said, smiling as he spooned a good ten pounds of prepared pork chops into the thick plastic food safety container. “I mean, really, these pork chops were tasty. Maybe a little spicy for some of the guys, but I bet if there hadn’t been a good party that night, these would have disappeared. Shame to throw them out though, so really, thanks.” As I load up the containers full of the pork chops, along with cheesy scalloped potatoes, a two-pound container of cole slaw, and a sleeve of 200 plus American cheese slices, Paul grabs my attention: “Sarah, could you come back right at the end of the semester? We throw away all the canned goods and boxed up stuff... well, really everything goes then. I know we would have a ton of good stuff for you guys when we close down the house for the summer.”

Scenarios such as this one with my friend Paul are occurring with increasing regularity around the country. Students are building relationships with workers in their own campus cafeterias as well as with local restaurants and food service businesses in the name of food waste prevention. As the lead cook for a large fraternity house, discarding leftover food has become routine for Paul—and he is not alone. Between cafeterias, on-campus restaurants, campus catering, Greek houses, and the proliferation of perishable convenience foods, institutions of higher education (IHEs) are hotbeds of food waste. Recognition of this reality led to the creation of the Campus Kitchens Project (CKP). As a rapidly growing, student-powered, food rescue and redistribution program operating at 31 educational institutions nationally (29 IHEs and two high schools), CKP has created unique town-gown partnerships and exposed and involved students with the often invisible population of people living with food insecurity.

Research has the potential to strengthen organizations like CKP and support their progressive advancement. The purpose of this research is to better understand the CKP through in-depth exploration of one highly active branch. By investigating one branch, lessons can be
applied to existing branches as well as new organizing efforts. Guided by Janesick’s (2003) outline for organizing dissertation content, this chapter includes background, purpose, research questions, an introduction to the conceptual framework, a brief discussion of the study’s scope, and an outline of the remainder of the study. The background section begins with an overview of the coexistence of food insecurity and food waste and a discussion of the history and reemergence of food rescue and redistribution as a food security strategy. I then focus attention on the Washington D.C.-based program, D. C. Central Kitchen (DCCK), and the development of the CKP. I argue that inquiry into CKP provides an opportunity to investigate a unique and growing type of IHE-community partnership. Following this background, I introduce community food security (CFS) as the framework guiding this case study. During the background and theoretical framework sections, I will also weave in discussion of my personal connections to this research. Next, I clearly lay out the study’s purpose and guiding research questions, and discuss the selection of an ethnographic qualitative case study methodology. Finally, I delineate the scope of the study, outline the remaining chapters, and summarize the key points contained in Chapter 1.

**Background**

Perhaps due to our biological need to eat, virtually no one enjoys seeing edible, nutritious food being thrown in the garbage. However, even as the demand for emergency food assistance rises and one in six Americans qualifies as food insecure (Nord, Coleman-Jenson, Andrews, & Carlson, 2010), millions of pounds of food are thrown away every year in the United States (Bloom, 2010; Jones, Dahlen, Cisco, Bockhorst, & Mckee, 2002; Jones, Dahlen, Cisco, Bockhorst, & Mckee, 2003; Jones & Martinez-Nocito, 2004). Understood as the concern or anxiety people feel when they are uncertain whether or not they will have enough to eat and
measured through multi-level categorization (Nord, Coleman-Jensen, Andrews, & Carlson, 2010), food insecurity in the United States has been targeted through a variety of interventions by both the government and the non-profit sectors. The persistent lack of effectiveness by these interventions to create a more food-secure society has led to well-justified and important criticisms of the systems and structures undergirding dominant forms of food assistance (Biggerstaff, Morris, Nichols-Casebolt, 2002; Poppendieck, 1998). Food waste occurring at every point in our large-scale, industrial food system—and taking place simultaneously with the struggle of many Americans to meet their food needs—screams for action. Crop production and harvesting, multiple transports, packaging, as well as raw and prepared sales, all allow, anticipate, and accept food waste as part of the normal mode of operations (Bloom, 2010). In response to this troubling disconnect of wasted food piling up in landfills and hungry people overwhelming food assistance providers, the food rescue and redistribution movement has emerged. By harnessing food that otherwise would be wasted and redirecting this food either to individuals or to human service agencies, food rescue and redistribution programs make intuitive sense. This practical approach to food security is not a new concept; examples of this practice are evident in biblical times, as demonstrated in Leviticus 19:9-10:

> When you reap the harvest of your land, do not reap to the very edges of your field or gather the gleanings of your harvest. Do not go over your vineyard a second time or pick up the grapes that have fallen. Leave them for the poor and the stranger.

---

1 Conceptualizations of hunger and food insecurity have evolved since the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) began reporting them. For discussion of this evolution please see Andrews et al., 1998; Bickel et al., 1998; Bickel et al., 2000; Carlson et al., 1999; Hamilton et al., 1997a, 1997b; Nord & Bickel, 2002. Currently, food insecurity is measured on a spectrum where “insecurity” includes low and very low food security. The most recent report on food insecurity from the USDA Economic Research Service, cited in text, was released in November 2010 and can be accessed in its entirety at http://www.ers.usda.gov/Publications/ERR108/ERR108.pdf
Modern food rescue and redistribution programs span a wide range—from farm and field gleaning such as those referenced in the passage above to the diversion of entire trucks and shipments rejected by supermarkets to the collection of prepared food excesses from restaurants, bakeries, cafeterias, and other local food service establishments.

Although the reclaiming and repurposing of food that otherwise would be wasted depends on the excess and surplus of the market-based food system, this practice also challenges the conceptual foundations of a system characterizing food strictly as a commodity and equating access with monetary means. This economic-based conceptualization has bled into how food assistance is approached and structured. Food waste and food rescue offer a critical take. First, food rescue efforts hold the proverbial mirror to a society that has accepted a system that bases food security on buying power and turns a blind eye to food waste. Additionally, as the Leviticus passage underscores, food rescue and redistribution efforts are not solely tied to the wasteful practices of a large-scale, industrial food system; seasonal excesses are often present in sustainable food production. In this sense, food rescue and redistribution tactics play a critical role in locally-focused and sustainable food systems.

**Researcher Connection to Food Rescue**

By age 14, I was a firm supporter of food rescue and redistribution as a food security strategy. My experience as a restaurant worker served as the original catalyst; hauling loaves of bread, mashed potatoes, bacon, and sliced tomatoes to the garbage nightly offends notions of good sense regardless of one’s awareness of and connections to the experience of food insecurity. Growing up volunteering with a local soup kitchen, however, I was conscious that there were people who struggled daily to meet their food needs. Awareness of waste and want within the same community—my own community—became difficult to reconcile. With
encouragement from my mother, I spoke with the house manager of the local transitional shelter, confirming that he would be interested in receiving available food donations. Following the establishment of this donor site, I stopped cramming loaves of bread into my parents’ basement freezer and began packaging the leftover food, delivering it to this transitional shelter on the nights I worked. Although this action alleviated some of my personal guilt about toting useable food to the garbage, I also recognized that my efforts accounted for the waste of just one food stand in one shopping mall in one town. Clearly, systemic changes were needed both to fully acknowledge the ubiquity of food waste as well as to create a more accessible, less wasteful food system.

Being employed in the food service industry for the next 15 years furthered my commitment to the food rescue and redistribution movement. While keeping my employers informed regarding surplus food donation-related policy progress (such as the 1996 Emerson Good Samaritan Food Donation Act\(^2\) protecting donors from legal liability), I also became involved in a variety of anti-hunger projects. After participating in projects ranging from Society of St. Andrews “potato drops” to baking desserts using giant cans of government-issued peanut butter, I finally located my niche as a food rescue activist, becoming involved in 2001 with Food Not Bombs. Consistent with my own values of food as a human right and the promotion of a non-violent food system, Food Not Bombs’ radical take on food rescue and redistribution includes the collecting, cooking, and sharing of meals in public spaces. In addition to my activist interest in food rescue, I channeled my undergraduate and MSW programs towards improving my knowledge of innovative approaches to food assistance, continually seeking information about programs utilizing food rescue and redistribution.

\(^2\) Named for the late Congressman from Missouri and enacted by the 104\(^{th}\) United States Congress, the original legislation may be found in its entirety at http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Bill_Emerson_Good_Samaritan_Food_Donation_Act
Growing up in the Washington, D.C. metro area, I was exposed early in life to one such effort—D. C. Central Kitchen (DCCK). I recall initial coverage by the local media of what may currently be the nation’s most well-known food rescue and redistribution program. Since its first surplus food collection following the 1989 inaugural celebration for President George H. W. Bush, DCCK has steadily grown in its capacity, presently distributing 4000 meals a day to individuals and agencies in the Washington, D.C. area. The ability of DCCK to provide such a large number of daily meals relying primarily on rescued food illustrates the rationality of framing hunger and food insecurity as community-level issues, with food rescue and redistribution as a pragmatic, community-level response. DCCK founder Robert Egger (2004) articulated this idea in his book *Begging for Change*, stating,

> As I started delivering food around the city, I began to recognize how nonprofits like after-school programs, homeless shelters, and senior centers have to deal with people everyday, which means they have to deal with food issues everyday. If the D.C. Central Kitchen provided these organizations with pre-cooked, nutritious meals, these sister agencies would be able to keep more of their money, redirect their staff and resources, and ultimately stay more focused on their missions. The same was true with individuals….The children who received an after-school meal wouldn’t have to worry about the ache in their bellies and could concentrate on what their tutors were teaching them. (p. 38)

In 2001, the food rescue and redistribution movement “went to college.” After 12 years of operating DCCK, Egger and a former DCCK intern transposed the mission of DCCK onto a university campus, creating the first branch of the Campus Kitchens Project (CKP) at St. Louis
University (http://www.campuskitchens.org). Like DCCK, CKP harnesses surplus food that otherwise would be wasted, repurposes these foods into nutritious meals, and distributes the meals to human service agencies and individuals. The IHE setting, student leadership, and program scale are the major distinguishing factors between these programs, with the CKP defining its mission to use service as a tool to:

- Strengthen bodies by using existing resources to meet hunger and nutritional needs in our community;
- Empower minds by providing leadership and service learning opportunities to students, and educational benefits to adults, seniors, children and families in need;
- And build communities by fostering a new generation of community-minded adults through resourceful and mutually beneficial partnerships among students, social service agencies, businesses, and schools. (http://www.campuskitchens.org/)

Since the first branch was instituted in 2001 at St. Louis University in Missouri, student-led movements have organized and established CKP branches across the United States, and in combination have served over 1,000,000 meals with the help of over 20,000 student volunteers. (http://www.campuskitchens.org/)

**Researcher Connection to the CKP Organizing Process**

Through the development of this research plan, I have created a relationship with CKP’s National Office. In addition, I have communicated with the National Office related to efforts aimed at establishing a CKP branch at The University of Georgia (UGA). Since returning to student status to pursue a PhD in 2009, I have focused my food rescue activism towards this goal. Progress in the organizing process includes creating an official UGA student group, establishing the Office of Service Learning as the campus sponsoring office, and connecting this
pursuit with courses and professors in multiple disciplines, including Women’s Studies and Geography. While this movement towards institutionalizing CKP into UGA feels essential to the program’s capacity to outlast any particular student leadership, the most significant progress has come from securing a community partner agency. Connecting with the Athens Community Council on Aging, and specifically its Grandparents Raising Grandchildren Program, has propelled CKP organizing at UGA beyond the theoretical realm and into CFS interventions.

**CKP’s Converging Contexts**

As the UGA organizing process has confirmed, branches of the CKP are connected to multiple institutions. Each college- or university-based branch constructs and maintains several fundamental relationships. One such relationship is with the IHE, which serves as the host institution, another is with the CKP National Office and other branches in the network. A third type of relationship exists between each branch and a set of local partner organizations which provide distribution outlets for the recovered food. Given the convergence of these multiple contexts, there will likely be significant differences in the culture and operations of each CKP branch. CKP branches are both part of and independent from their host IHEs, presenting a unique opportunity to explore “town-gown” service relationships. Research investigating service-learning and other IHE-community partnerships often report challenges when the socio-economic and ethnic composition of the community is not mirrored in the college or university (Creighton, 2006; Ehsan, 2006; Maurrasse, 2001). Regardless of potential problematic aspects, CKP continues to expand. Research is needed so that awareness of the contributions and challenges may be used to move CKP further towards actualizing its mission. Context-aware research opens the door to critical examination of complex issues including the challenges of
town-gown relationships and the role of class dynamics in service—issues that can complicate CFS and fail to advance discourse regarding food access and how to address inequality.

**Conceptual Framework**

The town-gown relationships established through the CKP branch are intended to enhance the food security of the community partners; therefore, when seeking a conceptual framework to help guide inquiry into CKP, community food security (CFS) is a good fit. As opposed to framing the individual as the appropriate unit of analysis and intervention, as is the case with traditional government and non-profit food assistance, programs drawing on CFS ideals provide an alternative understanding for how food security may be achieved. By shifting attention towards creating “a situation in which all community residents obtain a safe, culturally acceptable, nutritionally adequate diet through a sustainable food system that maximizes community self-reliance and social justice” (Hamm & Bellows, 2003, p. 37), CFS depathologizes food insecurity by reframing food security as a community-level planning and prevention issue. Social work, with firm roots in the ecological perspective (Germain, 1979) and allegiance to the core value of “the importance of human relationships” (NASW, 2008, paragraph 3), is easily aligned with CFS. As the preamble to the National Association of Social Workers *Code of Ethics* (2008) states, “[s]ocial workers seek to enhance the capacity of people to address their own needs. . . [and] also seek to promote the responsiveness of organizations, communities, and other social institutions to individuals’ needs and social problems” (p. 1). Predicated on constructing interventions specific to the needs and resources of each community, CFS echoes social work’s core professional values in its argument against one-size-fits-all models of food assistance (Bellows & Hamm, 2003; Fisher, 1999; Hamm & Bellows, 2003).
**Concepts and Theoretical Connections in CFS**

Whereas the definition of CFS helps envision a future of food secure communities, the values and principles comprising CFS provide a conceptual framework for inquiry into the selected CKP branch and its relationship to its community. Six principles of CFS were outlined by Fisher (1999) in a newsletter article of the Community Food Security Coalition. These principles are:

1) Focusing on the needs of low-income populations;

2) Recognizing that lasting food security is based on a variety of circumstances including sustainable agriculture and a healthy environment;

3) Encouraging both local food production and consumption of locally grown foods;

4) Emphasizing community self-reliance and decreased dependence on emergency food assistance, including employment security, access to food retailers, etc.;

5) Creating a democratic and community-responsive food system dependent on stable local agriculture and reconnecting people and their food; and

6) Acknowledging that a variety of systems and perspectives informing food security means ensuring representatives from these perspectives have a voice.

CFS’s focus on interconnection, empowerment, and justice in the food system is consistent with a critical theory worldview (Freire, 1970) and the professional values of social work (NASW, 2008). Additionally, CFS’s delinking of food security from monetary means and marketplace access draws on the perspective that food is a human right, an influential notion in international
food security discourse (Chilton & Rose, 2009). These converging ideas inform this study’s overall goals, purpose, and specific research questions.

**Relevance of CFS to Social Work Practice**

Beyond noting the overlap between social work’s core professional values and the principles outlined in CFS, articulation of social work practice realities have the potential to contribute to increased pragmatism in the CFS movement. Social work is predicated on intervention. Given that social workers are instructed to pay “particular attention to the empowerment of people who are vulnerable, oppressed, or living in poverty” (NASW, 2008, paragraph 1), there is a responsibility to support programs that assist both individuals and communities in building their capacities to address the problems they experience. Because of social work’s commitment to vulnerable populations, professional social workers in a variety of practice settings routinely interface with the realities of food insecurity. Ideally, interventions would encompass the core values of service and social justice. However, due to the focus in many practice settings on addressing immediate needs, social workers inevitably tend towards service, at times making referrals to programs and resources incongruent with professional values. While linking clients with services such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP, formerly the Food Stamp Program) that accept and promote an economic conceptualization of the food system may fulfill the “service” aspect of social work, these actions fall short of the social justice aims of social work. Pursuit of social justice requires that systems which create inequality be challenged. CFS’s conceptualization of food security can help push social work practitioners towards advocating and building programs in congruence with professional values.
As I transitioned from restaurant work to social work, my commitment to food rescue and redistribution strengthened. In my social work practice, I struggled with keeping social justice in balance with service during everyday tasks, including linking clients with food assistance. Supporting clients in meeting their immediate food needs frequently occupied several hours—securing food sources as well as transportation. Moreover, as a mental health social worker, addressing food needs was not my primary task or purpose. Due to the crisis-oriented circumstances that frequently accompanied clients’ lack of sufficient food, I was seldom able to consider whether my referral choices were consistent with my professional values.

In contrast, as a volunteer with Food Not Bombs, I was able to interact with some of the same individuals who, during my work day, were labeled as clients in a completely different way: The preparing and sharing of food together created an atmosphere of cooperation rather than charitable assistance. Although not all programs falling under the food rescue and redistribution category would hold up to this version of cooperative, community-based interaction, the possibility for even a portion of these efforts to challenge the worker-client binary demonstrates the potential for pragmatic justice in food rescue and redistribution.

**Study Purpose and Research Questions**

Similar to the worker-client binary which troubles social work practitioners’ social justice aims, students and community members working through IHE-community partnerships often experience difficulties related to the town-gown divide (Creighton, 2006; Ehsan, 2006; Maurrasse, 2001). Qualitative research provides CKP participants and CFS activists with rich and detailed information about CKP’s organizational culture and relationships with community organizations and members. As a starting point for this investigative process, I conducted an in-depth examination of one CKP branch: the Marquette University branch (CKMU) in Milwaukee,
Wisconsin. Using a CFS framework, the purpose of this study is to better understand the culture of CKMU and investigate its relationship to the broader community. Awareness of town-gown dynamics, student motivations, and the depth and quality of relationships between the CKP and its community partners are all needed to pragmatically confront inevitable challenges and help move CKP towards alignment with CFS ideals. Four questions will guide this research:

1) How is CKMU structured and organized?
   a. What values, beliefs, and role constructions are evident among CKMU staff and volunteers?
   b. How are individual and institutional values reflected in CKMU?

2) How are relationships constructed and maintained between representatives of CKMU and representatives of community partner agencies?

3) What are the cultural norms for student engagement?
   a. How do students construct their roles as CKMU participants?
   b. What motivations do students express for participation in CKMU?

4) How do CKMU stakeholder groups think about the successes, challenges, and contributions of CKMU?
   a. What is CKMU’s connection to food security?
   b. How does CKMU demonstrate an environmental understanding of the food system?

**Design and Scope of the Study**

Determining the most appropriate and effective research methodology for a given study often stems from a review of existing research knowledge on the topic area in combination with the theoretical framework and epistomolgical beliefs of the researcher. My decision to employ a
qualitative, ethnographic case study design to investigate CKMU resulted from just such a combination. In qualitative research, findings are subjective and time and place dependent; the notion of an objective “truth” that exists separate from and outside of its context is not the goal (Charmaz, 2006; Creswell, 2007). Rather, qualitative research aims at a fuller, more complete understanding of a phenomenon within its context. In considering how to build knowledge and understanding about CKMU or any CKP branch, research could focus on isolating and testing variables related to preconceived notions of organizational operations and structures. However, with qualitative investigation, the direction of research is emergent with “the collection of data in a natural setting sensitive to the people and places under study” (Creswell, 2007, p. 37). Case study methodology supports focused attention to context while also requiring the researcher to bind the case by time, place, and activity (Creswell, 2007; Stake, 1995).

Honoring the constructed nature of reality is of particular importance when conducting research that aims to contribute to social change. Separating studies from their contexts or trying to reach a sample size that will allow for generalizations to be made by “controlling” for variables will be ineffective. What is needed is knowledge that acknowledges and values the unique contexts and influences relevant to the topic of investigation. This grounded knowledge and detailed understanding of both case and context makes sense for researching the CKMU due to the desire for this research to be a contribution to CKMU’s self-awareness and capacity for reflective, progressive advancement as well as to inform the efforts of others interested in forming a CKP branch or similar program.

**Research Timeline**

Data collection took place during a six-week period in September and October of 2011. Selection of CKMU as the case study site resulted from a combination of factors including
findings from pilot survey research, feasibility, and opportunity to learn. During my six-week stay at CKMU, I completed participant observations, conducted semi-structured interviews, facilitated focus groups, and reviewed relevant documents and artifacts. I employed the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) whereby “analysis is continual in the field. . . [however], it is only after leaving the field that the final analysis of data can proceed” (Janesick, 2003, p. 193). Thus, an iterative analysis process took place during the five months following the completion of field work. Communication with my major professor, methodologist, and other members of my dissertation committee supplied feedback which was incorporated during this analysis period. A final report of this research was submitted during March of 2012.

**Sampling and Participants**

Just as in the site selection process, purposive sampling was utilized in the recruitment of study participants. The goal of a purposive or judgment sample is to allow for the researcher to identify the sources of data that will yield the richest information (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2009). This technique, used in a wide array of qualitative research studies, can be contrasted with random sampling—the commonly accepted gold standard of sampling techniques in quantitative research. Because of my aim to particularize rather than generalize, in combination with my inability to capture the entirety of available information relevant to the case, the logic of purposive sampling was applied across the four sources of data in the CKMU case study: (participant) observations, individual interviews, focus group interviews, as well as documents and artifacts. A more complete discussion of participant roles and data collection strategies is included in Chapter 3.
Remainder of the Study

The subsequent chapters include a comprehensive review of the literature, a nuanced discussion of the methodology, a presentation of findings responding to the research questions, and a discussion of the contributions of this research to CFS; IHE-community partnerships; and social work research, education, and practice. To underscore the need for the social work voice in CFS, I began Chapter 2 with a discussion of how the preponderance of social work research has addressed food security. I discussed the economic conceptualization of food and how this understanding has shaped and limited food assistance interventions. CFS is presented as the conceptual framework for the study, and I connected its main principles with critical theory and social work’s core professional values. Following the outline of this framework, I included theoretical and empirical contributions to the CFS literature. I then directed the discussion towards an exploration of IHE-community partnerships—reviewing their history, challenges, and types. Demonstrating the potential for IHE-partnerships to support a social change agenda such as CFS, I included service-learning literature from social work courses as well as courses where the service component focused on food security. To conclude the literature review, I positioned the ethnographic case study of CKMU as contributory to the intersection of CFS, social work, and IHE-community partnerships.

After showing how the case study contributes to the aforementioned areas, Chapter 3 moves the study forward by detailing specifics around study design as well as the research and analysis process. The start of the chapter outlines the rationale for case study and aspects of the context and purpose shaping the study design. Next, I discuss the process resulting in CKMU as the case study site and provide a site description. Plans for data collection including how research questions connect with data collection strategies are included in this chapter, as are
plans for the data analysis process. A discussion of reliability and validity in the research process in this chapter supports the quality of the data and of the findings. Finally, I discuss my connection to this research, including ethical considerations, assumptions, biases, and my strategies for self-awareness and reflexivity as a researcher.

**Chapter Summary**

In this chapter, I have framed food rescue and redistribution programming as a logical food security strategy, given the coexistence of high levels of food insecurity with vast amounts of food waste. To better understand the background of the case study of CKMU, I shared information about CKP’s parent organization, DCCK, and the development path of CKP. Also included in this chapter was an overview of my own involvement in food rescue activism which contributed to my research interest in CKP. I briefly discussed the selection of a qualitative, ethnographic case study methodology, the research timeline, as well as the rationale for purposeful sampling. This chapter touched on research and literature related to food insecurity, the conceptualization of food security from a CFS framework, and the partnership challenges for IHEs entering into service-oriented relationships with community members or agencies. In the next chapter, I flesh out these issues and demonstrate with greater specificity the potential contributions of the CKMU case study.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this study is to better understand the culture of the Campus Kitchen at Marquette University (CKMU) and its relationship to the broader community. Four research questions guide this investigation:

1) How is CKMU structured and organized?
   a. What values, beliefs, and role constructions are evident among CKMU staff and volunteers?
   b. How are individual and institutional values reflected in CKMU?

2) How are relationships constructed and maintained between representatives of CKMU and representatives of community partner agencies?

3) What are the cultural norms for student engagement?
   a. How do students construct their roles as CKMU participants?
   b. What motivations do students express for participation in CKMU?

4) How do CKMU stakeholder groups think about the successes, challenges, and contributions of CKMU?
   a. What is CKMU’s connection to food security?
   b. How does CKMU demonstrate an environmental understanding of the food system?

In this chapter, I will position an ethnographic case study of CKMU as a logical entry point for investigating the intersection between food security interventions and institutions of higher
education (IHE)-community partnerships. The Campus Kitchens Project (CKP) has rarely been the subject of academic investigation\(^3\); however, literature related to food security, food waste and food rescue, and service-oriented partnerships between IHEs and their communities is plentiful. Drawing on theoretical and empirical literature from these primary areas, I demonstrate a knowledge gap regarding how groups such as CKMU function and relate to their communities.

In addition to books and other materials gathered through coursework, I utilized seven on-line databases to elicit articles for this literature review. I searched a 10-year timeframe within the following databases: Academic Search Complete, Agricola, Education Research Complete, Social Work Abstracts, SocINDEX with Full Text, Sociological Collection, and Women’s Studies International. Search terms included: social work, food security, food insecurity, hunger, food assistance, community food security, food rescue, food surplus, food waste, food loss, university-community, town-gown, and service partnerships.

I begin by discussing how food security has been approached within social work research. Subsequent to this examination of the social work literature, I argue that food security interventions have been limited by the dominant economic conceptualization of food as a commodity. I then discuss the notion of community food security (CFS), outline its major concepts, and connect CFS with critical theory and the core values of social work. Following the discussion of the conceptual framework (Maxwell, 2005), I provide a historical summary of CFS-oriented projects, focusing particular attention on community gardening, the role of the CFS Coalition, food waste, and food rescue and redistribution. To close the chapter, I explore the history and growth of IHE-community partnerships, explore types of partnerships, investigate

\(^3\) Published in the *Journal of Business Ethics*, the article “Working Towards Empirically-Based Continuous Improvements in Service-Learning,” by Flannery and Pragman (2007) studied the impact of service-learning over multiple semesters in a Principles of Management course. CKP was the service-learning setting; however, the study’s focus was student perceptions regarding social responsibility and civic engagement, and did not include a detailed account of CKP as the context.
instances where such partnerships have focused on food security, and discuss their common challenges as well as their potential to contribute to social change.

**Social Work and Food Security**

Social workers routinely interface with people experiencing food insecurity and requiring emergency food assistance. One important role for social work research is to support practitioners in identifying best practices—that is, the most effective types of supports and interventions reflective of professional values. Therefore, when conducting research on a self-described, anti-hunger organization such as CKP, it makes sense to first examine the typical angles from which social work researchers have approached food security. How food security issues are conceptualized impacts not only the designs and purposes of specific research projects, but also the profession’s opportunity to advocate for food justice and systemic changes. This section of the literature review focus on understanding social work research discourse regarding food security.

**Experience of Food Insecurity**

One of the most common ways social work research addresses food insecurity is through investigation of people’s experience. Food insecurity may be examined exclusively, or it may be connected to another issue or “risk-factor,” such as disability (Parish, Rose, Grinstein-Weiss, Richman, & Andrews, 2008), addiction (Kaufman, Isralowitz, & Resnik, 2005), environmental crisis (Pyles, Kulkarni, & Lein, 2008), or poverty (Bisgaier & Rhodes, 2011). Studies such as these often refer to the negative consequences of food insecurity on physical and mental health and may include recommendations for social workers, such as increased attention to vulnerable groups and policy advocacy.
Parish, Rose, Grinstein-Weiss, Richman, and Andrews (2008), utilizing data from the 2002 National Survey of America’s Families (NSAF), compared material hardships, including food insecurity, for families containing children with disabilities versus families without disabled children. Findings demonstrated that controlling for all covariates, children with disabilities and their families were significantly more likely to have experienced food insecurity. . . . [with a] 78% greater likelihood of reporting that they had worried food would run out. . . a 78% greater likelihood of reporting that the food they bought did not last. . . and an 89% greater likelihood of reporting that they had skipped meals because of lack of money. (p. 83-84)

This research highlights the multitude of factors that increase the risk of food insecurity, and how factors like disability are often absent from policy discussions. The authors advocate for an increase in Supplemental Security Income (SSI) payments, arguing that greater financial stability would mediate material hardship for these families. For social work research to advocate for such policy changes is understandable; people who are raising children with disabilities, like anyone dealing with food insecurity, are often in emergency food situations. However, when social work researchers share findings such as these, recommendations and implications for practice must also include critical attention to the systems from which these inequalities and “at-risk” populations are derived.

As with disability, addiction is also a risk factor for food insecurity. Kaufman, Isralowitz, and Reznik (2005), members of the social work faculty from Ben-Gurion University in Israel, conducted one such investigation on the intersection between addiction and food insecurity. Reported in their article “Food Insecurity Among Drug Addicts in Israel: Implications for Social Work Practice,” the authors aimed to assess food insecurity levels, examine individual
characteristics related to food insecurity, and to gain a more detailed understanding of food insecurity in a population of addicts. Although their findings indicated high rates of food insecurity across their sample, addicts were “significantly more food insecure than non-drug addicts (50% vs. 35%)” (p. 26). In addition to highlighting the shortfalls of Israel’s social welfare state, this study shed light on another important consideration: the (lack of) participation in charitable food assistance programs. Survey results showed that, in spite of experiencing food insecurity, only 39% of non-addicts and 14% of addicts accessed charitable food assistance. Due to the survey-based nature of the research design, this study lacks the capacity to explain low participation in the midst of such a high level of need. However, in congruence with this study’s findings, obstacles ranging from social stigma to lack of transportation have been connected with low food assistance program participation in the United States (Biggerstaff, Morris, & Nichols-Casebolt, 2002; Brandon, Plotnick, & Stockman, 1994). Although cultural differences need to be considered when applying findings of this study to the United States, there is value in considering what prevents those in need from accessing current forms of assistance and expanding notions of what food assistance programming means in an effort to extend food security to greater numbers of people. Among their intervention recommendations, Kaufman and Associates (2005) argued for increased “cooperation and coordination [amongst] welfare, local government, and community-based services” including non-traditional food security efforts such as “community gardens, lunch clubs, and communal cooking programs” (p. 29).

In addition to personal circumstances such as disability or substance dependence, people dealing with environmental crises such as natural disasters have an increased likelihood of experiencing food insecure situations. In examining the food-related experiences and coping strategies of 67 Hurricane Katrina survivors, Pyles, Kulkarni, and Lein (2008) underscored the
need for a multi-scale approach to food security planning. Interviews revealed that scavenging unoccupied homes and stores for food was a common experience and, in many cases, a tactic necessary for survival. The authors explained that a major disaster, disrupting community and informal networks, illuminates the dependence of many households on larger state systems of support, and the degree of hardship experienced when it fails. . . . Sharing and exchanging of resources are economic coping strategies commonly utilized by low-income families. . . . [Although] such sharing can carry people through the two or three days of dislocation and trouble following many storms, it is not a sufficient strategy [for severe natural disasters]. (p. 51)

Implications from this study include a call to further address food security when planning for natural disaster responses. The authors also aptly point out the inability of major food assistance programs (e.g., SNAP/ Food Stamp Program) to operate in disaster circumstances, when food stores are not able to operate.

A frequent underlying (or, at times, an explicit) assumption in social work research, is that food insecurity is most commonly experienced by those living in poverty. A recent study from social work characterizes food insecurity in this way—as a “category of economic deprivation” (Bisgaier & Rhodes, 2011, p. 129). By focusing investigation on the impact of multiple financially-related stressors on patient health status, Bisgaier and Rhodes (2011) found that rates of food insecurity, among other variables, correlated with poor self-rated health scores. In addition to advocating for social workers to increase their voice regarding health care reform, these authors argued for inclusion of financial circumstances in social worker-patient assessments, particularly in hospital emergency department settings. This research reinforces the connection between an adequate diet and physical and mental health, underscoring the need for
social work to prioritize food security issues. However, it does little to disconnect ideas about how to create food security from marketplace access.

**Food Assistance Programming**

Social work researchers also approach food security issues through investigation of both public and private food assistance programs. In addition to government intervention and assistance methods\(^4\), the United States also houses a network of over 200 private food banks. These charitable operations “supply food to more than 37 million Americans each year, including 14 million children and 3 million seniors” (http://www.feedingamerica.org). Research from disciplines other than social work has demonstrated significant overlap between those participating in public and private food assistance programs (Berner, Paynter, & Ozer, 2008; Bhattarai, Duffy, & Raymond, 2005; Wilde, 2007).

One way to research any type of food assistance programming is to evaluate its effectiveness. Bartfeld and Ahn (2011) made such an effort in their research pertaining to the School Breakfast Program. While the authors acknowledged that previous research has correlated participation in food assistance programming with those who are at higher risk for food insecurity, this particular study focused on access rather than participation. The purpose was to “determine whether having access to the School Breakfast Program reduced the risk of household food insecurity among a national sample of third-grade students” (p. 471). Taking a sample of data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Survey, analyses were conducted and findings revealed that availability of the School Breakfast Program provided a degree of

---

\(^4\) Currently the U.S. federal government administers nine major food assistance programs: the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP, formerly known as the Food Stamp Program); the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC); the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP); the School Lunch and Breakfast Programs; the Summer Food Service Program; the Elderly Nutrition Program; the Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP); the Commodity Distribution Program; and the Food Distribution on Indian Reservations (FDPIR) program (http://www.fns.usda.gov). All of these programs are administered through the United States Department of Agriculture except for WIC, which is administered via Department of Health and Human Services.
protection for families on the verge of food insecurity. For families over the standard threshold of food insecurity however, program access did not have a significant impact on food security status. Based on these findings, the authors advocated for increased attention to the Child Nutrition Programs policy.

Like the School Breakfast Program, SNAP is a federally funded food assistance program operating across the United States. Utilizing data from the 2003 Food Security Supplement to the Current Population Survey, Lombe, Yu, and Nebbitt (2009) investigated the relationship between food stamp participation and food security as well as the role of informal supports for single, female-headed households. Findings related to demographic characteristics characterizing food stamp participation—lower income, age (being older), lower education level, and working fewer hours—were consistent with previous research (Bhattarai et al, 2005; Zekeri, 2006); however, results of this study contradicted previous research that pointed to a negative relationship between non-white status and food security, finding that “race/ethnicity, black and American Indian/American Native were associated with greater household food security” (p. 312). The overall analysis indicated “food stamp takeup and informal assistance were positively associated with household food security” (p. 309). The authors called for more research to be conducted to flesh out these preliminary understandings. Secondary data analysis has the capacity to respond to certain research questions; however, due to the lack of relationship between researcher and respondent, this type of inquiry (whether quantitative or qualitative) is limited in its capacity to explore follow-up questions the findings may generate.

Food stamp participation is also explored in the article “Likelihood of Using Food Stamps During the Adulthood Years” (Rank & Hirschl, 2005). Through their analysis of “approximately 260,000 person-years of information on food stamp use” (p. 137) these social
work researchers employed a life-course perspective to investigate the risk of food insecurity. While about 10% of the population is enrolled in the Food Stamp Program at any one time, results of this study “indicate that at least 42% of the US population will experience a year in which they encounter food insecurity” (p. 144). By examining the potential for food insecurity to occur over the lifespan, this research demonstrates the precarious nature of food security. The authors argued that “[b]eing able to empirically establish these patterns is vital in demonstrating the relevance of the federal food assistance safety net and the emergency food and nutrition needs of Americans as they make their way across the adulthood years” (p. 145). While strengthening the food assistance safety net is certainly needed to address current needs, the authors bypass questioning the dominant food system’s capacity to create food security, seemingly content with interventions responding to food insecurity.

Social work research has also combined focusing on the experience of food insecurity with critical attention to specific food assistance efforts. While providing demographic and descriptive information on people receiving emergency food assistance, Biggerstaff, Morris, and Nichols-Casebolt (2002) also underscored low participation in the Food Stamp Program. Echoing concerns raised by other studies (Poppendieck, 1998), this research confirms that many people relying on private, charitable emergency food assistance, such as food pantries and soup kitchens, are not receiving food stamps. A multi-stage cluster sample of emergency food assistance recipients in Virginia (n=1500) revealed that only 37% participated in the Food Stamp Program. These authors highlight that the profession of social work has “direct[ed] little attention to the issues of hunger and food assistance programs” (p. 275) and call for inclusion of food resources as an aspect of social work service assessments. They warn that “[b]ecause social workers most often omit food adequacy as part of the assessment process, clients may be
reluctant to raise food needs, thinking that these needs are outside of the social worker’s interests or responsibilities” (p. 275). Implications from this research include the need for social workers to maintain awareness regarding emergency food assistance providers as well as knowledge about administrative requirements of the Food Stamp Program. While these suggestions are geared towards social work practitioners having competency in helping clients meet their food needs, these authors also point out the social justice issue raised when food security is defined solely through individual terms. They call for attention to structural inequalities and argue that social workers need to become “better educated about issues of hunger and food assistance and their broader public policy implications” (p. 276).

Research from outside the United States also has the potential to inspire critical reflection on domestic food assistance programming. A recent qualitative interview study of past and present participants in the Canadian welfare systems’ Ontario Works Program revealed that structuring food access solely through the marketplace reproduces inequality (Lightman, Herd, & Mitchell, 2008). The Ontario Works Program intended to connect participants with employment, thereby increasing self-sufficiency. However, findings from semi-structured interviews with 90 participants showed that

[i] irrespective of whether they were “welfare-poor” or “working-poor,” the majority of panel members reported compromised hunger status, both fear of, as well as actual hunger, and monotonous diets lacking necessary nutrition. Such inadequate diets exerted a damaging toll on the physical and mental health of participants. (p. 244)

This study shows the Ontario Works Program achieving some degree of effectiveness in reducing unemployment; food security, however, continued to be an unreachable state for many. In light of these findings, the authors focused their critique on the erosion of the social safety net.
However, the replication of income inequality in food insecurity calls for examination and
expansion of the ways food is accessed.

**Emergence of a Critical Perspective**

The majority of social work research over the last 10 years demonstrates that,
overwhelmingly, attention given to food security does not confront the structural inequalities of
the dominant, industrialized food system. Rather, the focus is on the experience of food
insecurity and existing programs. Implications for practice are geared towards improvements in
assessment or access, stopping short of system-level action. However, social work research has
produced notable exceptions to this norm in both the conceptual and intervention-oriented realms
(Freedman & Bess, 2011; Hazra, 2009; Kaiser, 2011; Jacobson, 2007; Jacobson & Rugeley,
2007; Jacobson, Pruitt-Chapin, & Rugeley, 2009).

One example of social work research that draws attention to the “mutually reinforcing”
relationship between poverty and hunger comes from outside the United States. In his article
“Hunger and Undernourishment in India,” Hazra (2009) described a disconnect between progress
in agricultural production and hunger. Over the last several decades, India has transitioned from
dependency on food import to producing a sufficient supply of grain. However, due to food
access relying on monetary means, rates of chronic hunger and undernutrition remain high.
Hazra noted that accepting this situation stymies progress and development in other areas:

> Food insecurity, in terms of lack of access to adequate nutritious food, and
> poverty mutually reinforce each other. . . . Hunger and undernutrition make it
> extremely difficult for poor people to improve their own livelihoods and to make any
> meaningful contribution toward sustainable and broad-based goals. (p. 45)
This disconnect between a plentiful food supply and continued inequality in access mirrors the food insecurity situation in the United States. Hazra, like several of his U.S. social work counterparts, advocates for an approach to food security that would decentralize food assistance efforts, creating interventions responsive to community-level assets and needs. Though he does not mention a CFS framework explicitly, Hazra explained that “[f]ood security should safeguard the rights and interests of local communities. . . . [while] contribut[ing] to sustainable agriculture, rural development and achievement of sustainable production and consumption” (p. 45).

The connection between food security and development has also been parlayed by Kaiser (2011) in her conceptual piece, “Food Security: An Ecological-Social Analysis to Promote Social Development.” Highlighting systemic inequalities in food access and the potential role for social workers to contribute to building an alternative framework, Kaiser explained:

The United States’ industrialized food system embodies an unsustainable network of production and unequal distribution of food creating threats to both the natural environment and human development. Social workers have a unique set of community practice knowledge and skills that can help communities achieve greater access to affordable, healthy food. Building interdisciplinary networks to change food policies and develop sustainable and equitable food systems can address food insecurity. (p. 63)

After reviewing the individual and environmental health consequences of the dominant food system, Kaiser pointed out the on-going problem of food insecurity this system produces. Providing hope for change, she discussed several CFS-oriented interventions operating outside of the mainstream food assistance system. Community gardens, community supported agriculture
(CSA), farmers’ markets, and community food assessments (CFAs) all challenge the notion that food assistance either relies on charitable donations or reinforces marketplace access to food.

With their research of the Food Security Partners (FSP) group in Tennessee, Freedman and Bess (2011) focused further attention on the connections between environmental issues and food security. The FSP provides an example of an effort to create a more secure local food system, a shift the authors argue addresses the global issue of climate change. An on-going coalition, the research focus for Freedman and Bess was the interaction between partners during the FSP’s first year. Comprised of representatives from food banks, food retailers, farms, food advocacy groups, community organizations, community gardens, and the university, the creation of the FSP established new connections while increasing the frequency of others. Social network analysis also revealed a trend towards centralization in the FSP. Discussion of this finding underscored that community-based efforts around the food system are not inherently just or inclusive of all community members. Rather, the authors raised questions regarding “how emergent coalitions can establish the necessary structures and processes to maximize efficiency and mobilization capacity while attending to participatory values and democratic governing principles that inspired members’ initial participation” (p. 407). The authors contend that future research using social network analysis should be pursued to assess the capacity of coalitions such as the FSP to maintain democratic and participatory principles. Although the FSP is an imperfect coalition, by focusing on such a group, these social work researchers provide an example of a food security planning process aimed at building local networks and decreasing dependency on the dominant, industrial food system.

One of the most active voices in social work’s critical examination of current food security efforts, as well as the development of alternative interventions, is Jacobson (2007;
Jacobson & Rugeley, 2007; Jacobson, Pruitt-Chapin, & Rugeley, 2009). In her article detailing a successful community food assessment (CFA), Jacobson (2007) began by underscoring the lack of attention on food security issues from social work:

Although social work has a rich tradition of community practice as a vehicle for addressing key local concerns. . . little attention has been paid to food security, one of the most basic human needs, and what a number of scholars claim is a basic human right. . . . Social work literature is more likely to turn up articles on anorexia or bulimia, which suggests social workers may view food-related issues more through an individual, psychological lens than the ecosystems perspective. (p. 38)

Going on to connect social work’s core professional values with a community-level approach to food security planning, Jacobson reported on both the process and outcome objectives involved in a community food assessment (CFA) in which she was a participant. Conducting this CFA resulted in several contributions, including a local government resolution to increase local food systems’ security, an on-going food policy coalition to identify and address local needs, and a sizeable grant from the USDA Community Food Solutions Program to create and maintain infrastructure. This study demonstrates that relationships are key to creating an accessible and just food system. Moreover, Jacobson also commented on the challenge faced by the group when working to include the voices of those experiencing food insecurity:

The CFA gained power through choices made regarding steering committee representation. These were based strategically on connections to resources, on particular knowledge and skills, or to larger more powerful networks that would help provide increased credibility for the project. However, although considered a noteworthy goal by CFA proponents, there was no representation in the steering committee from people with
first-hand experience of food insecurity. A typical stereotype fed this decision—that people with limited resources have little time or energy for involvement in community work due to their own survival needs. (p. 49)

Jacobson argued that to avoid recreating the oppressive structures present in other social institutions, future CFA and CFS efforts need to actively pursue involving those experiencing food insecurity. And, although this particular CFA project may not have achieved such inclusion, Jacobson reminds readers of the “beauty and hope of CFS work is that it continually renews itself—what is not addressed in the first leg of the journey has the possibility of being addressed on the next” (p. 50).

Jacobson and Associates provide such an example in two articles exploring different aspects of the “Finding Solutions to Food Insecurity (FSFI)” project (Jacobson & Rugeley, 2007; Jacobson, Pruitt-Chapin, & Rugeley, 2009). Jacobson and Rugeley focused on the process of community-based participatory action research (CBPR). Echoing prior critiques (Bennett & Roberts, 2004; Beresford & Hoban, 2005; Lister, 2004) of a policy environment that does not value the voices of “those who bear the greatest burden of unsustainable policies,” (p. 31) the authors detailed the CBPR process. The FSFI project involved community members with first-hand food insecurity experience in discussions aimed at eliminating obstacles to accessing healthy foods. Outcomes from this project are on-going; however, “[o]ver the long haul the FSFI project hopes to challenge and change the public discourse about people living in poverty to reflect awareness of both structural and personal barriers to food insecurity” (p. 33). Similarly, in the article, “Toward Reconstructing Poverty Knowledge: Addressing Food Insecurity Through Grassroots Research Design and Implementation” (Jacobson, Pruitt-Chapin, & Rugeley, 2009), the research design helped spur critique regarding conceptualizations of poverty and food
insecurity. Through a series of public meetings, ideas that “[o]ne group has the power to give and take away, while the other must acquiesce to get their basic needs met” (p. 16) were broken down. This type of dialogue demonstrates the potential for CFS-oriented projects to deconstruct the provider-recipient binary common in social services and create space for practical and responsive ideas to flourish.

**Economic Conceptualization of Food**

Although efforts to think outside-the-box and detach food from monetary means are growing, food assistance interventions, by in large, remain tied to an economic framework. Due to this positioning of the economic model as the norm, much research related to food assistance programming lacks explicit recognition of or reflection on this framework (Nord et al., 2010). In addition to research from social work, numerous other studies have detailed shortcomings and problem outcomes for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) participants including food insufficiency, obesity, and nutritional deficiencies (Chen, Yen, & Eastwood, 2005; Gibson, 2003; Gundersen & Oliveira, 2001; Jensen, 2002). However, the discussion of such findings often focuses on access, adequacy, or participation issues with SNAP, rather than questioning the framework for food security on which SNAP is based (Beebout, 2006). Large-scale federal programs such as SNAP and the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) are predicated on market involvement; that is, the assistance comes in the form of additional income dedicated specifically to food purchasing. This approach to food assistance reveals a key assumption of the economic framework: Food is a commodity to be produced for and accessed through the marketplace (Nordahl, 2009).

The economic framing of food security manifests in these programs in two main ways: framing food insecurity as a poverty issue and government subsidization of industrial agriculture.
Both SNAP and commodity distribution programs have clear roots in the agricultural world, beginning during the New Deal as a way to distribute government-purchased goods to support farmers and stabilize prices (Piven & Cloward, 1971). The interests of this industry-government partnership have become institutionalized in federal food assistance, resulting in top-down, needs-based solutions (Anderson, 2008). Agricultural staples such as corn have flourished with government backing and currently flood the marketplace with low-cost, low-nutrient, high-calorie foods; studies have shown purchasing such items is a strategy employed by SNAP participants to stretch their food income (Nord & Hopwood, 2007; Wiig & Smith, 2009).

As previously mentioned, both the SNAP and WIC programs increase the capacity of individuals to participate in the food marketplace. Eligibility for SNAP is determined primarily through income: 130% of the poverty threshold qualifies most Americans for SNAP (Wilde, 2007). Likewise, households at or below 185% of the poverty line are eligible for WIC (http://www.fns.usda.gov). Perhaps due to income-based screening processes, multiple research studies report SNAP participants feeling stigmatized (Algert, Reibel, & Renvall, 2006; Zekeri, 2004). This issue, coupled with findings that question whether SNAP participation even significantly reduces food insecurity (Gibson-Davis & Foster, 2006; Huffman & Jensen, 2008), casts substantial doubt on the capacity for programs based on an economic conception of food security to address people’s real needs and to be effective in creating a food-secure society.

Another integral component of the economic model of food security is scale: The individual or household level is the focus for both measurement and intervention. Cultural values such as self-reliance and “the American dream” influence this aspect of the economic model (Messer & Cohen, 2007; Van Esterik, 1999). Many Americans cherish the notion that the United States is the land of opportunity—that regardless of your economic status or position at birth
there is equal chance to achieve financial stability and success. The ubiquity of this cultural value makes the individualized approach to food security interventions seem rational; if we believe the system is not the problem, then we do not understand or approach food security from a systemic level. By focusing on individuals and promoting their participation in the food marketplace, the intrinsic and non-monetary value of food is obscured, as are systemic issues including food waste.

The economic conceptualization of food security reflects the cultural values of the United States and provides a way to operationalize food assistance within the capitalist system. However, this narrow understanding of food as a commodity has limited creativity in planning food security interventions. And, importantly, inequality—“have-nots”—are inescapable within a food system based on this framework. Interventions that promote adaptation to structural inequalities contradict one of social work’s core values: social justice. To effectively support social change and move toward justice, social work research needs to include attention to food security efforts that diverge from the economic model. CFS projects, like those described by critical social work researchers in the preceding section, provide such an investigative opportunity. In the next section, I will outline the theoretical framework to be used in this study—CFS, and connect this way of conceptualizing food security with Freirian (1970) critical theory and social work’s core professional values.

**Conceptual Framework**

Although the economic conceptualization of food dominates much of the discourse around food security in social work and other disciplines, a number of other ways to think about food security also exist. A nutritional conceptualization of food security, concentrating on biological needs is also prevalent in the literature. Researchers using this approach tend to
examine food security interventions prizing nutritional adequacy (Frongillo & Wolfe, 2010; Lee, Johnson, & Fischer, 2010). In combination with the economic conceptualization of food, the nutrition-oriented understanding has been culturally influential and is reflected in many charitable food assistance efforts. Feminist perspectives have also contributed to food security discourse. In response to structural inequalities resulting in a disproportionate number of women experiencing food insecurity, feminist scholars have advocated for a gendered analysis of the issue—one that would value voices of women and recognize their integral role in food systems (Barndt, 1999; Phillips, 2009; Van Esterik, 1999).

Critical thinking around the food system does not stem exclusively from one perspective. While some feminist scholarship focuses analysis on the points of intersection between gender and the food system, feminist scholars such as Vandana Shiva (2000; 2008) also align with a focus on localism and the development of sustainable food systems and practices. By highlighting that “fossil fuels are the heart of industrial agriculture” Shiva (2008, p. 96) argued that multiple negative environmental consequences result from the current dominant food system. Underscoring the inseparable nature of food issues and environmental concerns, Shiva points to how overall climate change characterized by decreasing predictability in weather patterns and the extreme conditions of droughts and flooding contribute to unstable food production and increased risk for food insecurity and hunger.

By bringing together multiple disciplinary perspectives, community food security (CFS) presents the opportunity to utilize a different conceptual lens. Although CFS has an accepted and widely cited definition (Hamm & Bellows, 2003) and an articulated set of values (Fisher, 1999) its utility as a conceptual framework is less developed. By demonstrating how the values of CFS relate to tenets of critical theory and social work’s core professional values, we can better
understand how a CFS framework focuses attention on key issues that help to guide the direction of this study.

**Community Food Security**

Scholars across disciplines choose to employ CFS language and values in their research, demonstrating the relevance and breadth of the CFS perspective (Jacobson, 2007; Gottlieb & Fisher, 1996; Hamm & Bellows, 2003; Sullivan-Catlin, 2002). Explicating the interdisciplinary base of CFS in their article, “Community Food Security: Practice in Need of Theory,” Anderson and Cook (1999) suggested that CFS stems from “three streams of practice and disciplinary orientation” (p. 144)—community nutritionists and educators, progressive agricultural researchers and grassroots activists, and anti-hunger and community development researchers and activists. These influences are reflected in the six values of CFS outlined by Fisher (1999) and noted in Chapter 1:

1) Focusing on the needs of low-income populations;

2) Recognizing that lasting food security is based on a variety of circumstances including sustainable agriculture and a healthy environment;

3) Encouraging both local food production and consumption of locally grown foods;

4) Emphasizing community self-reliance and decreased dependence on emergency food assistance, including employment security, access to food retailers, etc.;

5) Creating a democratic and community-responsive food system dependent on stable local agriculture and reconnecting people and their food; and

6) Acknowledging that a variety of systems and perspectives informing food security means ensuring representatives from these perspectives have a voice.
These values provide a framework of priorities. The attention given to the food system as a whole implicates the industrial organization and economic conceptualization of food as the culprit of food insecurity—a sharp contrast to the assumption that individuals experiencing food insecurity are deficient in some way. While CFS’s values focus on creating a more just alternative rather than simply critiquing the current system, the emphasis on environmental sustainability, community self-reliance, and democratic inclusion of a variety of perspectives underscore the lack of these characteristics in the current system. Although CFS values were not constructed as an extension of critical theory or social work’s core professional values, illuminating the connections between these ideas strengthens CFS as a framework. Drawing connections between social work’s core professional values and CFS could also enhance support of CFS projects from the social work community.

Critical Theory

The six principles of CFS call for a transformation of the food system. Alluding to the oppression and inequality characterizing the dominant industrialized food system, these principles utilize ideas from critical theory to re-envision food security. The term “critical theory” is used at times to encompass several overlapping yet distinct theoretical traditions. Nuanced understandings of the divergent ideas and foci of theories including feminist, critical race, and post-structuralist are beyond the scope of this paper (for a more complete discussion of these theories, see Agger, 1998, or Tyson, 2006). For this discussion, critical theory implies a worldview concerned with power, inequality, and oppression. Critical theorists examine society’s structures and practices as well as interplay between them and human actors while drawing attention to privilege and oppression (for example, Foucault, 1977). Additionally, critical theorists have a common critique of positivism, questioning the existence of a single
reality or truth and challenging research methods that claim to achieve such conclusions within the social world. The purpose behind critical theory is a push towards transformation: changing practices and structures in pursuit of social justice.

An orientation to action is crucial for many critical theorists including Paulo Freire. In his seminal work, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire (1970) called for a new pedagogy, one that would transform the relationships between teachers, students, and society overall. Drawing on his experience as an educator in Brazil, Freire cast traditional education as oppressive. He outlined the relationship between oppressor and oppressed, detailed accepted structures and practices that reproduce these dynamics, and explored how to transform such inequality to create a more just situation where actors can regain their lost humanity. Although he was an educator, Freire’s message regarding these relationships and the opportunity and need for transformation through engaged praxis has much to offer social work generally and CFS specifically. A variety of disciplines outside of education have extended Freirian ideas in support of research efforts including public health, nursing, and theology (Brouse, Basch, Wolf, Smukler, Neugut, & Shea, 2003; Fulton, 1997; Lange, 1998). Freire’s critical pedagogy has also influenced social work, particularly around the professional orientation to empowerment (Breton, 1994; Lee, 2001).

Ideas from *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* have direct application to the current food system and relate to the six articulated values of CFS. Aspects of the dominant, industrialized food system—including the guarantee of unequal access, acceptance of large amounts of waste, and assistance methods that reinforce the dominant system—mirror the oppressive structures and practices described by Freire in the educational system. A CFS approach contains transformational potential. Four of the central ideas articulated in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* are
useful in relationship to CFS: 1) the relationship between oppressor and oppressed; 2) the banking concept; 3) the notion of praxis; and 4) the notion of dialogical change.

The relationship between the oppressor and the oppressed connects with the food system in multiple ways. Food insecurity is a result of limited access; access is fundamentally unequal. Food assistance operates in support of the overall system. Freire (1970) stated, “Once a situation of violence and oppression has been established, it engenders an entire way of life and behavior for those caught up in it—oppressors and oppressed alike” (p. 58). The CFS framework channels critical reflection towards the food system and where ideas about food security and food assistance originate. Fisher’s (1999) CFS principles focused on the needs of the food insecure; they also commit to increasing community-reliance and decreasing dependency on emergency food assistance. When put into action, these values have the potential to challenge the accepted relationship between oppressed and oppressor.

The concept of a “banking” approach to education is unpacked and discussed in terms of the masking of oppressive structures. Describing the narrative character of the banking concept, Freire (1970) explained:

The teacher talks about reality as if it were motionless, static, compartmentalized, and predictable. . . . His task is to “fill” the students with the contents of his narration—contents which are detached from reality, disconnected from the totality that engendered them and could give them significance.” (p. 71)

Extending this concept to the food system, people accessing food as a commodity become disconnected from the true value of food; they are unaware that the food system could be arranged another way—they are dehumanized, unengaged receptacles.
Freire (1970) argued that oppression creates an emotional dependency in the oppressed, and that transformation of this dynamic is possible only “when the oppressed find the oppressor out and become involved in organized struggle for their liberation” (p. 65). CFS values push this process of discovery in relationship to the food system. Freire spoke to the “finding out” process, explaining that “[t]he oppressed must see examples of the vulnerability of the oppressor so that a contrary conviction can begin to grow within them” (p. 64). For the food system, food waste is one such vulnerability. Going on to explain that praxis—action and reflection—is the key to the struggle against oppression, Freire wrote:

This discovery cannot be purely intellectual but must involve action; nor can it be limited to mere activism, but must include serious reflection: only then will it be a praxis. . . .

Attempting to liberate the oppressed without their reflective participation in the act of liberation is to treat them as objects which must be saved. . . it is to lead them to the populist pitfall and transform them into masses which can be manipulated. (p. 65)

The emphasis within the CFS values framework on participation, multiple voices, and valuing connections between food access, sustainable agriculture, and a healthy environment promotes praxis in food security planning.

Closely related to the notion of praxis is the idea that dialogue is essential to transforming oppressive relationships and structures. Dialogue in this context intends a meaning beyond speaking; it is based on a deep faith in people. Freire (1970) warned that “[w]ithout this faith in people, dialogue is a farce which inevitably degenerates into paternalistic manipulation” (p. 91). Dialogical change is explained as the genuine communication that promotes understanding and liberation. Non-dialogical action distorts communication and reproduces power relations. The six CFS values cannot guarantee dialogical change; however, communication is stressed in several
of the values. This emphasis underscores recognition that creating food security necessitates ongoing conversation.

**Social Work’s Core Professional Values**

While there is no universal agreement regarding a theoretical perspective in the social work profession, examination of the core professional values and their associated principles demonstrates convergence with the previously discussed concepts in CFS and critical theory. Social work’s core professional values are described as a constellation. Serving as “the foundation for social work’s unique purpose and perspective” (NASW, 2008, paragraph 3), the core professional values are: 1) service; 2) social justice; 3) dignity and worth of the person; 4) importance of human relationships; 5) integrity; and 6) competence. Each of these core professional values is associated with an explanatory ethical principle. The purpose of the core values and their related principles is not to prescribe rigid rules for social work practice; values “must be balanced within the context and complexity of the human experience” (NASW, 2008, paragraph 3).

Contributions from critical social work have underscored this context and complexity by acknowledging the power dynamics inherent in the social worker-client relationship. Critical social work is based on the connections between critical theory and social work practice (Fook, 2002; MacKinnon, 2009; Pease & Fook, 1999). The core value of social justice has helped drive this relationship. As Pease and Fook (1999) explained, social work itself “defines what a client is and what a social worker is. It also lays down rules for how they are to interact” (p. 14).

Recognizing the focus on justice inherent in critical theory, Finn and Jacobson (2003) constructed a practice framework building on these ideas. Calling for a professional shift from *social work* to *social justice* work, these authors articulated the “Just Practice Framework.”
Focusing on “meaning, context, power, history, and possibility” (p. 69) Finn and Jacobson created a framework for critical reflection and action—“praxis,” according to Friere (1970). The Just Practice Framework reminds social workers of the need for continual evaluation of interventions and practice norms to assess their congruence with core professional values. The major concepts of CFS have the capacity to serve a similar purpose for food assistance and food security interventions.

**Community Food Security Movement**

In this ethnographic case study CFS is called upon as a conceptual framework; however, it is most commonly discussed as a movement or as the basis for particular intervention strategies. Interventions reflecting CFS values are naturally diverse, due to merging the worldviews and priorities of community nutritionists, environmentally-oriented agriculturists, and anti-hunger, community development researchers and activists (Anderson & Cook, 1999; Johnston & Baker, 2005; Kalb, 2006; Pothukuchi, 2007). Though ensuring the human right to food is central to the CFS movement, food assistance programming is just one of the ways to address food needs. Instead of casting social services as an unaccompanied response to food insecurity, CFS embeds the immediate need for direct food assistance within a vision for sustainable food systems accessible to all community members. In this section, I review CFS projects and interventions. Although differing views exist as to the types of projects that reflect CFS values, efforts including food stamp outreach, farmers’ markets, food purchasing cooperatives, and food rescue programs have all drawn on different aspects of the CFS model to improve food access (Kantor, 2001). Additionally, community gardens, which also embody CFS values, have consistently expanded over the last several decades.
Community Gardens as a Food Security Strategy

Community gardens are a popular CFS strategy (Pothukuchi, 2007). The American Community Gardening Association (ACGA) estimates that over 18,000 community gardens operate in the United States and Canada (http://www.communitygarden.org/learn/faq.php) at the present time. Research explicating the goals and motivations driving garden creators and participants, as well as the food security impact gardens have on community members, is growing. Valuable findings regarding the potential of these programs to contribute to CFS are emerging.

*Organic Gardening* magazine featured a series of articles on community gardens around the United States and Canada. A garden in Huntsville, Alabama has linked with the aging population in its community and was responsible for supplying 12,500 pounds of fresh produce to seniors, a population at high risk for food insecurity (Nord et al., 2010). Huntsville’s community garden not only supplies free produce to the seniors, it plans ahead with the recipients during planting, as “each spring, seniors sign up for the vegetables they want” (Layton, 2007, p. 32). This strategy not only demonstrates sound garden planning but also an attention to the psychological aspect of food insecurity related to fear about future capacity to secure ample food: These seniors know they will have their favorite produce coming to them from the community garden.

Another community featured in *Organic Gardening* was in Denver, Colorado (Burns, 2007). This unique community garden, operating in a high-crime area which also housed a large number of Somalian refugees, “cultivate[d] fresh food and a sense of connection with each other…. [as] Christians work[ed] beside Muslims, children spen[t] time with their elders, and even though they may not share a common language, their gestures sp[oke] to what a community
garden is all about: kinship and common purpose” (p. 36). The article also highlighted the connection between community gardening and food security, in that, with a thriving garden, fresh produce is one less concern for these families (Burns, 2007).

Increased tolerance and learning have also been results of gardening programs. In his case study of the Toronto-based “The Stop” Community Food Center, Levkoe (2006) found that participants in community gardening programs experienced a type of transformational learning that “enabl[ed] individuals to build a stronger local community” (p. 97). Positive youth impact has also been found in community gardening programs. Often community gardens include in their mission a desire to increase nutrition education and improve the eating habits and food choices of young people (http://www.communitygarden.org/learn). One example of positive outcomes for youth is offered by Lautenschlager and Smith (2007) in their study focusing on inner-city youth in St. Paul, Minnesota. This study evaluated the impact of the Youth Farm Market Project (YFMP), a community gardening program that also includes “cooking groups, community markets, [and] classroom based activities…[as well as] field trips to grocery stores, restaurants, nature centers and cultural events” (p. 246). This study found that youth participating in the garden program increased their knowledge of the food system; improved their cooking skills, food choices, and nutritional knowledge; and became more tolerant of differences in their classmates. In summary, “the gardening program itself was an important social influence for these youth” (p. 256).

These examples provide evidence that community gardening programs are supportive of reconceptualizing food access. Gardens may not always be framed exclusively as food security enhancement strategies; however, based on these examples, their presence in the community does appear to promote empowerment related to control over food needs (Layton, 2007). In this
respect, gardens may be both a conscientizing and mobilizing force, as evidenced by garden participants’ increased knowledge about food issues and the sustained involvement of a diversity of community members.

**Community Food Security Coalition**

All CFS projects, like community gardens, take place at the local level, in communities. However, in an effort to support the CFS movement and promote information sharing amongst CFS practitioners, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) created the CFS Coalition in 1995. In addition to a competitive grant program which has funded over 250 community food projects (CFPs) since its inception, this network of “nearly 300 organizations from social and economic justice, anti-hunger, environmental, community development, sustainable agriculture, community gardening and other fields” (http://www.foodsecurity.org/aboutcfsc.html) shares program planning and outcome information, supporting the capacity of CFS to spread and advance as a movement. In a section of their website describing the six principles of CFS (Fisher, 1999), the CFS Coalition outlines how the goals of this movement naturally connect with a variety of disciplines:

- CFS addresses a broad range of problems affecting the food system, community development, and the environment such as increasing poverty and hunger, disappearing farmland and family farms, inner city supermarket redlining, rural community disintegration, rampant suburban sprawl, and air and water pollution from unsustainable food production and distribution patterns.

(http://www.foodsecurity.org/views_cfs_faq.html)

Commitment to balancing immediate food needs with constructing a more just food system can be seen in the projects selected for funding by the CFS Coalition. The CFS Coalition
has produced two reports (Kobayashi, Tyson, & Abi-Nader, 2010; Pothukuchi, 2007) chronicling the first decade of CFS projects. The first of these, “Building Community Food Security: Lessons From Community Food Projects 1999-2003” (Pothukuchi, 2007) indicated that projects with a primary focus on social services and nutrition comprised the largest overall percentage (31%) of funded efforts. Community-based social service organizations were also the most common host for CFPs (33%). While addressing the food needs of community members, nearly half (43%) of CFPs also included

- some type of knowledge-building in their core activities; types of activities included raising awareness of community members about local food issues, organizing educational events such as field trips, developing school and college curricula, training in activities such as food production or cooking, and providing technical assistance on specialized topics such as financial management for new farmers. (p. 14)

The CFPs reviewed in this report provided multiple benefits to their communities. However, challenges particular to certain projects as well as general to the CFS movement also exist.

CFPs navigated through a variety of circumstances including language barriers, difficulty engaging low-income participants, the time-limited nature of projects, and the diverse organizational cultures of project partners (Pothukuchi, 2007). Scale is one of the most significant general-challenges: CFPs aim to extend the reach of a socially just, sustainable, community-based food system; however, the ability of a handful of projects funded on a time-limited basis to impact long-established patterns of food access is an uphill battle. Noting the differing capacities of CFPs and SNAP, the nation’s largest food assistance program, Pothukuchi explained that with “a budget of nearly 33 billion in 2006, for example, the Food Stamp Program served only 65 percent of eligible participants and provided only 80 percent of the benefits they
could receive. The CFP Program, by contrast, had a budget of only $5 million in 2007” (p. 20). Moreover, government subsidies also support the industrial food system, creating a false price structure that often prevents local producers—CFP funded or otherwise—from being competitive.

The most recent report from the CFS Coalition, “The Activities and Impacts of Community Food Projects, 2005-2009” (Kobayashi, Tyson, & Abi-Nader, 2010), prefaces the discussion of CFPs with a reminder to readers that “[n]o one solution matches the needs of all communities. A strength of the program is that rather than imposing one solution, it nurtures creativity within the communities to find their own solutions” (p. i). Reporting on the second half of a decade of CFS projects, the authors noted a similar breakdown in project priorities. Contributions from these CFPs were discussed in four main areas: 1) increasing access to healthy foods, including a significant increase in the number of school lunch programs providing locally sourced items; 2) environmental stewardship, including a growth in the composting of food waste; 3) increased economic and social equity, through a focus on skill development and support for thousands of micro-businesses; and 4) increased community food system infrastructure, including

350 Community Food Assessments. . . almost 40 food policy councils and networks . . . and more than 180 policies aimed at increasing community food security across the nation. More than 50 million Americans lived in the communities where these system-level changes were made. (p. 2-3)

The two reports chronicling CFPs, their activities, and outcomes provide a foundation of knowledge about projects predicated on CFS values as well as a model for using CFS values as an investigative lens. Limitations in these two studies were, in part, related to data collection
strategies. For the projects from 2005-2009, a web-based data collection instrument was “developed to track common outputs across CFPs” (Kobayashi, Tyson, & Abi-Nader, 2010, p. 6). By predetermining outputs of interest, the stories of these projects may not be fully represented. The authors identified other limitations, including completion of the tracking form being voluntary, data being self-reported, and the fact that “[s]ome of the questions do not require that the grantee report unique numbers; therefore, a portion of the reported numbers could be redundant, suggesting a broader reach than what grantees actually accomplished” (p. 7).

The CFS Coalition has propelled growth in the CFS movement and enabled more communities to develop projects reflective of the definition of CFS. However, additional qualitatively-designed research would also support this movement by providing detailed information useful to communities attempting CFPs.

**Food Waste and Food Recovery**

The CFS Coalition funds diverse projects. Food rescue and redistribution (also referred to as food recovery) programs, however, do not appear to be a priority for the CFS Coalition. Because waste occurs at multiple levels in the dominant industrial food system, food rescue programs are not inherently local. Perhaps the capacity for large-scale operations to characterize themselves as “food recovery” has led to these programs receiving similar criticisms to food banks; namely, that their existence masks the structural shortcomings of the food system (Poppendieck, 1998). Examining the diversity within food rescue and redistribution will help to understand how these projects relate to the ideals of CFS. Before exploring the history of modern food rescue and redistribution, I will briefly discuss the related issue of food waste—a relevant topic for the environmental dimension of CFS.
Food recovery programs stem from the illogical simultaneity of food insecurity and food waste. In addition to interest from the anti-hunger sphere, the issue of food waste has garnered attention from multiple disciplines (Bloom, 2010; Caswell, 2008; Chen, Ramano, & Zhang, 2010). Recently, the issue of food waste has gained attention due to anti-immigration policies which have resulted in escalating levels of unharvested crops in key agricultural states (Mataconis, 2011; Neiwert, 2011). While not all discussions around food waste focus on food security, research investigating waste levels and related consequences spurs discussion about the state of the food system. In Great Britain, for example, intervening in food waste has gained status on the national agenda. The British self-described “battle against food waste” has developed policies in an effort to decrease waste at the industry and consumer level. This push been driven in part by rising food prices in conjunction with studies measuring the levels of waste. Caswell (2008) pointed to research indicating “consumers may be throwing away 6.7 million tonnes of food every year—a figure that equates to approximately one-third of all food purchased” (p. 331). The 2008 Cabinet Office report, “Food Matters,” emphasized the need to promote sustainable food systems while better integrating various components in the food chain. Although this change process is in its initial stages, the need to address food waste as an aspect of this change process has been recognized early on (Caswell, 2008).

In the United States, food waste has not reached priority status on the national agenda. However, the federal government has taken an important step towards acknowledging food waste through the USDA’s funding of the Food Loss Project. Leading this investigation was University of Arizona Contemporary Archeologist Timothy Jones. In addition to the seven reports published by Jones and his colleagues through the Economic Research Service of the USDA (Jones, Dahlen, Bockhorst, Cisco, & McKee, 2002; Jones, Dahlen, Cisco, Bockhorst, &
McKee; 2002; Jones, Dahlen, Cisci, McKee, & Bockhorst, 2002; Jones, Bockhorst, McKee, & Ndiaye, 2003a; Jones, Bockhorst, McKee, & Ndiaye, 2003b; Jones, Dahlen, Cisco, Bockhorst, & McKee; 2003; Jones & Ndiaye, 2004), Jones also disseminated information about food waste in a series of six articles published in *BioCycle* (Jones, 2005a; 2005b; 2005c; 2005d; 2006a; 2006b). In the first of these, entitled “The Corner on Food Loss,” Jones (2005a) outlined the Food Loss Project, explaining that “my colleagues and I began a study to measure food loss in the United States looking at how food is harvested, processed, stored, distributed, consumed and discarded” (p. 25). Introducing the importance of food waste by couching it in economic terms, Jones relayed key findings:

What we discovered was a loss rate roughly twice what most people guessed. Retail sector losses are nearly $30 billion (almost $20 billion in fast food alone), $20 billion in the farming industry and more than $40 billion in households. (p. 25)

Food waste is also linked with detrimental environmental consequences, as Jones explained, laying out the resources used in agriculture, from production to harvesting to distribution. Finally, Jones also drew attention to the security risks of an unsustainable and highly wasteful food system:

Besides keeping 40 to 50 percent of the harvest from ever reaching our mouths, food loss also represents a potential threat to America's security. An example might be a disruption to a key point in the distribution system for fresh fruits and vegetables. Creating a choke point in just one city could put tens of millions of people at risk. (p. 25)

After framing the issue in his first piece, Jones (2005b) began to report and comment on the findings of the Food Loss Project in his next article, “Food Loss on the Farm.” Efficiency is an assumption of the industrialized food system—one that Jones challenged as he conveyed
findings including an estimation that 12% of what is grown in the fields never reaches consumers. The reasons for waste at the farming level are several. Foremost among them is harvesting only the most perfect produce, leaving misshapen or blemished items in the fields. Another culprit is the trend towards convenience, with more and more produce going through a post-harvest slicing and dicing process before being distributed. Jones noted that while a “head of lettuce will last for days in the refrigerator. . . . [a] bag of lettuce is already on its way to becoming compost” (p. 45).

While the third installment in the BioCycle series provided a hopeful portrayal of the apple industry in the Northwest (Jones, 2005c), a return to reporting on wasteful practices occurred in Jones’(2005d) fourth article, “Analyzing Retail Food Loss.” While acknowledging that losses cannot be totally avoided, Jones suggested that “losses could economically be cut in half, adding nearly $15 billion in profits to retail food companies” (p. 40). Jones outlined surprising findings, including the relatively low levels of waste at supermarkets and “mom and pop” restaurants. Convenience stores were discovered to have the highest levels of food waste, with 25% of all food products being discarded. Jones explained:

There are two culprits. One is ‘instant’ food. An important market niche for these stores is providing fresh sandwiches, hot dogs, pizza, fried chicken and nachos that are ready to pick up and eat. If not bought in a limited time, instant food cycles quickly into the garbage stream. The other reason is a lack of management and training, which more than doubles their food loss and cuts into their profits. Store workers generally don't know how long they can safely leave prepared food out for sale, or predict potential demand. (p. 40)
In spite of wasteful practices undercutting potential profits, the retail sector largely ignores food waste. Jones noted that this industry, like “nearly everyone else in society. . . [has] lost touch with food and how it functions in the life cycle” (p. 42).

Individual household food waste is the focus of Jones’ (2006a) fifth article, “Food Loss in the American Household.” Jones shared that in American households, 25% of fruits and vegetables, 13% of meats, and 16% of all grains were “going bad” after purchase. Additionally, 14% of all household food waste was found to come from unopened, packaged foods. Suggesting a cultural denial of food waste, Jones noted that during “interviews for the Food Loss Study. . . it was not unusual to see members throwing leftover food in the trash while simultaneously stating that they do not waste food” (p. 28). Wrapping up the series with an article entitled, “What to do About Food Loss,” Jones (2006b) reviewed the pervasiveness of food waste and advocates for creation of a National Food Center. Such a Center would assess the multitude of issues and coordinate efforts among producers, wholesalers, distributors, retailers, consumers, government agencies and trade groups. An early childhood education program could serve as the core program. An informed population can understand and enact nutrition, food safety, food conservation and related programs. (p. 34)

Throughout this series of articles, Jones demonstrated how the industrial food system not only accepts wasteful practices, but it also distances consumers from food to such an extent that wastefulness bleeds over into individual practices.

Journalist and food-waste blogger Jonathon Bloom (2010) has also drawn attention to the issue of food waste in his recently published book, American Wasteland. Having been turned-on to the enormity of food waste during a volunteer stint at D.C. Central Kitchen in 2005, Bloom
began the story of waste by commenting on its vastness. He explained that “[e]very day, Americans waste enough food to fill the Rose Bowl” (p. xi). In addition to relaying knowledge accumulated during first-hand research, Bloom also pointed to cultural norms that create food waste and argued for a shift in American expectations of food. Asserting that norms like picture-perfect produce have some culpability for current food waste levels, Bloom also connected this idea to the growing separation between people and their food, explaining: “Our separation from the production of food has helped erode our food knowledge. . . . We throw out foods when we’re not sure they’re good. We’re perplexed by “use-by” and “sell-by” dates” (p. 68).

Household knowledge has suffered as the food system has been mechanized and distanced from daily life.

Bloom (2010) broadened the food waste issue by highlighting the environmental impact; food items comprise 18% of what goes into landfills. When food rots in this way, methane gas—a major contributor to climate change—is produced. Anaerobic digestion has been presented as a way to harness the methane produced by food (and livestock) waste. In an study investigating the potential for area food waste to supply a proposed anaerobic digestion plant in Sacramento, California, Chen, Ramano, and Zhang (2010) found that different waste sources had different results as far as digestability. The authors utilized statistical analysis of five waste streams; among their findings was support for a mixture of food waste streams to off-set the need for chemicals to moderate pH levels in the digester. While this research focused on specific, energy-related questions, it also highlighted the environmental consequences of the current dominant food system.

Not all of the food waste created by the industrial food system is suitable for human consumption, and redirection of this food waste could include anaerobic digestion as well as
animal feed and composting. However, much of what is wasted is still nourishing, and targeting edible food waste has been an increasingly common tactic for food assistance providers. Currently, over 150 food rescue redistribution organizations operate in the US and Canada (http://www.feedingamerica.org). Collection may focus on field gleaning or on warehouse-level, grocery-level, or prepared food waste from the restaurant and food service industry.

Although field gleaning and other means of collecting surplus foods predate the existence of non-profits, in the modern non-profit realm, New York’s City Harvest trailblazed food rescue and redistribution as a food security intervention. Officially beginning operations in 1982, City Harvest currently “delivers an average of over 83,000 pounds of food daily” (http://www.cityharvest.org), helping to address the food needs of individuals and families served through their partner agencies. In addition to the typical staff, volunteer, and board support characterizing non-profits, City Harvest also maintains three specialized volunteer groups: Generation Harvest, a group for young professionals in the food industry; a Leadership Council, which focuses on programmatic and fundraising goals; and a Food Council, comprised of chefs and food professionals that work to “increase the quality and quantity of food donations, enhance City Harvest’s image among donors, and help City Harvest reach its fundraising goals” (http://www.cityharvest.org).

Following City Harvest, D.C. Central Kitchen (DCCK) was established in 1989. Operating from a similar premise, DCCK targets food waste at several points in the food system, collecting both fresh and prepared foods, at times in large amounts from regional distributors. Operations are based on a rapid turnover and distribution of food products. Distribution is achieved through partner agencies as well as DCCK’s own First Helping Program (http://www.dccentralkitchen.org). Additionally, surplus food is used as a job-training tool;
DCCK recently graduated its 75th class in its culinary job skills training program. This group of graduates, comprised largely of people in substance abuse recovery, recently released from prison, or exiting homeless situations, boasts a 100% post-graduation employment rate (http://www.dccentralkitchen.org).

Though the numbers of food rescue and redistribution programs, including branches of the Campus Kitchens Project (CKP), continue to grow, in-depth research around these programs is lacking. With their extensive community partnerships and multiple food collection strategies, programs like City Harvest and DCCK demonstrate the capacity for food recovery programs to reflect CFS values and be a player in food security planning.

**IHE-Community Partnerships**

CFS projects including food rescue and redistribution programs have the potential to shift thinking around food security interventions through their attention to the food system, local needs, and local resources. Institutions of higher education (IHEs) have been involved in these type of efforts (Kobayashi, Tyson, & Abi-Nader, 2010; Pothukuchi, 2007) and have the potential to make even greater contributions to food security. In this section, I discuss the historical social contract between societies and institutions of higher education (IHE), review examples of IHE-community partnerships, and explore the challenges IHEs may encounter when attempting to develop community partnerships. Attention will then be given to the growing use of service-learning, with special focus on literature demonstrating the increasing number of social work educators utilizing service learning. The discussion will then shift to examples of courses that paired service learning with a topical focus on food security. Concluding this section, I will highlight how service-learning research limits its utility to the larger discourse of IHE-community partnerships by focusing uneven attention toward student outcomes.
Role of Higher Education in Addressing Social Problems

The fact that food insecurity exists in the United States, given our established national wealth and agricultural abundance, may be easily understood as a social problem. Addressing such social ills has historically been a task of IHEs. In the classic text *Democracy and Education*, John Dewey (1916) established the connection between advancing one’s education and contributing to one’s community. Suggesting that democracy depends on its citizenry to engage in research and formulate ideas for the betterment of society, Dewey alluded to the notion of a social contract between higher education and the larger society. Similarly, Marullo and Edwards (2000) argued that partnerships between IHEs and communities have the potential to act as a “vehicle for transforming society to make it more just” (p. 897). This sentiment has been echoed multiple times by leaders of universities, such as former Harvard President Derek Bok (1982).

One of the most influential contemporary voices advocating for increasing engagement and community-mindedness in IHEs was the late Ernest Boyer. During his tenure as President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Boyer (1996) called for a transformation of academic life toward what he termed “a scholarship of engagement” (p. 11). Challenging academia to reconnect with its democratic and social justice-oriented roots, Boyer’s offerings have become a model of scholarship and encouraged academics to balance research, teaching, and service. The model has been influential in increasing the relevancy of the college or university to the community, including evaluation research and service-learning teaching methodologies.

**Types of Partnerships**

IHE-Community partnerships are structured in a variety of ways. Service-learning, perhaps the most common partnering practice, is explored in a later sub-section. For social work
departments and schools, the signature pedagogy of the profession, field education, has long connected students with community agencies. However, connections between the IHE and the community may be deepened by partnering in ways that extend beyond the professional training expectation of students placed at field sites. In their article, “Building a Comprehensive Agency-University Partnership: A Case Study of the Bay Area Social Services Consortium” authors Austin, Martin, Carnochan, Goldberg, Berrick, Weiss, and Kelley (1999) described an IHE-community collaboration that focused on enhancing services in the community, as opposed to enhancing the skills of future social workers. This partnership, involving multiple social work programs, local social service agencies, and foundations emphasized training, research, and policy development. The primary goal of this “think-tank” style partnership is to assist the agencies and foundations in their coordination of community services (Austin et al., 1999).

The University of Maryland has created another type of unique IHE-community partnership with the creation of the Social Work Community Outreach Service (SWCOS) (Cook, Bond, Jones, & Grief, 2002). This outreach center, operated from within the School of Social Work, has “served low-income clients and neighboring communities by providing clinical services, community organization, and management consultation to grassroots and nonprofit entities” (p. 19) since its 1992 opening. At the SWCOS, new models of practice are developed, tested, and used to “sharpen classroom instruction” (p. 21). In order to pro-actively involve existing community agencies, this center created an Advisory Board “of faculty and community leaders to monitor the progress of SWCOS. Both faculty and community leaders were necessary given the many objectives of SWCOS and for ‘buy-in’ to the concept” (p. 22). Projects enacted through SWCOS have spanned a broad range—from advocacy that helped restore funding for rodent control, to community planning around HIV prevention, to the restoration of a public
housing playground. In their discussion of SWCOS’s contributions over the last decade, the authors noted that services

work best. . . when SWCOS responds to community requests for service and becomes a co-planner with local leaders in developing that service. . . . In this way, SWCOS is more than a series of individual projects; it becomes part of the community through its presence. (p. 23)

Projects like SWCOS help to inform exploration into the Campus Kitchen at Marquette University (CKMU), as they share key characteristics including being embedded in the IHE as well as having an on-going presence in the community. Findings such as the effectiveness of projects correlating with the level of community involvement confirm that attention to how community relationships are constructed is an important consideration for future study.

Beyond the specific community benefits, these examples demonstrate that the implicit social contract between IHEs and community partners cannot be defined solely in terms of service to the community by the university. Reciprocity ought to be a goal for these relationships. As Ira Harkavy (2000) explained, when universities “give full-hearted, full-minded attention to solving our complex problems, particularly the problems of our city[, t]he benefits of doing so would be considerable for the university, the American city, and American society in general” (p. 3). The long-standing presence of colleges and universities in their respective communities may potentially act as an additional legitimizing force in community partnerships. However, important challenges remain.
Challenges for Town-Gown Relationships

Partnerships between IHEs and their surrounding communities certainly have great potential; however, operationalizing mutually beneficial, respectful relationships is often a delicate process. More IHEs are recognizing that knowledge production, a central mission for higher education institutions, can be enhanced by university-community connections. Civic engagement adds new voices and ideas to the intellectual process, ideally adding new perspectives and insights, just as it helps ground and give broader meaning to the world of ideas and the work of academics. (Fisher, Fabricant, & Simmons, 2004, p. 16)

While community partnerships are increasingly prized within IHEs and even required by outside funding sources, blind encouragement of such connections may be harmful to the success of more thoughtful partnerships (Fogel & Cooke, 2006). Realizing the potential utility for community-based research to further the agendas of professors seeking tenure and promotion has contributed to tensions between IHEs and their communities. Additional issues include an unwillingness of academicians to share research information or follow-up on findings. In some cases, universities have simply been unable to disconnect from the social issues of their host communities. In their discussion of context in IHE-community partnerships, Fisher, Fabricant, and Simmons (2004) explained that, at times, “the area around them [the college or university] begins to decay, forcing the local environment and its problems on the college or university. And unlike more mobile corporations, which might choose to leave the area, most universities are place-bound” (p. 15). Too often the community has been cast as a place to study rather than as a complex entity with its own viable resources (Creighton, 2006; Ehsan, 2006; Maurrasse, 2001).
Beyond the more common criticisms of IHE-community partnerships—that academicians are inconsiderate of long-range community needs or are disconnected from real-world concerns—some communities perceive higher education institutions as having malicious intentions (Checkoway, 2001). Particularly in communities of color or economically disadvantaged areas, IHEs have purchased low-cost properties, limiting affordable housing options and creating an institutional form of gentrification (Watson, 2007). Other institutions have exacerbated tensions through fear-based reactions. Fisher, Fabricant, and Simmons (2004) described this problematic “response to declining adjacent communities [in terms of] the initial IHE reaction [which] was separation. Put up walls. Expand police forces” (p. 15).

The challenge of bringing people from diverse social backgrounds together is familiar to those engaging in IHE-community partnerships. Suggesting that “[r]ather than simply act[ing] as project facilitators, community organizers are ethically obligated to strive toward authentic social justice,” Cherry and Shefner (2004) pointed to four organizing frameworks they believe will support IHE-community partnerships: multi-cultural organizing, feminist organizing, civic engagement, and community planning. The authors also suggested that community-based organizations are the ideal hosts for IHE-community partnerships rather than IHEs, explaining that in multi-cultural organizing, there must be understanding of and value placed on local culture and knowledge. For IHE-community partnerships, this “means that the university representatives must be willing to meet in, and actively engage, pre-existing community institutions” (p. 228-229). Similarly, principles of feminist organizing such as “valuing the process, consciousness raising, wholeness and unity, democratic structuring, and an orientation towards structural change” (p. 229) can assist with achieving process- and outcome-oriented goals including on-going community participation and collaborative decision making.
Highlighting similar power differentials experienced by IHE-community partnerships in civic engagement and community planning, Cherry and Shefner encouraged organizers to seek common language. Being able to articulate an agenda will support action-advancement of these partnerships; moreover, concrete results will be the strongest trust and relationship builder. While the organizing suggestions outlined by Cherry and Shefner may be helpful as IHE-community partnerships continue to form, research investigating specific instances of these partnerships may be of greater utility: Descriptions of context, as will be addressed in the proposed research, increase readers’ ability to relate and apply findings.

Relationships and communication are often cited as challenges for participants in IHE-community partnerships. Human service workers are one of the groups with whom communication may be difficult. Tiamiyu and Bailey (2001) explored ways to improve relationships with human service workers and IHE-community collaborations in their article “Human Services for the Elderly and the Role of University-Community Collaboration: Perceptions of Human Service Agency Workers.” Their investigation surveyed human service agencies (n=133) in the greater Toledo, Ohio area. The authors narrowed their focus to responding agencies (n=24) that indicated providing services to older adults. Survey questions included inquiry into how the University of Toledo “could collaborate with the agency to address identified problems” (p. 482).

Although agencies indicated that their clients faced a variety of problems, including mental health concerns, physical illness, substance abuse, poverty, housing issues, stress, illiteracy, social isolation, and family breakdown, many of the agency-responders did not have a clear idea for how an IHE partnership could assist their clients (Tiamiyu & Bailey, 2001). The authors explained: “The results suggest that agency workers do not necessarily have a negative
perception of university-community agency collaboration; rather, many do not understand how such collaborations may improve the services they provide their consumers” (p. 491). Several recommendations are made by the authors to address this disconnect, such as advocating that funding sources include attention to the process of collaboration as well as the outcomes. Expounding on the how the collaborative process could be investigated, the authors called for empirical studies to document factors that facilitate and hinder organizational collaborations, relationships between type of organizational collaboration and type of outcome, relationships among individual, group, and contextual factors influencing organizational collaboration, and so on. (p. 491)

Importantly, Tiamiyu and Bailey also encouraged faculty interested in IHE-community partnerships to “leave the ‘ivory tower’ and market themselves in the larger community,” (p. 491) beginning by listening to the needs agency staff express and exploring possibilities together.

**Partnerships through Service-Learning**

In spite of the many challenges, recent trends have shown that colleges and universities are increasingly interested in creating connections with their host communities. IHE-community partnerships through service-learning courses are on the rise. Although variant definitions of service-learning exist, it is generally understood as a teaching method, a form of experiential education in which students engage in activities that address human and community needs together with structured opportunities intentionally designed to promote student learning and development. Reflection and reciprocity are key concepts. (Jacoby, 1996, p. 5)

The inclusion of service-learning is increasingly common across disciplines. Projects from business courses (Andrews, 2007) to public health (Cene, Peek, Jacobs, & Horowitz, 2010) span
a wide spectrum of possibilities, and may be indirect or direct in their functioning. Service-learning is of special interest to this study as the Campus Kitchens Project (CKP) identified service-learning as an integral source of student volunteers (M. Roche, personal communication, March 2010).

**Service-learning in social work education.** In a reflective essay advocating for IHEs to increase their support of communities, Moxley (2004) pointed to the natural fit between service-learning and social work education, stating “service for research and research as service, therefore, go hand and hand, something colleges and universities may come to understand if they take both engagement and civic responsibility seriously” (p. 242). Social work is among the disciplines where the status of service-learning as a respected teaching methodology is on the rise (Phillips, 2007). An increasing number of social work educators are utilizing this teaching modality and recognizing the strengths of this approach, both for student and community outcomes.

Social work research contains several examples where service-learning projects have been linked with the development of research skills, and particularly evaluation skills. Drawing on Gutierrez’s (1995) notion of empowerment-focused research, Berg-Weger, Herbers, McGillick, Rodriguez, and Svoboda (2007) provided one such example, as they report on a service-learning class’s involvement in evaluating a provider training for dementia issues. Students, several of whom were on-going members of the research team, “moved the project forward by participating in the design, data collection, analyses, and reporting” (p. 31). One student-researcher found that participating in this service-learning project shaped future practice goals: “This experience solidified my interest in gerontological social work by enabling me to go beyond working with agency staff to working more directly with older adults in the community”
An existing relationship between the School of Social Work, key faculty members, and the community agency was an important characteristic of this service-learning project.

Underscoring this dimension, the authors noted that “[w]hile not required for establishing an interactive research partnership, the long-standing relationship provided a level of trust and commitment that eased the transition to a fully-engaged research partnership” (p. 33).

A second social work service-learning course that provided research-oriented support for community partner agencies is described in the article “A Collaborative Approach to Service, Learning, and Scholarship: A Community-Based Research Course.” Hyde and Meyer (2004) detailed how students in an MSW-level research methods course assisted with a pro-bono evaluation of a community benefits district (CBD) program. The CBD under investigation was located in the Charles Village neighborhood of Baltimore, Maryland and was known as CVCBD. Its mission was, through additional taxes levied on area property owners, to provide improved sanitation and economic development services. CVCBD requested an evaluation as part of the information-gathering effort informing their reauthorization quest. Pursuing this evaluation through a service-learning course demonstrates the versatility of service-learning and the potential for the needs and priorities of community partners to drive the project agenda.

Data collection for the CVCBD project included walking tours of the area, a phone survey, individual interviews, focus groups, and observations of Board of Directors meetings (Hyde & Meyer, 2004). Student feedback regarding their participation was mixed: Some students relished the opportunity to apply the research skills they were learning, while others felt overwhelmed by the process and concerned about the depth of their evaluation. The authors identified several factors that supported the project, including preexisting linkages between the School of Social Work and the community. The flexibility of the social work curriculum as well
as support from the administration were helpful to the project. Time constraints, interaction with an Institutional Review Board less open to a participatory project, and students’ wariness regarding data collection were all named as hindering aspects of the research process. Importantly, these authors found that their students’ anxiety related to the research skills, not to the community-interaction piece. However, the authors noted that community conflict complicated the evaluation process, as “individuals and associations took advantage of this evaluation process to advocate their position with regard to the CVCBD, which (as the research proceeded) appeared to be a hotly debated force in the community” (p. 86).

**Food security and service-learning.** Higher education has shown interest in food issues and the CFS perspective, with some teacher-researchers beginning to highlight connections between food security and the environment (Fields, 2004; Glover & Reganold, 2010; Powledge, 2010). Reviewing studies that report on these courses will help inform investigation around the relationship between CKMU and Marquette University. The intersection of disciplines inherent in CFS holds promise for involvement from IHEs, as evidenced by food security being the topical focus in a number of service-learning courses.

Gottlieb and Fisher (1996) provided one such example, drawing on their expertise in urban planning and the non-profit sector, respectively. Their article, “Community Food Security and Environmental Justice: Searching for a Common Discourse,” called for increased cooperation between the food justice and environmental justice movements. By illuminating issues of mutual concern such as “production, distribution and transportation, and cultural heterogeneity and homogeneity” (p. 24) students were prompted to critically explore the production side of our industrial food system. Once students identified a shared vision for a more just society, opportunities for articulation of this mutual agenda presented themselves for action.
Examples of student actions included lobbying for inclusion of critical CFS issues on the annual Farm Bill.

Incorporating service-oriented community experiences into curriculum-dense courses presents difficulties. Recognizing this challenge in her article “Food, Hunger, and Poverty: A Thematic Approach to Integrating Service Learning,” sociologist Heather Sullivan-Catlin (2002) detailed her efforts to meet requirements for an Introduction to Sociology course and achieve appropriate placements in two settings (urban and rural) while also maintaining a topical focus on food security. Through service-learning placements at a food bank (in the urban setting) and a community agency featuring a food pantry and other emergency food programs (in the rural setting), students were able to connect their experience with sociological concepts such as stratification, culture, and socialization. Explaining one course assignment, Sullivan-Catlin wrote:

We began to look at the structure of the emergency food system. A homework assignment led students to investigate the roles of various organizations in that system via the Web site of a national organization of food banks….This Web site offers a wealth of information about the history and organization of the emergency food system, demographic profiles of emergency food recipients, and public policy issues related to hunger and poverty. (p. 44)

Students were expected to synthesize course readings and material with their community experience. The food security theme “provided a context for illustrating a variety of sociological concepts” (p. 43) and “73% of students agreed that the service-learning component enhanced their learning in the course” (p. 47).
While not as specifically oriented towards food security, sociologist D. Wynne Wright (2006) also used food as a “lens… to integrate students into local and global communities and engage them in communities of place” (p. 225). Employing the notion of civic agriculture (Lyson, 2004) into his course entitled Agriculture, Food, and Rural Community Development, Wright outlined how his two-part course, which included an exchange program with a Hungarian school, aimed to “help students see the interconnections between agri-food system restructuring and rural community well-being” (p. 226). Forging a partnership with a Hungarian Environmental Economics course provided students with a comparison of food systems and spurred critical thinking and peer learning (p. 228). Additionally, students connected with the local community. Service-learning projects included the organization and hosting of “a Community Food Expo that brought civic agriculture entrepreneurs within our community to campus to help promote food systems literacy and teach the broader community how local food purchases could contribute to regional economic development” (p. 229). Outcomes of the Expo included a commitment from campus dining services to increase their procurement of locally-sourced foods (p. 230).

These service-learning course examples demonstrate the relevancy of community food and food security issues to higher education coursework. A broad range of disciplines and a variety of projects and service opportunities can connect with food issues.

Gaps in Service-Learning and IHE-Community Partnership Research

One reason why it may be difficult to gauge the contributions of service-learning classes to CFS is because of the way service-learning is most frequently studied. As a teaching methodology, service-learning has demonstrated its utility to higher education through measurement and analysis of outcomes. Because service-learning is a multi-dimensional process
involving more than the typical student and instructor roles, devising a measurement process that captures the totality of service-learning has been challenging for researchers (Gelmon, 2000). Stakeholders in service-learning include community partners, actors from the IHE, and recipients of the service, be these specific individuals or broader community beneficiaries. Measurement efforts have focused on specific aspects of the service-learning process from student outcomes (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Gorman, 1994; Wang, 2000) to faculty impact (Stanton, 1994; Ward, 2000) to the effect on community partners (Bringle & Duffy, 1998; Gray, Ondaatje, Fricker, & Geschwind, 2000).

In a three-year evaluation study of “Learn and Serve America,” a service-learning initiative for higher education, Gray, Ondaatje, Fricker and Geschwind (2000) underscored the need for investigation into community outcomes: “To be worthwhile, service-learning must also provide benefits to communities and community agencies that exceed the costs of their participation in the program” (p. 32). However, as the findings of this evaluation demonstrate, operationalizing investigation into community outcomes is a challenge. Learn and Serve America had three main goals: “1) to engage students in meeting community needs; 2) to enhance students’ academic learning, civic responsibility, and life skills development; and 3) to promote institutional support for service” (p. 33). Evaluation methods included multiple surveys and site visits. Examination of community relationships was limited and focused on student-related issues, such as perceptions of students’ usefulness to the agency. While 75% of respondents indicated that “the benefits of working with student volunteers ‘far out-weighed’ the problems and costs, and another 15% responded that the benefits ‘slightly outweighed’ the costs. Only 10% responded that the costs of working with student volunteers exceeded the benefits” (p. 38). These findings indicate the potential for service-learning and other IHE-community
partnerships to support local agencies and contribute to overall community health; however, future studies are needed to respond to “how” and “why” questions absent from this evaluation. By focusing on the culture of CKMU and the quality of its relationship to its community, the proposed research will begin to address this gap.

Community participation, relationships, and outcomes remain under-studied dimensions in service-learning as well as in other types of IHE-community partnerships. Though preliminary investigation into community impact dimension of service-learning is a beginning, further research is needed. In addition to creating quantitative measurements of pre-determined outcomes, qualitative inquiry is needed in IHE-community partnerships to examine culture and relationships. IHE-community partnerships have the potential to drive social change, by providing, among other resources, a force of reflective and engaged volunteers. Research focusing on community participation and the relationships between IHE-based organizations and their community partners would support the effectiveness of partnerships as social change vehicles.

Chapter Summary

The purpose of this chapter has been to demonstrate how an ethnographic case study of the Campus Kitchens Project branch at Marquette University (CKMU) contributes to discourses in social work, community food security, and IHE-community partnerships. Food insecurity continues to rise in the United States, with vulnerable members of society feeling the greatest impact (Nord et al, 2010). Social workers in a variety of settings interact with people experiencing food insecurity. In light of this practice reality, it is surprising that social work researchers have not focused more attention on this issue. Of the literature that does exist, the dominant focus has been on either the experience of food insecurity or some aspect of food
assistance programming. While critical reflection on the food system is gaining momentum in social work research, this perspective remains in minority status. Studies that focus on the experience of food insecurity do provide information that may be used to improve assessment, outreach, and services. Likewise, inquiry into existing food assistance interventions have the potential to enhance services and advocate for progressive policy changes. However, in both of these research angles, the individual largely remains the unit of analysis and focus of intervention.

Conceptualizing food from an economic framework is also true beyond social work. In this chapter I discussed this way of interfacing with food issues as limiting food assistance interventions. An economic understanding of food depends upon accessing food with money through the marketplace. Cultural values of independence and “the American dream” validate the marketplace as the appropriate food access point, thereby framing food insecurity interventions from a deficit angle. Additionally, food’s role as a commodity masks its intrinsic value and distances people from their food, contributing to an environment where food waste is an acceptable norm.

Community food security (CFS) offers a different lens on the food system. With its focus on justice, participation, and systemic change, the principles of CFS (Fisher, 1999) are consistent with social work’s core professional values. By linking tenets of critical theory (Freire, 1970) and social work’s core professional values (NASW, 2008) with the principles of CFS, I present CFS as the conceptual framework for this study—one that will draw attention to questions of interconnectivity and justice during investigation into CKMU.

In addition to discussing CFS as the conceptual framework, I also reviewed the CFS movement and discussed its associated projects. Community Food Projects (CFPs) like
community gardens are frequently cited as demonstrating the values of CFS. The work, contributions, and limitations of the CFS Coalition were also discussed. This chapter included attention to issues of food waste. Although less commonly associated with CFS, food waste illuminates inefficiencies in the dominant, industrialized food system. Furthermore, food waste has been identified, collected, repurposed, and distributed to those in need by an increasing number of food rescue and redistribution organizations. Research around food rescue and redistribution is lacking. Little is known about how these organizations operate or how their goals may intersect with CFS. CKP is a contributor to the growth among food rescue organizations. Exploring CKMU provides a starting point for better understanding this food security approach.

Importantly, CKMU is also housed in an institution of higher education (IHE). CKMU, like all CKP branches, is predicated on partnering with agencies and individuals in the community. I discussed historical background around these partnerships, as well as their reemergence over the last several decades. Research repeatedly cites challenges to these relationships; however, community partnerships seem to be of growing importance to IHEs, particularly in the area of service-learning. In addition to being a teaching modality, service-learning projects (like other IHE-community partnerships) have the potential to aid and support their communities. Food security has been a topical focus for service-learning courses, and projects have spurred students towards critical thinking about the food system. Service-learning in social work has focused on supporting social service agencies, from research to direct service. Past investigations into these partnerships provide useful ideas for examining the relationships between CKMU, Marquette University, and the social service community. Research pertaining to service-learning in social work among other disciplines, however, continues to be dominated
by student-oriented perspectives. By focusing investigation on how groups like CKMU function and relate to their communities, the potential for these partnerships to contribute to social change is enhanced.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to better understand the culture of the Campus Kitchen at Marquette University (CKMU) and investigate its relationship to the broader community. Findings from this research will be shared with CKMU and the National Office of the Campus Kitchens Project (CKP) so that new and established branches may benefit from detailed accounts of CKMU’s successes and challenges. Four research questions guided this inquiry:

1) How is CKMU structured and organized?
   a. What values, beliefs, and role constructions are evident among CKMU staff and volunteers?
   b. How are individual and institutional values reflected in CKMU?

2) How are relationships constructed and maintained between representatives of CKMU and representatives of community partner agencies?

3) What are the cultural norms for student engagement?
   a. How do students construct their roles as CKMU participants?
   b. What motivations do students express for participation in CKMU?

4) How do CKMU stakeholder groups think about the successes, challenges, and contributions of CKMU?
   a. What is CKMU’s connection to food security?
   b. How does CKMU demonstrate an environmental understanding of the food system?
In this chapter, I will present a description of the methodology and methods used in this research study. Design, in part, delimits a project’s potential contributions. In Chapter 1, I briefly discussed the rationale for selecting a qualitative case study design. Here, I will more fully detail the strengths of a qualitative approach for this particular study. Before discussing the particulars of the selected case, I will explore more generally the various stakeholder groups associated with CKP branches, working towards an understanding of what is case and what is context. Then I will explain the case selection process and, drawing on findings from a pilot study, introduce CKMU.

Following a description of CKMU, I will outline the data collection process and discuss how the data informed the research questions. Data analysis methods will also be reviewed and the rationales for selection provided. Subsequent to the discussion of analysis, I will explain the relationship between my critical lens as a researcher and the strategies I used to promote quality, trustworthy research. As part of this discussion, I will explore my relationship to this research, a subject further fleshed out in the succeeding section: researcher subjectivities. Finally, I will conclude with a discussion of the study’s limitations, transitioning to Chapter 4 which will present the major findings of this research.

**Study Design**

CKP has experienced rapid organizational growth, and branches have been applauded in multiple journalistic accounts (Black, 2008; Giboney, 2009; Johnson, 2008; Perry, 2010). As branches continue to develop across the nation, the lack of attention from the academic community becomes increasingly glaring. Because the CKP lacks a foundation of research-based knowledge, a more open, qualitative approach makes sense as a way to begin investigating this organization. Additionally, qualitative research demonstrates awareness that context is key when
aiming to better understand the social world (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2002). Activities of the social world require a nuanced and context-specific understanding of successes and challenges; tenets of qualitative research including closeness to the data, the search for disconfirming evidence, and acknowledging the researcher’s role promote such understandings. These aspects of qualitative research reduce assumptions about what is key in a line of inquiry.

Investigating a CKP branch “experimentally,” by isolating it from its environment, would result in insights disconnected from the realities of social life—the context. Therefore, research with a social change agenda is best supported through qualitative inquiry (Canella & Lincoln, 2009), as qualitative epistemology approaches a topic in an open way without predetermined variables. CKP’s mission to train “the next generation of leaders to implement innovative new models to combat hunger” (http://www.campuskitchens.org) clearly articulates a social change agenda. My decision to approach researching this organization through a qualitative design was influenced by my support of their mission, to, as co-founder Robert Egger expressed, “crack hunger open” (personal communication, R. Egger, March 2010). As CKP and other community food security (CFS) organizations pursue the social change of creating food secure communities, research from social work and other disciplines can support these efforts. The capacity for groups and organizations to theory build (Eiserhardt & Graebner, 2007) and form analytic generalizations which can be applied to further social change at the ground-level is best promoted through the findings of qualitative research.

Case study design may be the qualitative approach which places the greatest emphasis on context. By investigating one branch of the CKP through case study, I have been able to “look for detail of interaction with its contexts . . . coming to understand its activity within important circumstances” (Stake, 1995, p. xi). CKPs multiple stakeholders and contexts are a good fit with
a research design which underscores the importance of embeddedness and relationships (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2009). In his book *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, Yin outlined several types of research circumstances where a case study approach would be appropriate, including when (1) “how” and/or “why” questions are the focus of the study; (2) context is essential to the study being undertaken; and (3) there are not clear boundaries between the focus of the study and its context. Exploration of CKP meets these three qualifications.

Following the decision to employ a case study approach, one must consider the types of case study designs and select the model best suited to the research questions at hand. Stake (1995) proposed two major types of case study research: intrinsic and instrumental. This distinction is based on the idea that a researcher’s rationale for case study will either stem from a desire to learn specifically about a particular case, or from the decision to employ in-depth examination of one or more cases to gain insight into broader issues.

**Instrumental, Ethnographic Case Study**

Because my interest in studying a CKP branch stems in part from believing that in-depth knowledge about this organization will “accomplish something other than understanding this particular [case]” (Stake, 1995, p. 3), the present case study falls within the instrumental realm. Through close investigation of the operations, structure, and community contributions, findings from a CKP case study have the potential to contribute to CFS theory and discourse around institutions of higher education (IHE)-community relationships. In congruence with the premise of an instrumental case, findings from this research will be provided to the CKP National Office.

To increase the relevance of findings, research questions should be approached with the best-fit methods; this research was designed as an ethnographic case study. My interest in CKP’s organizational culture and the relationship dynamics with community partners was best answered
through an immersive data collection process. Nuances of CKMU’s culture were revealed as I moved from outsider to insider status (DeWalt & DeWalt, 2002). Decisions regarding time commitment and researcher presence are congruent with models for ethnographic case study (Bechky, 2003); the specific methods for this study will be discussed in the subsequent section detailing data collection.

The value of ethnographic case studies has been increasingly recognized in the field of organizational studies (Bechky, 2003; Gioia & Chittipeddi, 1991; Rinallo & Golfetto, 2006; Visconti, 2010). Benefits of the researcher’s connectedness in an ethnographic approach include increased capacity to identify norms, interpret behaviors, and make inferences about organizational culture. Smircich (1983) explained the importance of attending to culture in organizational inquiry, stating, “[t]he process through which a group of individuals negotiate and interpret their experience are . . . central for understanding the way patterns of shared meaning sustain organized activities” (p. 161). As a nationally-networked, community service organization housed in a university, CKP has a complex set of constituencies and contexts to negotiate; an ethnographic case study design will allow for exploration into these shared patterns of meaning, deepening understanding of what makes the case unique.

Embedded Design

In case study research, the case is investigated as a whole—a unit of analysis bound by time, place, or activity (Creswell, 2007; Stake, 1995). However, in some instances it makes sense to organize the case into subsections. Yin (2009) provided an example of an embedded case study design, explaining that “even though a case study might be about a single organization, such as a hospital, the analysis might include outcomes about the clinical services and staff employed by the hospital” (p. 50). CKMUs composition includes similarly embedded units:
staff, students, Marquette University officials, other volunteers, and community partner recipients. This research will focus primarily on a holistic interpretation of CKMU as an organization, its culture and relationships. However, the research questions, which will be used to guide data collection, have been written to acknowledge the aforementioned embedded subunits. The data collection schema outlined later in this chapter also demonstrate my intention to solicit information across subsections of the case.

**Sample Selection**

In this section I will explain my rationale for determining the case study site as well as provide a case description and a discussion of contexts. Site selection was a purposive sampling process influenced by a number of factors. A multi-faceted process, it included input from CKP’s National Office, findings from pilot survey research, feasibility, and an opportunity to learn. Stake (1995) suggested the “first criterion should be to maximize what we can learn . . . [considering] which cases are likely to lead us to understandings, to assertions, perhaps even to modifying generalizations” (p. 4). In line with these ideas, I selected the CKP branch at Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wisconsin for this research.

In March of 2010, I sent surveys to the Coordinators of each CKP branch. Results from these surveys assisted with site selection. Due to the purpose of this study being, in part, to better understand a CKP branch’s relationship to the broader community, having a significant number of community partnerships was an important selection criterion. CKMU was a leader in this area, indicating a partnership with every type of community organization listed, as well as two additional programs not included as choices in the survey. The survey, as completed by CKMU’s Coordinator, is included as Appendix A. Other preliminary information revealed through the surveys also indicated that CKMU would provide ample opportunity to learn; CKMU reported
year-round operations, multiple meal deliveries per week, and a comparatively high level of student volunteerism (with more than 200 unduplicated student volunteers between January 2009 and January 2010).

In addition to CKMU’s capacity to address the study’s goals and particular research questions, site selection also included feasibility considerations and willingness of the site to host a researcher. Because the ethnographic dimension of the research involved a relatively lengthy field presence, the selection of CKMU as the case site was not one-sided. CKMU also expressed a need for clarification of my role and the overall purpose of the research. Stake (1995) underscored that “[m]ost case studies are not evaluation studies but some interpretations made by the researcher will be evaluative in nature, so at least in that sense the researcher is always an evaluator” (p. 96). CKMU’s Coordinator communicated via the CKP National Office an initial wariness about being the subject of research, indicating to me a need for trust and relationship building. Although I had selected CKMU as my first-choice case study site based on the aforementioned reasons, the site was finalized only after mutual agreement was achieved during a short rapport-building and pilot-level research visit in March of 2011.

Due to the number of partners and angles on involvement, distinguishing CKMU from its contexts proved challenging. However, this distinction was necessary in order for research questions, data collection, and study findings to clearly reflect the identified case. In an effort to “bind” CKMU, I have delineated two types of contexts: intra- and inter-case context. Intra-case contexts are defined as factors particular to the CKMU branch, whereas inter-case contexts represent the elements and influences shared by all CKP branches. This combination of contexts contributes to the uniqueness of CKMU. In the following paragraphs, I will briefly describe CKMU and outline what I have learned regarding these two types of contexts. This background
understanding of the case and its contexts, largely stemming from two pilot-research trips, informed the specification of research questions as well as the data collection design.

Resulting from a combination of student organizing efforts and support from CKP’s National Office, CKMU began operations in 2003. One of five nationally-staffed branches in the CKP network, CKMU currently provides between 400 and 600 meals a week through more than 10 community partner agencies. Its status as a nationally-staffed CKP branch primarily refers to the direct funding for the Coordinator position by CKP’s National Office. Branches that are funded in this way are generally the larger programs, as defined by number of meals provided.

Predicated on interacting with other organizations, CKMU is not easily separated from its partners. In an effort to develop a strategy for understanding the case of CKMU, I followed Stake’s (1995) notion that case studies are bound by time, place, and activity. For this study, the CKMU case includes:

**Time:** data collection period from September 12, 2011 to October 21, 2011

**Place:** anywhere CKMU does its work (e.g., kitchen space, office space, delivery sites, meeting rooms, recruitment sessions, etc.)

**Activity:** work of CKMU (e.g., food recovery efforts, observing and participating in meal preparations and deliveries, shadowing the Coordinator’s work day, attending student meetings, etc.)

Activity is understood from the perspective of CKMU; this is how I distinguished case from context. For example, the activities of partner agencies are a part of the case only during times that CKMU is present.

My understanding of CKMU’s intra-case context stems from observations and interviews conducted during the aforementioned rapport-building and pilot-research trip in March of 2011.
Although this visit was focused on CKMU, observing operations and speaking with the Coordinator and volunteers also illuminated key aspects of intra-case context. Foremost among these are: 1) the institutional values of Marquette University; 2) the culture(s) of CKMU’s community partner agencies; and 3) the history of the relationship between Marquette University and the greater Milwaukee area.

As the activities comprising the case of CKMU underscore, CKMU’s intra-case context intersected with day-to-day data collection. Certain components of context more obviously relate to CKMU, such as the values of Marquette University and their influence on student culture or the values and norms of community partner agencies. Other aspects of context, while less directly connected to CKMU, may still have significant influence on the organizational culture and relationship to the broader community. Consider, for example, the demographic contrast between the student body of Marquette University and its host community: Over 75% of Marquette’s student body identifies as white (http://collegestats.org/college/marquette-university/admissions), and this private, Jesuit university is situated in the heart of Milwaukee, a city which recently earned the dubious distinction, based on data from the 2010 census, of the most segregated city in the United States (http://www.salon.com/news/politics/war_room/2011/03/29/most_segregated_cities).

My specific awareness of Marquette University’s values and student culture grew during my March 2011 visit. Starting with their motto “Be the Difference,” Marquette University places great emphasis on service. Commenting on how these values impact student culture, one CKMU leadership team member explained:

[A] lot of students at Marquette participate in service in some form, so maybe, I feel like a lot of Marquette students are experiencing similar things [to
volunteering with CKMU], like going out to different places and meeting people and doing different things. Because it is a pretty big part of education here.

(personal communication, March 2011)

These initial experiences observing CKMU operations—talking with CKMU participants and learning about contextual aspects of the case—allowed for the purpose of this study to be honed and particularized, with the goal of increasing its utility to CKMU, the CKP National network, and CFS advocates.

In addition to the contexts with which CKMU shares geography, other contexts are also relevant to understanding the case. Foremost among the inter-case contexts of CKMU are: 1) the impact of being part of a network of branches; 2) reporting to a National Office; and 3) the CKP network being a program of D.C. Central Kitchen (DCCK). The organizational chart in Appendix B visually depicts these relationships. While technically a program of DCCK, CKP functions primarily as a separate organization, consisting of 31 separate branches and a National Office. CKP branches operate—in terms of day-to-day food collection, preparation, and distribution—with a high degree of independence from the CKP National Office and from DCCK; however, influence of the central office and the parent organization are vital to understanding CKMU’s culture and its relationship to the community.

Based on my three-day visit to DCCK and CKP’s National Office, which included observations, interviews, and document review, I constructed three preliminary themes which influenced the development of the research questions for this study. These themes were: Emphasis on Innovation, Faith in Youth, and Information Sharing. These initial themes revealed organizational beliefs and priorities, from the perspective of CKPs leadership, which may have an influence on the goals and culture of CKMU.
The importance of innovation to CKP was expressed during multiple interviews. This emphasis on new, original ideas can be traced back to CKP’s development. Co-founder Robert Egger expressed repeatedly during our interview that an ongoing goal for CKP was to “train them [students] to look hard for assets in the community that other people don’t see” (personal communication, March 10, 2010). CKP National Director Ms. Maureen Roche also underscored the organization’s support of branches innovating and creating new partnerships. She explained, “[t]hey can develop whatever partnerships or whatever programs they want that would suit their particular place” (personal communication, March 11, 2010). The idea that young people of today will be the leaders for the next generation was expressed in several ways through the various interviews. A constantly changing leadership could be understood as an organizational challenge; however, Egger expressed a preference for such a model, stating, “within each Campus Kitchen now there’s been generations. . . that’s a powerful thing, the idea of transitional leadership. Constant new ideas washing through.” Lastly, CKP’s support of information sharing is connected to its prizing of innovation and its faith in student volunteers’ abilities to accomplish significant goals. Egger shared his take on information sharing:

My sense is that they’re [the CKP branches] obligated to share with each other. They participate in the regular calls, they participate in web stuff. They write a blog. For my purposes, what I want them to do is use new media. You’ve probably seen this, but you’ll see Campus Kitchens now has a really good Twitter kind of regimen. They’re always putting their stuff out—this is why I love it. In the past week it’s been like a bunch of Campus Kitchens are a part of the president’s great colleges. Or the Campus Kitchen in Burlington gets 25 thousand
dollars from Paul Newman’s Foundation, or Gettysburg College gets an article about closing the food gap in rural Pennsylvania. That’s what I want them to do.

This background understanding of the connections between DCCK, the CKP National Office, and branches of CKP such as CKMU, situates findings around the organizational culture of CKMU within a larger frame and provide evidence for the impact of a central office on the culture of network members.

**Data Collection**

In accordance with ethical research practices, both the pilot research informing this project as well as the following data collection scheme were approved by The University of Georgia Institutional Review Board. Data collection took place over a six-week period in the fall of 2011. An ethnographic case study design typically focuses on participant observation as the primary data collection method. In congruence with the case study model, however, multiple data sources are required (Creswell, 2007; Stake, 1995, 2000; Yin, 2009). While at CKMU, I relied heavily on participant observations. In addition, I conducted semi-structured interviews, facilitated focus groups, took photographs, and reviewed relevant documents. The table in Appendix C illustrates how each research question connects with multiple data collection strategies.

The subsequent sections describe each data collection method in detail. Within the discussion of each method, I will review how data saturation was pursued. Ensuring data saturation by “bringing new participants continually into the study until the data set is complete, as indicated by data replication or redundancy” (Bowen, 2008, p. 140) was an imperfect pursuit due to the inability to anticipate redundancy and the set time frame for data collection. However, I addressed this need through multiple observations of key activities, conducting a broad range of
interviews, photographing a variety of interactions and activities, and collecting an extensive array of documents.

**(Participant) Observations**

Observations were based largely on the key activities noted during my visit to CKMU in March of 2011. In addition, CKMU’s Coordinator served as a gatekeeper, assisting in the identification of relevant activities to observe (Creswell, 2007). A summary of observation locations (which also contains researcher role and approximate amount of time spent) is included in Appendix D. Actual numbers of observation sessions depended on the point of saturation as indicated by redundancy of data. I followed a protocol for each observation session, focusing attention on interactions that provide information about relationships, roles, and values. Expansion of “scratch” field notes occurred within 24 hours; these expanded field notes also contained observer comments (DeWalt & DeWalt, 2002) which I inserted using the track changes function of my word processing program. I also utilized a two-part researcher journal. The first section of this journal provides an audit trail while the second section is dedicated to reflective memoing, articulating my reactions, thoughts, and questions, as well as illuminating my subjectivities (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Charmaz, 2006; Creswell, 2007; DeWalt & DeWalt, 2002).

When a researcher enters an environment, the environment is impacted regardless of the researcher’s intention to do so. Spradley (1980) was one of the first to acknowledge this practical reality, and he articulated the notion that participant observation functions on a spectrum from uninvolved-observer to complete participant. Considering the range of possible involvement assists researchers in identifying the least-intrusive approach. My position on this spectrum varied by observational setting; however, I experienced an overall progression towards full
participation during the six-week period. Notable exceptions to this move towards complete participation included student Leadership Team (LT) meetings, phone calls between CKMU’s Coordinator and the CKP National Office, and “drop-off” meal deliveries to CKMU’s recipient agencies. Behaving as a more passive listener in such instances allowed for information about the relationship dynamics between these sub-groups to emerge without undue interference. In contrast, passivity in certain CKMU settings would likely have drawn more attention towards me as the researcher and away from routine activities. Such settings included food donation pick-ups, student-led food preparation sessions, and “stick-around” meal deliveries. In the majority of instances, I consciously refrained from offering suggestions to improve practice or taking on a leadership role, and the choice to participate in these activities was intended to reduce interference in the natural interactions.

**Semi-Structured Interviews**

In congruence with observations as the primary form of data, I immersed myself in the CKMU world for more than a full operating week prior to conducting interviews. Engaging in this period of observation allowed me to reference field observations during interview conversations. Participant observations throughout the data collection period also allowed for me to pose in-the-moment questions regarding the activities, roles, and routines of the Coordinator and student volunteers in a setting less formal than a traditional interview. Spradley (1979) described this type of ethnographic interviewing, specifying types of inquiries including the grand tour, the guided tour, and experience-oriented questions. I utilized this type of interviewing and included participant responses (as close to verbatim as possible) in my scratch and expanded field notes throughout the data collection period.
More formal interviews also served as a valuable source of data, as they allowed for me to engage with a different perspective (Loftland & Loftland, 1995) on mutually witnessed activities. Purposeful sampling was used to select interviewees and ensure adequate representation of student volunteers, CKMU staff (Coordinator and recent intern), recipient agency representatives, and relevant persons from Marquette University. I conducted 19 total interviews—seven students, one non-student volunteer, four Marquette University officials, six community partners, and CKMU’s Coordinator. The need for data saturation (Charmaz, 2006) was considered as recruitment progressed. For example, when soliciting involvement from students later in the data collection period, I focused on students not involved in the Leadership Team to ensure inclusion of a broad range of student perspectives. Several of the individually interviewed community partners and student volunteers also elected to take part in the (focus) group interviews for these CKMU sub-groups.

**Individual interviews.** Given that knowledge built from several weeks of participant observations impacted the formulation of interview questions, follow-ups, and probes, the use of semi-structured interview guides was an ideal approach for this case. Describing the tenets of a semi-structured interview in her book, *Reflective Interviewing*, Roulston (2010) noted:

> In these kinds of interviews, interviewers refer to a prepared guide with a number of questions, these questions are usually open-ended, and after posing each question to the research participant the interviewer follows up with probes seeking further detail and description about what has been said . . . . [E]ach interview will vary according to what was said by individual interviewees, and how each interviewer used follow-up questions to elicit further information. (p. 15)
Interview guides varied based on role. Appendices E through H outline the questions generated for CKMU’s Coordinator, student volunteers, community partners, and Marquette University partners, respectively. Tables beneath each of the interview guides demonstrate how interview questions were intended to inform each of the research questions. In an effort to ensure the questions contained in the interview guide would elicit responses related to the research questions, pilot interviews were conducted with people involved with the Campus Kitchen Task Force at The University of Georgia: The Coordinator, a community partner, and a University partner from the sponsoring office all participated in practice interviews during July of 2011. I audio-recorded these interviews and listened to them for the purpose of improving interview questions and topics. Pilot interviewees were aware of the purpose of their participation and were informed that no data from these interviews would be used in this study or for any other purpose in the future.

Pilot interviews assisted with increasing confidence around interview questions; however, the interview guides were intended as a starting point and allowed for flexibility in the interview process to clarify particular topics and probe additional areas of interest (Miles & Huberman 1994; Patton 2002; Roulston, 2010). I transcribed all individual interviews verbatim. All participants were invited to participate in member-checking of their transcripts and were given a three-week period for such a review. Due to the identity of CKMU’s Coordinator being publicly accessible, her participation in this study was public. The identity of all others taking part in individual interviews is confidential; participants are referred to by their role with CKMU (i.e., student or other volunteer; University or community partner) as well as by a pseudonym.

**Focus groups.** Focus groups are another data collection strategy common to qualitative research and the case study design. Defined as a type of group interview, focus groups “are
advantageous when the interaction among interviewees will likely yield the best information, [and] when interviewees are similar and cooperative with each other” (Creswell, 2007, p. 133). I conducted two focus groups: The first with a group of 12 student volunteers, the second with a group of two representatives from community partner recipient agencies. Because participants in these groups had the shared experience of involvement with CKMU, this type of group interview format was able to elicit stories from multiple angles, complementing individual interviews as well as other data forms. The same semi-structured interview guides that were constructed for individual interviews were utilized for the focus groups. While there was some participant overlap between focus groups and individual interviews; the interactivity of the focus group resulted in the same questions generating new data. This was particularly true in the case of the student group. Because the community partner focus group was attended by only two participants (one of whom had previously participated in an individual interview) the level of interaction and sharing between participants was lesser. Also of note, the second participant in the community partner group elected to cancel his individual interview, which had been scheduled for the week following the group interview. He expressed feeling that he had shared all of his thoughts and experiences regarding CKMU.

The student focus group lasted just over one hour, while the community partner group lasted approximately 30 minutes. Both focus groups were co-moderated. The role of the co-moderator was to serve as a note-taker, recording group discussion and main ideas on a flip chart. Participants confirmed that all main ideas and discussion were captured, utilizing a member-checking strategy where participants walk around the room at the end of the session, ensuring the accuracy of documentation (Jacobson, Pruitt-Chapin, & Rugeley, 2009). Colored markers were provided to participants, and they were encouraged to modify or elaborate on the
notes as needed. Following completion of the groups, flip chart notes were typed and participant remarks were noted within the document through the track changes word processing function.

**Documents and Artifacts**

Like interviews, inclusion of documents and artifacts is common in case study research (Creswell, 2007; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2009). As sources of data, documents and artifacts can be used to corroborate information from other data sources, provide new evidence, or even lead to additional directions for inquiry (Patton, 2002). Perhaps particularly important when investigating an organization (like CKMU) is the potential for documents to reveal discrepancies between what is being said and what is being done. As Prior (2003) underscored: “Indeed, in any organization it can be quickly seen that it is documentation—rather than its artifacts or member—that underpins the organizational presence” (Prior, 2003, p. 60). Documents certainly yield powerful information about organizational norms and practices; additionally, the unobtrusive nature of this data is also a key strength. It seems

> [t]he strength of documents as a data source lies in the fact that they already exist in the situation, they do not intrude upon or alter the setting in the ways the presence of the investigator might. Nor are they dependent upon the whims of human beings whose cooperation is essential for collecting data through interviews and operations. (Merriam, 2002, p. 13)

In addition to documents that would exist regardless of this research effort, I photographed regular activities of CKMU and its volunteers. I also solicited an additional form of documentary evidence that *did* “depend on the whims” of student volunteers: Question of the Week. While these participant-generated documents contradict the notion that the strength of documents resides in their lack of entanglement with the research process, the intention behind
these documents was to provide another way for student volunteers to share their perceptions and experiences.

Recruitment for Question of the Week took place during student meetings and cooking shifts. Additionally, the weekly question was posted on a bulletin board I created, in a hallway area between the entrance to the kitchen space and the office and kitchen areas. Selection criteria included student status and any level of involvement with CKMU. No question was posed during the first week in the field as this week was focused on observations. All participants received the same questions and provided me with written responses. I also encouraged students to email me recorded responses, although this option was not used. As with all of the student participation opportunities, students responding to the Question of the Week were directed to put their name in the “Research Participation Box” which was kept in the kitchen office. At the end of the research period, as I explained to the students during kitchen shifts and via email to the CKMU listserv, I drew the names of two research participants, and they received gift cards to local restaurants. Questions of the Week focused on motivations, roles, relationships, and other areas of interest that emerged from observations and interviews. Table 1 outlines the dates, questions, and number of respondents. Although participation in the Question of the Week was quite low, this effort provided an option for students to contribute their perspectives without participating in a focus group or individual interview.
Table 1

*Question of the Week Summary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Question Posed</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 19, 2011</td>
<td>What motivated you to start volunteering at Campus Kitchen?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 26, 2011</td>
<td>Has volunteering with Campus Kitchen changed the way you think about food and the food system? If so, how?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 3, 2011</td>
<td>What are your ideas about service and how did those ideas develop?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 10, 2011</td>
<td>Pretend I’m a new student—how would you recruit me to be a part of Campus Kitchen?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 17, 2011</td>
<td>How do you know if the Campus Kitchen is a success?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, in addition to the documents previously discussed, additional documents were added during the course of data collection, including brochures from community partner agencies, maps of the city and University, and several organizational forms created by CKMU (versus those created by the CKP National Office). The two-part table found in Appendix I outlines documents included in this study and their connection to the four research questions.

**Data Analysis**

Organizing, sorting, and reducing large amounts of data is often referred to as one of the more challenging aspects in qualitative research (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Patton, 2002). Although this process may rely more on a researcher’s intuition and artistic connection with the data, rather than cookie-cutter procedures, key case study researchers have offered suggestions for navigating the analysis process (Creswell, 2007; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2009). In this section, I will outline my strategy for data analysis, drawing on aspects of key analytic frameworks in case study research. I will also discuss my utilization of computer-assisted qualitative analysis software (CAQDAS) and the rationale behind this choice.
Analysis Methods

Qualitative data analysis is frequently characterized as an iterative process, one that is not clearly separated from report writing (Wolcott, 2009). The researcher may move back and forth between reviewing data, writing, mapping connections between codes and categories, and memoing (Charmaz, 2006). Creswell (2007) described this process as a “data analysis spiral...[where] the researcher engages in the process of moving in analytic circles rather than using a fixed linear approach” (p. 150). The constant comparative method fits this idea of moving in and out of data. In this method, data collection and analysis occur concurrently and are constantly compared throughout the process as codes and themes are constructed by the researcher.

Originally proposed within grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) the constant comparative method is now used in a variety of qualitative approaches. Through an ongoing construction of codes, themes, or categories, new data are sought to clarify and flesh out meanings. Following this method allows for theoretical saturation: “the point at which no new insights are obtained, no new themes are identified, and no issues arise regarding a category” (Bowen, 2008, p. 140).

Analytic Strategies in Case Study

In his discussion of case study, Stake (1995) defined the analysis process as “a search for meaning” (p. 84) and named four methods of analyzing and interpreting data relied upon in case studies: categorical aggregation, direct interpretation, correspondence and pattern, and naturalistic generalizations. Categorical aggregation “piece[s] together a snippet of information from here and another there, aggregating impressions” (p. 75) as a way to make sense of happenings. Direct interpretation, in contrast, allows the researcher to give credence to “important features [that may] appear only once” (p. 74). While researchers conducting
instrumental case studies, such as the proposed study of CKMU, should be alert to the potential for valuable information that requires direct interpretation to emerge, Stake viewed categorical aggregation as more important to the analysis of instrumental cases. The correspondence method can assist the researcher with a search for meaning based on “consistency within certain conditions” (p. 78). These patterned conditions or behaviors help generate codes, which may stem from preconceived, etic issues, or may be constructed by the researcher directly from the data. Lastly, Stake discussed naturalistic generalizations, explaining these as “conclusions arrived at through personal engagement in life’s affairs or by vicarious experience so well constructed that the person feels as if it happened to themselves” (p. 85). Case studies are limited in their generalizable capacity; however, the notion of naturalistic generalization recognizes that readers may take portions of a case’s findings and apply them to their understanding of a broader phenomenon. Adding to Stake’s (1995) ideas for case study analysis, Creswell (2007) pointed to the importance of including a “description of the case, a detailed view of aspects about the case—the ‘facts’” (p. 163). This detailed account will assist with the usefulness and transferability of findings.

While Yin’s (2009) notions of the analytic process have significant overlap with those of Stake (1995) and Creswell (2007), he offered a relatively more structured take on the analysis process for case studies, perhaps due to his closer connections with positivist research. He suggested four general analytic strategies to frame and organize analysis: the first (and most preferred) reliance on theoretical propositions returns the researcher to the theoretical issues underpinning the research questions. Yin (2009) argued that this method “helps to focus attention on certain data and ignore other data . . . [and] also helps organize the entire case study and to define alternative explanations to be examined” (p. 130). Also mentioned as ways to frame
understanding of the case are developing a case description, using both quantitative and qualitative data, and examining rival explanations.

**Merging Analytic Strategies**

The aforementioned analysis frameworks are intended as such; within each there is room for methods such as the constant comparative method (Glazer & Strauss, 1967) to inform the process of coding data and creating themes. Constant comparison has been a key tool in my analysis process. I have taken a more holistic approach to coding, due to the variety of data sources being utilized. While some qualitative researchers (Charmaz, 2006) advocate for line-by-line open coding as the initial coding effort, others (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Patton, 2002) believe a less rigid process of open coding can capture the content without adhering to a strict line-by-line approach. I primarily draw on Stake’s (1995) suggestions for both analysis and presentation, while also organizing findings within a thick description of the organizational settings, participants, and tasks (Creswell, 2007). Because of the instrumental nature of the CKMU case, I have used categorical aggregation (Stake, 1995) to merge my sources of data, offering findings about the case based on a convergence of information. My organization of findings both directly responds to research questions (Yin, 2009) while also presenting a composite scenario to demonstrate the constructed themes in a more artistic and attached manner.

**Computer Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis Software (CAQDAS)**

As a novice qualitative researcher, I have been aware of the potential to become overwhelmed by large amounts of textual and photographic data. Data sources emerged during field work, including unexpected documents and unplanned observation opportunities. These additional data have supplemented the anticipated six weeks of expanded field notes, 19
interview transcripts, notes from focus groups, dozens of documents and photographs, and a daily researcher journal with activities and reflective memos. For this reason I opted to utilize CAQDAS, specifically the Atlas.ti program, to assist with organization and data management. While CAQDAS does not perform analysis, it can “serve as an able assistant and a reliable tool” (Yin, 2009, p. 128). Additionally, CAQDAS may increase closeness with the data, due to the number of ways to access and interact with various whole and partial data files (Lewins & Silver, 2007, p. 10). My experience employing Atlas.ti during pilot research solidified my belief in this program’s capacity to support effective data management. When data are organized and easily referenced, constant comparison is a more straightforward practice; connections between observations, interviews, reflective memos, other data sources, and their resulting codes and themes are well grounded and solidly constructed.

**Trustworthiness**

Rigorous qualitative research has the potential to yield findings that are reflective of the research experience and have value for other settings. Case study research in particular has been cited for its capacity to contribute to theory-building (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007). However, research quality is often equated with practices consistent with a quantitative understanding of reliability and validity. Due to the contrasting epistemologies underlying positivist and interpretivist paradigms, qualitative researchers argue that experimental designs and researcher disconnectedness do not enhance the quality or usefulness of their research. In fact, researchers with a social change agenda have emphasized the importance of action-oriented projects (Whyte, 1991).

Although tactics will differ from our quantitative counterparts, qualitative researchers must articulate their efforts to enhance quality and trustworthiness in research. The first task of
this section will be to define my understanding and usage of reliability, internal validity, and external validity. Next, I will review the strategies I have employed. Woven into this discussion, I will address how my critical lens shapes efforts at quality enhancement.

**Defining the Terms**

In quantitative research, reliability is understood in terms of replicability: Would the findings of a study be comparable if the study were to be carried out again? Reliability in qualitative research, however, relates more to consistency—to whether the findings of the study are clearly reflective of the data gathered (Merriam, 2002). This is not meant to imply that another researcher would construct identical findings simply due to the same data being interpreted. Rather, the focus is on whether findings make sense—not only to the researcher, but to participants as well as those external to the study (Creswell & Miller, 2000).

Similarly, the concept of validity in qualitative research is distinct from quantitative approaches. A qualitative understanding of internal validity relates to the accuracy of representation of the data, including interpretations and perceptions (Creswell, 2007). External validity, on the other hand, relates to the usefulness of findings to similar cases or situations outside the particular context of the research. Lincoln and Guba (1985) helped develop this understanding of external validity by linking the individual reader and the study’s findings. In short, the user or reader of the research is responsible for determining the applicability of the research findings to other, potentially analogous situations.

**Reliability**

In accordance with notions of “dependability” and “confirmability” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 301) efforts were made to ensure that study findings reflect the data, thereby strengthening the study’s reliability, in the qualitative sense. I employed the following
techniques: data source triangulation and methodological triangulation (Merriam, 2009). Data source triangulation may be understood as collecting data from multiple points in time or multiple people in an effort to strengthen findings (Patton, 2002). Methodological triangulation, gathering data using multiple methods (in the case of this research: participant observations, individual and focus group interviews, and documents and photographs) also strengthens the reliability of the findings, as well being congruent with the principles of a case study approach (Patton, 2002; Stake, 1995).

Validity

Creswell and Miller (2000) encouraged researchers to consider their paradigmatic assumptions when selecting ways to increase the quality of their work. For myself and other critical researchers, reflexivity is the key strategy, requiring “reflect[ion] in the social, cultural, and historical forces that shape . . . interpretation” (p. 127). Creswell and Miller also highlighted how validity is strengthened when researchers take into account multiple lenses: their own, those external to the study (i.e., readers), as well as study participants to support “checking how accurately participants’ realities have been represented” (p. 125). The design of this study did not allow for the deep collaboration Creswell and Miller (2000) suggested as the ideal tactic for researchers coming from a critical paradigm. However, prolonged engagement in the field and multiple member-checking opportunities are intended to “actively involv[e] participants…add[ing] further credibility to narrative accounts” (p. 128). Focus group participants, for instance, were involved in a member-checking role that verges on collaboration; when, at the close of the session, participants were provided with markers, asked to walk around the area and review the flip chart notes, modifying them as needed to ensure their completeness and accuracy (Jacobson, Pruitt-Chapin, & Rugeley, 2009). In their seminal work Naturalistic
Inquiry, Lincoln and Guba (1985) stressed the importance of member checking in building internal validity. Member-checking of interview transcripts acknowledges that even verbatim transcripts are a construction of the researcher (Riessman, 2008) and promotes reliability by ensuring accuracy from the standpoint of the interviewee. For this research, participants who took part in individual interviews were provided with a copy of the transcript and given a three-week period to communicate any issues or changes.

Internal validity has been further attended to through a review by experienced qualitative researchers on my dissertation committee. Creswell and Miller (2000), along with others (Merriam, 2002), referred to this peer review process as a type of debriefing, where someone familiar with the research topic and process “provides support, plays devil’s advocate, challenges the researchers’ assumptions, pushes the researchers to the next step methodologically, and asks hard questions about methods and interpretations” (Creswell & Miller, p. 129). Being that this is my dissertation study, I relied on my committee chair and methodologist to fulfill this role.

In support of external validity, I aimed to include rich and thick descriptions, providing the reader with as much detail as possible from which to base comparisons to other cases or situations (Merriam, 2009). Additionally, an audit trail was used, allowing for transparency of my decision points (Miles & Huberman, 1994). For this study, I recorded the audit trail in my researcher journal. It consisted of a detailed daily chronology of research activities, including (but not limited to) observations, interviews, focus groups, and document review. My reflections were also recorded in a separate section of the researcher journal.

**Researcher Subjectivities**

Practicing reflexivity in the research process is another way to promote the reliability and validity of study findings (Creswell, 2000; Etherington, 2004; Peshkin, 1988). Articulating my
initial subjectivities serves as a starting point for the reflexivity I have practiced throughout the research process. Qualitative research recognizes and values the relationship between the researcher and that which is being researched. When considering my plan to conduct a case study of the CKP, intentional reflection on and articulation of my feelings about this organization and my connections to their mission was undertaken in an effort to promote the legitimacy of research findings. The purpose of this section is to outline aspects of my personal and professional history and belief systems that have the potential to interact with this research.

Having followed the CKP since its inception in 2001, I would certainly classify myself as a supporter of their mission. CKP’s pragmatic approach to food security aligns with my personal values, my understanding of social reality, and my professional values as a social worker. As I noted in Chapter 1, my personal connection to food rescue and redistribution was initially sparked by an awareness of the coexistence of hungry people and perfectly good food being thrown away. Since CKPs first branch opened, I have periodically perused its website and generally kept up-to-date regarding operations and expansion. Although I have never worked directly for the CKP, I did interview for a Coordinator position several years ago, and am currently involved with organizing a branch of the CKP at The University of Georgia.

In addition to my personal connections to the CKP, my identity as a social worker is important to include in an analysis of my subjectivities. Because of my strong belief in the profession’s core values of service and social justice, I search for programs that demonstrate the capacity for these values to coexist in a single program. This consideration of my personal and professional interest in the CKP necessitates an acknowledgement that I entered into this study with positive assumptions related to the CKP. Bearing in mind that my personal and professional
background has fostered an admiration for CKP, rigorous attention has been given to providing a holistic account of operations, including weaknesses, challenges, and inconsistencies.

I was reminded of my positive assumptions regarding CKP during data collection as I noticed feelings of disappointment surrounding what I viewed as CKMU’s missed opportunities. For me, food rescue and redistribution has the potential to go beyond a simple-service model, focusing on the reallocation of wasted resources to a critical view of the large-scale, industrial food system. When reviewing my researcher journal, I noticed multiple instances where I expressed disappointment or criticism around CKMU’s dependence on the food bank, its lack of connection with service learning, and its limited relationships with community partners.

In addition to consciousness of my thoughts and reactions, examination of my subjectivities must include attention to aspects of myself that I bring to interactions with participants. During this research process, I conducted individual interviews and focus groups with a variety of people involved in CKP operations. My own demographics and background informed these interactions (Roulston, 2010). Altering these aspects of my identity is not possible; however, awareness of my gender, race, and age, as well as my economic and education status supported my capacity to develop rapport and limit my own assumptions when working with diverse populations.

**Limitations**

Every research endeavor has limitations inherent to its design. For this case study, several limitations must be taken into account. First, qualitative case studies aim for particularization (Stake, 1995) of the case; therefore, findings are not generalizable in the statistical sense. Moreover, while findings may be useful to CKMU and other CKP branches, this research effort captured a certain time and place in the course of CKMU; findings are reflective of these
parameters. Additionally, the study’s purpose shaped (and therefore limited) what data were gathered. Because of the interest in understanding CKMU and its relationship to the community, all participants have connections in the case and, to some extent, investment in its survival. Community members not involved with CKMU may differ in their understandings or characterizations of this organization. Another participation-related limitation is the lack of involvement from food donors. Starbucks was the only regular food donor that was open to speaking with me as a researcher about their donation experience. Dining services at Marquette declined to participate, initially asking to be contacted via email with questions but opting not to respond to multiple emails.

Perhaps the most significant limitation for this case study is the set of issues resulting from a single researcher. When one researcher is responsible for the totality of data collection, her worldview, assumptions, and relationship to the topic exert greater influence over the study. As previously discussed in the sections on Researcher Subjectivities and Trustworthiness, several strategies were employed to balance the limiting aspects of a single researcher. While peer review and other strategies support the analysis process and prevent researcher isolation to some extent, a team approach for this topic would likely result in different findings and may be a useful strategy for further exploration of CKMU and the CKP.
CHAPTER 4

CASE STUDY FINDINGS

The purpose of this study is to better understand the culture of the Campus Kitchen at Marquette University (CKMU) and its relationship to the broader community. Four research questions guided this investigation:

1) How is CKMU structured and organized?
   a. What values, beliefs, and role constructions are evident among CKMU staff and volunteers?
   b. How are individual and institutional values reflected in CKMU?

2) How are relationships constructed and maintained between representatives of CKMU and representatives of community partner agencies?

3) What are the cultural norms for student engagement?
   a. How do students construct their roles as CKMU participants?
   b. What motivations do students express for participation in CKMU?

4) How do CKMU stakeholder groups think about the successes, challenges, and contributions of CKMU?
   a. What is CKMU’s connection to food security?
   b. How does CKMU demonstrate an environmental understanding of the food system?

The purpose of this chapter is to present this study’s findings, which are summarized in the following table:
Table 2

*Findings Summary Table*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub-categories</th>
<th>Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CKMU’s Structure and Organization</td>
<td>Undergirding, Institutional Forces</td>
<td>Marquette University</td>
<td>Messages of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CKP National Office &amp; Network</td>
<td>Knowledge Sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recordkeeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily Routines</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Leadership Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Student Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-student volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community agency partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Food Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CKMU’s Community Partner Relationships</td>
<td>Initial Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appeals to Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requests for Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Food Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delivery Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Volunteer Culture of CKMU</td>
<td>Variable Depth of Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Paths to CKMU</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scholarship Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Service Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Socialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple Benefits of Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Food Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder constructions of CKMU’s successes, challenges, and contributions</td>
<td>Changing Lives</td>
<td>Social Service Sector</td>
<td>Food Safety &amp; Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More Than Nourishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lives of Students and Other Volunteers</td>
<td>Engaged Environmentalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction &amp; Personal Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stretching the Mission</td>
<td></td>
<td>Developing &amp; Implementing Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deepening Community Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expanding Student Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enhancing MU Connections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The responses to these research questions provide the reader with insight into the purpose of this study. The first area provides a detailed description of organizational culture, from overarching influences to specific roles and tasks. Following this representation of organizational life, I delve into the area of community relationships in greater detail. Next, I focus attention on CKMU’s group of student volunteers. Finally, I explore the meaning of this organization to the community through discussion of how participants conceptualize both strength and growth areas. Within each section, I draw on data from multiple sources.

Due to the multiplicity of data sources used in this study, it will be important for the reader to have familiarity with my plan for referencing the data forms. When field notes are the data source, the abbreviation “FN,” along with the date and line numbers, will follow the example. If the excerpt is taken verbatim from my expanded field notes, it will be off-set similarly to a block quotation; if the field notes are paraphrased, they run continuously in the paragraph. When I captured participants’ words verbatim in the field notes, quotation marks will be used.

Because focus groups were member-checked directly following the interview rather than transcribed verbatim, direct quotations will not be used. Instead, these data are paraphrased and identified as stemming from either the student or community partner groups. Photographs will be included in text with their relevance explained in the narrative. Documents will be either included in their entirety in the Appendices or, if only a portion of the document is relevant to the example, the document will be described for the reader’s reference in the narrative.

For individual interviews, the participant’s pseudonym, the date, and the line numbers from the transcript will be provided to the reader parenthetically following the quotation.
Quotations are taken verbatim from interview transcripts; however, on occasion I added or removed non-essential words to increase clarity and allow the reader to focus on meaning (Kvale & Brinkman, 2009). The table included in Appendix J provides information about the 19 people interviewed in this study. Quotations from these interview participants are utilized throughout this Chapter. In the response to Research Question Two, an additional table is included which provides relevant information related to CKMU’s community partnerships.

**CKMU’s Structure and Organization**

As a living organization, understanding CKMU may look quite different depending on who you are and what you are looking for. Keeping the purpose of this study in mind, I identified two major forces on the structure and organization of CKMU: Undergirding, Institutional Influences and Daily Routines. These two forces will be discussed in the following sub-sections as the categories of this area of inquiry. Although CKMU’s structure and organization is best understood through the combination of these two categories, the latter—Daily Routines—is dominant in the data. Explanation of these categories draws on all available data forms, and their constructions take into account multiple perspectives.

Within the first category, Undergirding Institutional Influences, I will discuss Marquette University and the Campus Kitchen Project National Office and network. These influences are grouped together due to being primarily overarching, rather than direct, forces on CKMU. As do all CKP branches, CKMU operates on the campus of an institution, in this case Marquette University (MU), with no other relationship with the CKP National Office than through the Campus Kitchen. Naturally, the host institution is a major influence on kitchen operations. Moreover, as a nationally-staffed kitchen, CKMU also owes much of its organizational structure to the CKP National Office and network. The second category, Daily Routines, is depicted
through a description of the major roles and associated tasks described by participants and observed during my field stay. Within each of the roles, attention is given to how they are understood by participants as well as the individual values and beliefs of those occupying these roles.

**Undergirding Institutional Influences: Marquette University**

Evidence of MU’s influence can be seen through the delivery messages highlighting the importance of service, the existence of the Burke Scholarship Program, and the instances of employees volunteering for CKMU. While this category demonstrates primarily the connections with and contributions of Marquette University to CKMU, multiple participants also identified problematic aspects of this relationship as well as potential ways it could be strengthened. These dimensions of the institutional influence will be discussed in the response to research question four.

**Messages of service.** Strolling through Marquette University’s campus, situated at the edge of downtown Milwaukee, Wisconsin, one encounters multiple messages reinforcing service. The following two photos illustrate this institutional priority. The first, taken of a group of televisions at the entrance to the student union dining area—Marquette Place—simply reads “service,” and shows students preparing sandwiches, presumably for free meal program.

The second, a table tent in the dining area of the student union, reminds students of the University’s newly appointed President’s challenge to the student body to increase its commitment to service. The flip side of this table tent provides a web address for students to share their ideas and service experiences.
Multiple student volunteers with CKMU point to the institutional focus on service as a leading factor in their desire to attend Marquette. During the ride to a delivery site, a member of CKMU’s Leadership Team (LT) distinguished the emphasis on service from a purely religious
phenomena: He isn’t Catholic, he explained, but he wanted to attend a school where service was important—one where he would be provided with opportunities to “really take service beyond what you did in high school” (FN, October 18, lines 62-64). Similarly, a different student volunteer described during our individual interview what MU’s prioritization of service has meant to her experience:

I think service at Marquette comes a lot from Marquette’s kind of, the sense of community, working together, friendship’s really big. Just working together to make something happen. I think there’s so many opportunities at Marquette—like they’re basically, like anyone could do service ‘cause there’s something that’s accessible to everybody. No matter what your schedule, abilities, interests—there is something for everybody. And I think that’s something a lot of colleges don’t have. They have more limited, like you can go work this food pantry and that’s the extent of it. Like you don’t have to work with food, like I got to tutor at the middle school, and that’s a blast. I love kids though, so it’s right up my alley. I know people go tutoring, there’s the elderly care facility….people go downtown and work with people with disabilities. There’s like, through like engineering, I know they have their own things. PT [physical therapy], we do a lot with people with physical disabilities. It’s just Marquette offers so much, you just can tell it’s an integral part of the Marquette experience, just doing service. (Fran, October 10, lines 208-218)

Another student volunteer highlighted how MU’s messages regarding the importance of service directly resulted in her introduction to CKMU. One of the ways MU structures service opportunities is through the “Urban Connection” program for incoming freshman. She explained,
Yeah, they send people and groups all over and then they say, “Oh, do you want to go to Campus Kitchen?” And I’m like, “Sure.” . . . And so she wrote down Campus Kitchen and a group of maybe six or eight of us, we came here and then we cooked and some of us did dishes and we like rotated and…. It’s a thing for freshman coming in, kind of introducing them to community service. You have to sign up for it, and it’s only for freshman and the orientation staff, they take them there. It’s kind of like an intro to community service at Marquette. (Mary, October 13, lines 52-55 & 59-61)

While increasingly many IHE’s encourage service, the extensiveness of this message to MU students suggests distinction. As an MU alumnus, CKMU’s Coordinator shared her understandings of the institutional commitment to service and its importance in a Jesuit education: “One thing that’s very cool about the Jesuits—they are all about peace and justice;” she explained the Jesuit model that MU is based upon—the four pillars—excellence, faith, leadership, and service (FN, September 15, lines 42-45). The particular religious philosophy of the Jesuits may account for the stress on helping others. However, it is a message of service, rather than religion, which has been most impressed upon students.

**Burke scholars.** MU’s commitment to service frames CKMU operations in a supportive context where students are seeking opportunities to contribute to their community. While not intentionally created with CKMU in mind, the Burke Scholarship Program may be the single most vital way MU supports CKMU. This annual service-scholarship program, initiated by Dick Burke, the founder of Trek Bicycle Company, provides full tuition for a select number of Wisconsin residents to attend MU. Scholarship recipients are obligated to complete 300 hours of community service per academic year. CKMU’s Leadership Team is comprised largely of
recipients of this scholarship. Describing how Burke Scholars are a particularly good fit with CKMU, a Marquette University Administrator explained:

So one of the things that we do, is particularly for first-year students, we place them in sites, so that they’re not out spending all their energies trying to find a good site. So we have sort of a list of go-to sites that we feel are going to give them the opportunity to hit the ground running. But frankly, for students who are, because all these students have to come from Wisconsin, and that means we have a really interesting blend, it’s hard actually to have balance between students who are from the greater Milwaukee area and other more urban parts of the state to students who are from the more rural areas of the state. Often students who are coming to Marquette from rural places, this is a big transition for them and just sort of saying, “Here’s your bus pass, go someplace”, is not the easiest sell. And so Campus Kitchens, in terms of how I work with them with the Burke Program, has been a really, really—it’s like this great launching pad of, here’s something that’s right on campus, and you’re going to be with other Marquette students, so it’s not that I say we have the kids who don’t show if you kind of need the extra help, but we have every year a couple of kids who come into the program [who] are kind of “deer-in-the-headlights” about coming into the city. And they’re concerned and their parents are concerned and everybody’s concerned. And so Campus Kitchens has been a really, like a great gateway program, it allows them to be in direct service—which is part of what our requirement is—but also to be able to have that safety zone while they are really getting their feet wet. So it’s really a best-of-both-worlds situation for them.

(Phyllis, October 12, lines 64-80)
Several students in the Burke Scholars Program identify this status as the impetus for their involvement in CKMU. Multiple individual interviews with Burke Scholars on the LT indicated that CKMU, due to its on-campus location and regular cooking shifts, enabled Burke Scholars to meet their service obligations. In one interview, an LT member explained:

Well, I’m in the Burke Scholarship program, so we have to do 300 hours of service every year. And I, as a freshman, I was really concerned I wasn’t going to do enough hours and that I was going to be, I don’t know, an embarrassment to the program or something, all those crazy thoughts. And I know a lot of students went to Campus Kitchens to get in a few hours during the week. I didn’t really know what it was or what I would be doing, but I went with Lindsay and we just started going on Monday nights and I think [another friend] was there, too, and it was kind of…. I thought it was really cool, I think I didn’t really think a whole lot about it. It was more like it was just a nice social time during the week to catch up with people but to be doing something productive. Yeah, just kind of a block where I could set aside homework and do something different. (Mollie, October 17, lines 7-15)

While this LT member goes on to discuss how her understanding of and relationship to CKMU evolved as she continued volunteering, her Burke Scholar status served as the impetus for her initial involvement, helping to demonstrate the impact of this MU program on the structure of CKMU. Additionally, from the Coordinator’s perspective, Burke Scholars are essential to CKMU. She explained:

We also have a really great connection with the Burke Scholars program on campus, which is a scholarship program for Wisconsin high school students who have proven themselves as academic, social leaders and service-minded individuals in their
communities in high school and then receive this scholarship to be service and community leaders in their university time. So, we have been very fortunate to be able to connect with them and some of our biggest cheerleaders on our leadership team have encouraged others to be involved. Our Burke Scholars are just amazing, amazing people and we are really lucky to have them. Not just because they have a, I think it’s a 300-hour service commitment for the school year, which means they are always here [laughs] so they can make sure and get their hours, but they choose. I love them in that they come here because they want to be here. They can choose. There are a million other service opportunities in the area that they could have chosen, and they, many of our leadership team spend the majority of their service time with us. And they’re excited and they get others involved in the kitchen. (Amanda, October 20, lines 76-87)

The Burke Scholarship Program has converged with and contributed to the overall structure of CKMU. In particular, its construction as a relaxed, social on-campus service opportunity fits with the high-volume needs of scholarship recipients.

**Employee volunteers.** MU also intentionally connects with and supports CKMU through endorsing a plan, initially developed by a values focus group in the Finance Office, allowing a variety of MU employees to volunteer for CKMU during work hours. Describing these relationships during our interview, Amanda informed me that:

We [CKMU] do have volunteers from University administration. We have a nice, a good relationship with the Finance Department and the Bursar’s Office and we’ve also, this summer, had a group from Recreational Sports come in and they are hoping to come in again. Full time employees in the Union help also sometimes. (Amanda, October 20, lines 182-185)
Although other MU employees volunteer with CKMU (particularly one long-time cafeteria worker whose specific role will be discussed within the Day-to-Day Operations category), the relationship with the Finance Department demonstrates how the institutional values of MU contribute to CKMU’s organizational structure.

Early on in my field stay, Amanda named the volunteer contributions of the Finance Department as essential to maintaining deliveries during semester breaks when students largely leave town (FN, September 21, lines 122-123). Describing how this relationship developed, a representative of the Finance Department explained:

We developed this values focus group, which talked about the Jesuits and the mission and kind of the history. And it was like, okay that’s fine, and so often people think that Marquette’s mission means religion and it doesn’t. And so we tried to go beyond that and one of the big pieces was this service to others. So as a group we kind of brainstormed what could we participate in, and we were trying to find something that anybody in finance could do. So it had to be located on campus, and we got the okay that it could take place during work hours, as long as it was coordinated, and people are, you know, paid for that. Whatever those hours are. And so, we, I was familiar with Campus Kitchen because I had seen in the past for over holiday, Christmas break, that they needed help cause the students were gone. So my daughter and my niece, we came down and worked in it. It was quite a while ago. So I mentioned that and everyone liked the idea so I contacted Amanda over one of the holiday breaks and then put that option out there. And we had a good response and people really enjoyed it and then we thought, “Well, I wonder if they need that help?” Easter it didn’t seem so much, but summer…. and we thought one day a week and people could sign up. I think it’s like a two-hour
commitment. So we did that for the summer, we did it the summer before as well. And people enjoy it. It’s another chance to be involved and it’s a whole other perspective. And that’s just kind of how it grew. (Lucy, October 5, lines 30-44)

Though students rarely interact with employee volunteers, the significance of this relationship was further demonstrated when, during an LT meeting, the Finance Office was brought up as a possible vehicle source for travel to the CKP national conference (FN, September 13, lines 256-257). MU’s policy allowing employees to volunteer at CKMU, in conjunction with the impact of the Burke Scholarship Program and the more general messages of service present throughout campus, elucidates how the context of MU impacts the structure of CKMU.

**Undergirding, Institutional Influences: CKP National Office and Network**

In addition to the effect of being housed at MU, the mission and core functions of the larger CKP organization help structure CKMU. According to the Director of CKP’s National Office, each branch must do “food recovery, meal distribution, and some kind of programming” (personal communication, M. Roche, March 2010). While these aims are carried out by CKMU largely independent from the National Office and network, the goals and priorities of CKMU’s parent organization exerts significant influence. I will discuss this influence through the three thematic properties of Knowledge Sharing, Emergency Supports, and Record Keeping.

**Knowledge sharing.** Although in-person contact between CKMU and CKP National occurs only twice yearly (during CKP’s annual site visit and again at the yearly conference) and face-to-face interactions with other branches occur solely through the annual conference, alternative forms of communication between CKP National and network members is regular and ongoing. One function of this interaction is sharing information, ideas, and resources.
Perhaps the most obvious way the CKP National Office facilitates communication and interaction among its branches is through connecting their webpages via the National office website. CKP branches also have their own Facebook pages; while these are maintained by the individual branches, it is common to see “likes” and “comments” from both the National office and other members of the network. CKMU’s Coordinator reported relying on the Facebook pages of other branches for interesting articles about food issues and related current events (FN, September 20, lines 90-91). New projects branches are undertaking, such as planting gardens, soliciting donations from farmers markets, and composting, have all been shared via branch Facebook pages. These posts contribute to the culture and norms of the organization in terms of programming and priorities.

In addition to connected webpages, CKP National facilitates the sharing of ideas by organizing an annual CKP conference. CKMU’s Coordinator conceptualized this conference as a chance for students to learn about and from other branches, and bring those ideas back to CKMU. She explained how pleased she was that past requests from herself and Coordinators from other Nationally-staffed branches to fund students have resulted in a new budget line this year; she was able to provide funding for three students to attend the 10th annual conference (FN, October 20, lines 154-159). The conference was also conceptualized by CKMU’s Coordinator as a way to develop key partnerships across the network. During my field stay, Amanda shared her plans to present on the development of CKMU’s new partnership with Children’s Healthcare and the Foundation for Children with Cancer. With the notion of knowledge sharing in mind, she felt the conference served as an ideal opportunity for other branches to learn about this partnership model and begin similar programs with hospitals or Foundation chapters in their respective areas (FN, September 21, lines 77-79).
Another annual event bringing together representatives of CKP branches is the “boot camp” for new Coordinators. Although students do not regularly attend this training-focused retreat hosted by the National Office, its impact can be seen in the habits and norms at CKMU. The following photo shows a student volunteer wrapping in plastic a congregate meal delivery pan. This four-way wrapping technique, student volunteers informed me, is a part of their kitchen training outlined by the National Office and taught to Coordinators during the boot camp.

*Figure 3. Food safety plastic wrap technique photograph*

Sharing knowledge also occurred directly between branches. Through an email, CKMU was contacted by the Coordinator of another branch regarding reusable containers. It was the National Office that referred this branch to CKMU, having known about the acquisition of these “eco clam-shells” through a grant during 2010. Amanda was excited to share this information.
with another branch, noting the massive reduction in waste and cost associated with packing 100 individual meals weekly after securing the eco clam-shells (FN, September 13, lines 43-48).

**Emergency support.** Whereas the sharing of knowledge among branches is an ongoing way the National Office and network influence CKMU, the relevance of this relationship is also evident when examining changing circumstances. Since establishment in 2003, CKMU has had multiple Coordinators. As a Nationally-staffed branch, CKP is responsible for keeping this position filled. However, during times of transition between Coordinators, a staff member from the National Office has stepped in to cover some of the regular Coordinator duties. This type of support has impressed upon student volunteers that the National Office will not allow CKMU to falter—that support will be provided to ensure consistency and stable service for community partners. As one member of the LT explained during our interview,

> I know in some ways it [belonging to the CKP National network] kind of gives a security plan in case we would need somebody. Like I know when Jordan came out for Turkeypalooza ‘cause we didn’t have anybody ‘cause our Coordinator had left.” (Paul, September 30, lines 496-498)

The understanding that CKP National is invested in the success of CKMU was also shared by MU staff. During an interview, a MU staff member involved with the initial organizing of CKMU shared her experience of reaching out to CKP National staff with concerns regarding support needs for Coordinators:

> After Jen left, I met with Jordan, their supervisor. [We] talk[ed] about some of the concerns of that isolation, in terms of how fast the turnover has been and how fast the burnout rate has been, so we talked a little bit about expectations for those Coordinators and just kind of making them aware of the fact that, you know, they’re doing work here
at 9 pm at night and they’re alone in the building, so kind of [attempting some] advocacy
that way. (Susan, October 3, lines 66-70)

MU staff reaching out to CKP during a transitional period demonstrates their awareness of the
National Office’s influential role. Likewise, by responding to the concerns of MU, CKP National
acknowledges MU as a major support, vital to the success of CKMU.

**Record keeping.** While the overarching influence of CKP’s National Office and network
is evident in the communication between branches and by the personnel support of the National
Office, recordkeeping may be the most significant area of impact. The National Office requires
certain monthly reports from branches; they also provide templates for this record keeping
process. The information recorded encompasses food collection, delivery, and volunteer-related
data.

Having previously visited CKP’s National Office during my pilot research for this
project, I had been provided what I believed to be the standard documents all branches
completed and returned monthly. Entering CKMU’s space with this assumption, I was struck
that CKMU does not regularly submit certain forms, for example Community Feedback forms.
The forms that are submitted, then, take on an even greater meaning, due to the presumption of
the Coordinator that what she is choosing to report is the information most needed by the CKP
National Office—a notion that becomes reinforced when the branch remains in good standing.

During the second week of my field stay, I watched as Amanda worked to complete some
paperwork. I inquired about CKMU’s utilization of forms, and she shared that the following
forms were regularly used: “C” forms, used to help structure cooking shifts; “D” forms, related
to delivery shifts; “V” forms, which record volunteer information; and “F” forms, connected
with recovery and donated foods. (FN, September 19, lines 87-92). Although the ultimate
responsibility for recordkeeping falls to the Coordinator, students regularly complete these forms as well. Amanda takes pride in CKMU’s move towards a paperless system; she explains having transferred the majority of CKP’s regular forms into “google docs” which are completed and updated on CKMU’s laptop.

These regularly used forms are the basis for the monthly reports CKMU submits to the CKP National Office. Appendix K provides an example of a monthly report completed by CKMU. The first statistic requested is the number of meals served, conveying to branches like CKMU that the number of meals distributed is of primary importance. Notably, CKP National requests a numerical report of programming (both community and educational). In the example from May of 2011 (Appendix K) CKMU reported zeros in these columns. CKMU expressed awareness regarding the challenges of creating and maintaining programming—an issue which will be discussed in detail as a part of the response to the fourth research question. Regardless of where “zeros” appear on CKMU’s reports to the CKP National Office, one important take-away point results from examining recordkeeping: What is measured lets branches like CKMU know the values and priorities of the larger CKP organization. This awareness impacts CKMU in terms of how they conceptualize their successes, challenges, and plans for future growth.

**Daily Routines**

The overarching, contextual influences of MU and CKP National certainly trickle down to the daily life of CKMU. However, when seeking to understand CKMU’s structure, examining who performs what functions in the organization is of equal importance. During my six-week stay at CKMU, I found the daily routine to be most easily understood in terms of roles and their associated tasks. This is an imperfect way to describe daily operations, as some tasks shift between roles while other tasks are shared; however, describing the roles most central to CKMU
reveals much about participants’ values and beliefs regarding the organization. In turn, participants’ own values and beliefs feed back into the constructions of their roles. In this section, I will detail the major roles of CKMU: Student Leadership Team (LT), Other Student Volunteers, Coordinator, Non-student Volunteers, Community Agency Partners, and Food Donors. Marquette University partners are not included in this discussion due to the rarity of their interaction with CKMU. Within each role I will provide data demonstrating dominant values and beliefs and briefly discuss how these beliefs contribute to role construction as well as CKMU’s daily routine.

**Student Leadership Team (LT).** CKMU’s LT was comprised of nine students. As leaders in this organization, the LT had two primary responsibilities. The first, which during my field stay was taken on by two members of the LT, was managing the twice-weekly delivery to the stay-and-serve after school program. The other major duty, which involved eight out of nine LT members, was to lead the evening cooking shifts Monday through Thursdays. Nightly food recovery from Marquette Place, the dining services of the student union, was an associated responsibility of the evening cooking shift.

Though members of the LT shared a variety of motivations for and impacts of their experience with CKMU (which I will detail in the response to Research Question Three), their collective function may be most aptly characterized as middle management. Largely, the LT facilitated the involvement of other student volunteers and carried out tasks designated for them by the Coordinator. The following excerpt is representative of LT behavior at the beginning of a cooking shift:

Mollie is the LT member to arrive first. She takes the laptop out of the kitchen office and brings it into the kitchen. She sets it on the counter and starts reading through the tasks
for the evening. Other student volunteers come in, Mollie makes sure they have signed in, washed their hands, and then she gives them tasks. Mollie explains some of the sites to the new volunteers; as she explains where the food is going, however, she is not sure about several of the agencies. (FN, September 21, lines 135-140)

In my observer comments from this evening I noted surprise that the LT was not more familiar with the partner agencies of CKMU. However, ongoing observations revealed this lack of knowledge as the norm rather than the exception. The norm for the LT role was very much a task-centered one. An example of the specificity of tasks communicated to the students is evident in my field notes from the following evening:

- The first LT member arrives. He begins reading the laptop note from Amanda about the tasks of the evening. She is detailed in her instructions—tonight, in addition to the regular cleaning tasks of Thursday, the crew will chop veggies (squash, tomatoes, and peppers), cover them with shredded cheese, and freeze them for the winter. She instructs the students to cut off bad spots and she specifies what type of pans she wants the veggies put into. . . . One of the students asks “How much of these are we chopping?” and [the LT member] answers, “I think she wants us to chop them all,” and he goes back to the computer and checks Amanda’s note. (FN, September 22, lines 88-92; lines 96-98).

This level of instruction during cooking shifts was consistent across multiple observations. While their tasks were still clearly laid out, LT members involved in delivery shifts experienced a less directive volunteer situation.

- The “stay-and-serve” deliveries that LT members led, took place Tuesday and Thursday afternoons. LT would arrive at the kitchen space and begin their shift by loading the congregate-style meals (after checking food temperatures to ensure safety) and driving themselves along
with two or three other student volunteers over to the site, HeartLove Place (HLP), located in the historic African-American Harambee neighborhood of Milwaukee. Multiple members of the LT, even those who were not involved with the delivery shifts this semester, identified this task as their favorite part of the LT role, citing their love of kids and how enjoyable it is to see people eating the meals they helped create. (FN, September 13, lines 106-108)

Once the CKMU volunteers arrive at HLP, the LT member leading the shift heads to the kitchen to heat up the meal while the other student volunteers go back to the classroom areas to spend time with the kids. The two rooms of children receiving the meals are primarily pre-school aged. LT members do not come with an agenda; rather they act (and encourage non-LT student volunteers) as additional playmates, following the lead of the kids in the room as far as activities. The following photograph illustrates one of the most well-received LT interactions—magic tricks.

*Figure 4. Student leader community interaction photograph*
In addition to maintaining food safety standards by taking food temperatures prior to delivery and again pre-meal service, LT members also manage the timeframe of the shift, ensuring that the entire experience is complete within a two-hour period.

Examining the role of the LT highlights the narrow leadership development potential available in both cooking and delivery shifts. Practice directing other students towards the completion of pre-determined tasks appears to be the primary opportunity. In our interview, a member of MU administration confirmed this as the crux of the LT role, explaining,

[LT members gain practice with] that idea of, “How do I try to hold my peers accountable for something?” And that can be a real challenging thing for a young person to do. So, you know, what you see is if somebody’s not pulling their weight, first the student is going to try and cover for the student, then eventually the student is going to learn they have to be assertive. And that’s an amazing life skill for a person. (Phyllis, October 12, lines 117-120)

However relevant the development of assertive communication skills, the LT role at CKMU suggests a level of stagnancy due to the lack of growth, change, and creativity in the tasks delegated to LT.

Other student volunteers. Handling the large quantity of weekly meal deliveries requires a focused, efficient group of volunteers. Non-LT students volunteering with CKMU are essential to accomplishing this organizational task. Characterization of the LT as task-oriented could also be applied to other, non-LT student volunteers. However, if the LT functions as middle management, other student volunteers are pure worker bees. During a student volunteer focus group, several non-LT volunteers offered their opinions about their roles, stating participation in CKMU was a way to give to the community. Others mentioned the hours
fulfilling community service required by a fraternity. Another casual volunteer indicated “that it’s fun,” that the other volunteers “are upbeat.” Though the idea of community service is attached to the role of CKMU volunteer, its development appears tied to a benevolent rather than a critical perspective. Students are exposed to the idea that their community has needs, while remaining separate from those people and spaces. The photo below captured a typical scene of non-LT student volunteers. They are gathered around the prep table, preparing to unload and sort large boxes of salads collected from Marquette Place.
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_Figure 5. Student volunteer cooking shift photograph_

Those pictured are members of a fraternity requiring community service hours. Tasks were regularly assigned to student volunteers without explanation of where the food was going or how a particular task—such as sorting salads—connected with a specific meal or delivery site. One member of the LT shared her experience when she first began volunteering with CKMU, explaining,
[W]rapping pastries became kind of my thing freshman year. But, I mean, essentially that would be my job. I didn’t kind of look beyond that to where the meals [were] going or what’s [in] the actual meal. It was more that I would be assigned a task and I would just complete it. Which was usually wrapping pastries. (Mollie, October 17, lines 28-31)

Though some students increase their involvement, even joining the LT as Mollie did, the majority of students volunteering with CKMU remain at this basic level of volunteering.

**Coordinator.** Having served as CKMU’s Coordinator for nearly two years, Amanda is comfortable in her role and values its relative independence and flexibility. Coordinators of nationally-staffed CKP branches such as CKMU are supervised through the National Office; however, Amanda explained that “I’ve been here two years, so I don’t really need much support. I just check in . . . once in a while. When [a former supervisor] was here, our once-a-week meeting was really about once a month” (FN, September 21, lines 66-68). With this limited oversight, Amanda organizes deliveries, ensures adequate student volunteers, delineates the tasks for cooking shifts, and secures the needed food. The following section from September 19th’s field notes reveals a typical set of tasks:

Amanda is sorting through things in the walk-in fridge and determines she will be going to the food bank tomorrow. She says we can go there first, then come and drop off, then go and pick up the pastries at Starbucks. She tells me there will be a student volunteer joining her tomorrow for the drop off deliveries. . . . Amanda pulls out the list from Shari and starts putting together what is done, what is partially done and can be completed by the cooking shift tonight, and what needs to be prepped still. (FN, September 19, lines 9-15)
In addition to the tasks associated with running a kitchen, Amanda serves as the face of CKMU. In fact, the majority of community partners interact with CKMU solely through Amanda. This vital role will be further explored in the response to Research Question Two.

Amanda’s relationship with the student volunteers is central to understanding her role. Having completed her undergraduate and Master’s degrees from MU, Amanda has a special relationship with MU students. She shared having been drawn to the Coordinator position by her desire to work with students:

I was just hoping to be able to get students excited about service. And knowing how big a part service was during my undergraduate time at Marquette, I just hoped that I would be able to inspire other students in service and to realize that it doesn’t have to be just something that you do in the afternoon once a week, or it doesn’t have to be something you just do in your free time, it can be something that you do all the time. Like being involved in service can be something that’s, that’s beyond just your spare time. (Amanda, October 20, lines 9-14)

Engaging students with service is clearly a value Amanda holds and brings to the Coordinator position. Although she welcomed ideas from students and solicited input from the LT during bi-monthly meetings, Amanda did not appear to have specific expectations for the LT to take on projects or go beyond the routine previously discussed. One agenda that Amanda did stress with students was having the CKMU experience be an enjoyable one. From my notes on the September 13th LT meeting, Amanda is seen checking in on the LT’s stress level. She encourages the students to contact her if there are not enough people on a shift, so she can try to direct volunteers: “Let me know if you feel overworked” (FN, September 13, lines 226-228).
The minutes from that meeting (taken by Amanda and emailed to the LT and myself) similarly reveal her priorities. She summarizes for the students what she expects from them as LT:

- *Have Fun!*
- *Feed People!*
- *If either of these two things aren’t happening, please let me know so we can fix it!!*

These values contribute to how students experience CKMU and how they come to understand their roles as volunteers. A member of the LT described this laid-back approach to interacting with student volunteers, explaining,

> I think that she keeps things really simple and she keeps things like very relaxed and just like, she wants us to do things right, but not to the point when it’s like off-putting to volunteers. . . .Like, you know, if someone isn’t wearing long pants, it’s okay. Or like, if someone you know, I know that all these food regulations are here for a reason and I’m not saying we shouldn’t follow them, but if someone forgets to put on gloves, she won’t like freak out, she’ll just be like, “We have to put on gloves.” Or just little things like that. She’s just very easygoing, which is kind of how Campus Kitchens is in general, you know. Volunteers can come and go as they please, there’s no [message] like, “If you sign up, you have to come every time.” (Mollie, October 17, lines 244-246 and 250-255)

From the discussion of student volunteer roles, it appears the laissez-faire attitude Amanda brings to student interactions starkly contrasts with her style of closely managing cooking shift content. However, Amanda reported that her communication with LT regarding cooking shifts really depended on the composition of the group and on their abilities and interests.

**Non-student volunteers.** There is one volunteer with CKMU that the Coordinator makes no attempt to manage. Off-season employee volunteers were discussed in the preceding section
detailing the influence of MU; however, the non-student volunteer I will discuss in this section, though she is an MU employee, has a commitment to CKMU that is a far more personal and intimate one. The amount of time and energy, as well as the integral nature of her contribution, makes her role essential to understanding CKMU day-to-day operations.

Shari, as she requested to be referred to by, is CKMU’s longest-running volunteer, beginning her weekly contributions when CKMU was first established in 2003. During our interview, she shared her understanding of her place in the organization:

I think [I am] somebody who helps do whatever needs to be done. And provide really good meals so people can get, um, back on their feet and be able to progress in their lives and not worry about food because it’s a big worry for many people. If you don’t have food you don’t have the energy, you don’t have the… if you have food then you don’t have to worry about where your next meal is gonna come from, or where the next meal is gonna come from for your children. And that can reduce the stress 100%. (Shari, October 12, lines 25-29)

Currently, Shari spends anywhere from six to ten hours per week (per self-report) volunteering with CKMU. During semester breaks, she takes on additional hours and meal preparation duties. Through her years of volunteerism with CKMU, she shared interacting with student volunteers, teaching them money-saving cooking tricks like the one she described during our interview:

[W]e received copious amounts of ramen noodles. And… I showed them how to make a pasta casserole with it, without cooking the noodles first, and putting some pepper on it, and some cheese, a little vegetables, and one of the boys said, “I eat ramen noodles all the time but I get really tired of it.” And I said, “If you buy inexpensive or cheap spaghetti sauce, and you wet the noodles first, and then drain them, and mix a little cheese and
pepper on it, whatever kind you need to have.” And then, they have a whole meal. And you don’t have to work that hard. (Shari, October 12, lines 58-63)

Students confirmed this cook-mentor characterization of Shari (Mary, October 13, lines, 83-86; Paul, September 30, lines 167-175) and other students jokingly warned me to “be hungry” when I meet with Shari, and that she is “a total food pusher” (FN, September 13, lines 184-186). The following excerpt from my field notes details my initial introduction of Shari:

She’s a middle-aged white woman, about 60, I would guess. She wears glasses and has her brown hair pulled back and secured with a bow. There are boxes of food on the prep tables. NPR is playing in the background. Shari greets me and tells me to pull up a chair. She has laid out a schedule for the week—Monday through Thursday, with all the delivery locations marked. She has begun jotting down ideas for the different sites in pencil. She explains to me that she does this basic meal planning every week: “It’s easier for the kids and I like seeing what we can make for the week.” (FN, September 23, lines 8-16)

Shari plans the basic menu for the upcoming week. She also prepares, including packing, the meals for Monday and often for Tuesday as well. Reportedly uncomfortable with the attention associated with being CKMU’s “super volunteer” (as she is referred to on CKMU’s blog and in a National Office website piece highlighting her volunteerism), Shari explained to me that she just enjoys “playing with the food” (FN, September 23, lines 63-64). She also pointed to the values instilled in her in childhood as helping shape her understanding of her role with CKMU.

Growing up in a working-class family, Shari explained, “There was always room for someone to eat with us. We had lots of family around, and neighbors. In our family, if there was one piece of pie and five people, you just cut it in five pieces” (FN, September 23, lines 44-47).
Shari’s values fuel her participation and her understanding of how she can best contribute to an organization that, from her perspective, “helps students see the other side of the world” (Shari, October 12, line 299).

**Community partner agencies.** Often referred to as “recipient agencies” by students, the organizations that receive meal deliveries from CKMU are predominantly cast in a narrow role. In sites where food is dropped off as well as stay-and-serve sites, community partners demonstrate this limited role during their interactions with CKMU representatives—both students and Coordinator. The following excerpt from field notes illustrates a typical level of interaction with drop-off sites:

2:25pm: We arrive at Casa Maria. One of the workers of this house lets us in . . . .

Amanda and I enter the main house, where the group kitchen is set-up. We walk into the kitchen and unload a tray of seafood patties, large box of veggies, and two boxes of cake mix. Amanda explains what everything is to the worker, and tells him the seafood patties have been cooked and will just need to be reheated.

2:35pm: Amanda and I are back in the car and heading to Progressive Community Health. In less than 10 minutes, we are pulling up to the agency. We walk in with the two delivery bags—one filled with individual meals, the other with the bags for families. We take the elevator to the 2nd floor and walk back to the break room where we unload the food. Margaret, a social worker, walks in and Amanda explains to her what is packed in the individual meals and family bags. She mentions the CKMU stickers have been placed over the sell-by dates, but, in case any of the people wonder, everything has been frozen since before that date and only thawed yesterday. Jessica nods and says “thank you” to Amanda. We leave within five minutes of our arrival. (FN, September 27, lines 19-37)
Community partners construct and understand their roles through these brief and limited interactions. Margaret’s agency, referenced above, is a “drop-off” site for CKMU. Although relationships certainly become more involved at “stay-and-serve” sites—an important dimension to understanding community relationships that will be further discussed in the response to Research Question Two—representatives of stay-and-serve sites also assume a recipient role.

Congruent with this recipient status, community partners avoid making waves with CKMU. In the following field note excerpt from the senior meal site, folks receiving CKMU meals demonstrate their desire to be easy to work with:

After the line is set up, Amanda and I walk around and hand out the take-home meals. . . .

About half the folks take their meal out of the eco-clam shell and put it into a plastic bag. Amanda explains to me that Mabel has scolded people in the past for not bringing back the shell, so, if they think they may forget, they just pack it up right away. (FN, September 14, lines 60-61 and 64-67)

The recipient role occupied by community agencies is, in many ways, a natural fit: These agencies are receiving meals from CKMU. However, there are exceptions to the simple provider-recipient dichotomy that suggest the potential for a more collaborative role to exist. One such example comes from the same senior meal site, where, in addition to receiving meals from CKMU, the site manager has also donated bakery items. Their group collects day-old bakery items in a similar fashion to CKMU; however, they do not have the distribution capacity, so, when they are overstocked they donate those items to other community groups via CKMU (FN, September 28, lines 60-61). This practical sharing of resources highlights the potential for CKMU to expand the ways in which it relates to its partners.
**Food donors.** My decision to include food donors in the primary roles of CKMU was based on the food recovery premise of CKMU and the regularity of the food collection task. However, the donor role is not a complicated one. As is evident from the larger discussion of roles, interactions and relationships contribute to how people understand their roles and where they fit into the life of CKMU. For those in the role of food donor, multiple challenges exist, including in some instances a lack of understanding about food donation policies and protections. This issue will be further explored in the discussion around the fourth Research Question.

Aside from what Shari may bring with her from her dining hall on the weekend, donations stem from three main sources for recovered food: Marquette Place, The Brew (an on-campus coffee shop), and Starbucks. Student volunteers take the lead on collecting items from the first two places, and Amanda regularly picks up pastries from a Starbucks located in the downtown Milwaukee Hilton Hotel. In addition to food recovery, CKMU has established a relationship with a nearby farmer’s market. Vendors from this market are an important source of food donations for CKMU. Whether the donor is a prepared or fresh food source, interactions are minimal. None of the donors keeps track of their donations, though approximate poundage of donations is recorded by CKMU staff and volunteers. For vendors at the farmer’s market, Amanda explained that she writes an end-of-the-season letter for all the donors (FN, September 14, lines 98-99). My observations provided no examples of food donors being invited for further involvement. Similarly, donors are not kept abreast of information related to community partners and lack specific knowledge about where meals are being distributed.

In this section I have discussed the impact of institutional affiliations as well as the daily roles and tasks in the structure and organization of CKMU. During this discussion, I introduced the notion that, overall, community partners occupy a passive, recipient role. In the next section,
I will explore in greater depth how community partner relationships are constructed and maintained.

**CKMU’s Community Partner Relationships**

Relationships with community service agencies comprise an essential dimension of CKMU operations; it is through these organizations that the food distribution mission occurs. During the six weeks I spent with CKMU, 11 different organizations received food deliveries. Nine of these agencies enjoyed regularly scheduled deliveries, while two had more intermittent interaction with CKMU. Each of these relationships had unique features; however, many characteristics were also shared. When considering CKMU’s relationships with its community partners, examining how these relationships are initially formed as well as how ongoing partnerships are typically supported helps to better understand how CKMU fits into the greater Milwaukee community. The category Initial Energy focuses on the formation of partnerships. Within this category, I will discuss two properties: Appeals to Leadership and Requests for Support. These categories draw on multiple data sources in their demonstration of how past and more recent partnerships were formed. The next category, Inertia-bound, will focus on how relationships are maintained with ongoing community partners. A diversity of data sources and multiple perspectives will also be included in the discussion of this section’s two properties: Food Quality and Delivery Issues.

**Initial Energy**

The majority of partnerships between CKMU and community agencies pre-date both the current Coordinator and current student volunteers. However, for the more recent partnerships, relationship construction has primarily occurred between the Coordinator and representatives of
the community agency or organization. Students are largely removed from this process, as one LT member referenced during our interview:

Well, I don’t really know about how Amanda comes up with the sites. I think that’s kind of her end of things—coordinating that. I know we have dropped some sites and, you know, we find new ones. . . . I am not, like, quite clear on the whole community aspect except that I have done a couple of deliveries. And I think it’s interesting cause more students, like, do the cooking shifts and stuff than deliveries. (Lindsay, September 29, lines 243-247)

The path to partnership appears to be influenced by two major forces which serve as the properties in the following sub-section. The first, Appeals to Leadership, involves the Coordinator and other leaders within CKMU seeking out and prioritizing organizations with certain characteristics for partnerships. The second, Requests for Support, involves organizations approaching CKMU regarding meal delivery.

**Appeals to leadership.** Because Amanda, as Coordinator, serves as the main link between CKMU and the community, her personal criteria for bringing on a new community partner takes on an important weight. Describing in our interview how this understanding had developed for her, Amanda explained:

When I first was approached to bring on a new site, the first partner, potential partner or contact had asked, “What is your criteria for being, for us [CKMU], to serve?” And I was like, “Well, you’re the first one… I guess you’re serving people in need, your agency is serving people in need, and your program makes me think it’s really awesome,” and so that’s sort of been my criteria [laughs]. . . . we’ve brought on a couple of new sites since I’ve been here and everyone has had that—serving people who could use a little extra
help, who could—whether it’s people who are homeless or people who are, who have
kids who are battling cancer. They are all just people who could use a little extra help and
the program is doing that. That’s our criteria, if we can make it fit, we’ll do our best. And
so far we haven’t had an agency approach us that we weren’t able to make it fit.

(Amanda, October 20, lines 168-176)

This statement illustrates an important value undergirding CKMU’s community partnerships:
Though Amanda takes into consideration aspects of the organization in question when securing a
new partnership, it is overall growth in the number of partnerships and total people served that is
the priority. She went on to explain this version of organizational growth in our interview:

   We set our level of [meal distribution]…I don’t feel like we have some, I don’t feel like
the National Office is telling us, or me, to serve more people. I feel like we can serve, we
have the ability to serve more people, so we should. If we have a partnership and then, if
we still can, we should—I feel we should bring on something else so we can reach a few
more people. If we can feed 20 more people every week—awesome—then we should try
to do it. If we have the ability to do it, we should do it. We’re in a position to feed people
and I would hope that if I was in the position to need food that someone would be willing
to take that extra step. (Amanda, October 20, 123-129)

CKMU’s conceptualization of its capacity for new partnerships is filtered through beliefs about
its capacity for meal distribution. This demonstrates an important aspect of CKMU’s
relationships with community partners and the potential for growth within relationships, which
will be further discussed in the response to Research Question Four.

   In addition to Amanda’s personal beliefs regarding organizational growth, both MU and
the CKP National Office have influenced the Coordinator’s priorities in terms of partnership
formation. Outside of CKMU, MU enjoys a long history of working with agencies in the Milwaukee area. As a two-time graduate and a former Burke Scholar, CKMU’s Coordinator has familiarity with many of the agencies that have other types of partnerships with MU. This influence is illustrated as Amanda explained how she initiated her first partnership as Coordinator:

[S]o when we [needed] to bring on a new site and had short notice, because we had ended a partnership with another site, I had worked with Casa Maria during my undergrad at Marquette. And so, I knew it was an emergency shelter for women and families and that they also provided, they also had clothes and food available to members of the community, and that they were just a good organization that was out there wanting to help people. And so, when we needed a site, [I] called them up, and . . . they were excited to be partnering with us, we were excited to partner with them, so it was just, within a week we had everything set and we were going and we were feeding twice a week. Providing meals for those in the shelter and also for the volunteers who make everything happen as Casa Maria is entirely a volunteer run organization. So, like, some partnerships that if, uh, that—I do recognize that having partnerships that may have been set up by someone else who was passionate about the organization, but as leadership here has changed, the relationship changed as well. (Amanda, October 20, lines 105-115)

Though sites such as Casa Maria, with some prior relationship to MU, have been sought out, Amanda also mentioned keeping in mind the values of CKP National when forming new community partnerships.

While packing up large plastic bags full of bagels for delivery to a nearby (but irregular) delivery site, I inquired as to why CKMU did not have a more formal relationship with this
group. Amanda explained that CKMU prefers working with groups that are accepting and open of all religions: “Since our base organization is secular, we stick to places that don’t make religion compulsory” (FN, September 19, line 40-43). Many of CKMU’s community partners do have a religious affiliation; however, when religion is compelled, CKMU has declined to build a formal relationship. The Mission, as it is referred to by Amanda and the students, is a homeless services facility catty corner to the CKMU building. It serves hundreds of Milwaukeeans in food-insecure situations daily. However, due to its philosophy of compulsory religious participation, CKMU has avoided bringing the Mission into the fold as an established community partner.

As the Coordinator of a non-profit with a constantly fluctuating pool of volunteers, Amanda recognizes the struggle to step in and maintain relationships with a host of agencies. In one instance, CKMU ended its relationship with a community group. Amanda explained during our interview how this experience impacted her thinking on partnership formation:

I do recognize that having partnerships that may have been set up by someone else who was passionate about the organization, but as leadership here has changed, the relationship changed as well. And so without [the initial relationship] being quite as strong, it makes it, things that are not quite as good, [that] were maybe no big deal before, [become] maybe more of a challenge. Which is why we did end a partnership with a previous organization. (Amanda, October 20, lines 113-117)

Though LT and other student volunteers are able to donate a maximum of four years volunteer timeline, Shari has acted as one stable member of the CKMU family since its inception. It makes sense, then, that she has also played a role in partnership formation. Several community partners
identified Shari as CKMU’s cook, and referenced her communication about food preferences as a component of their relationship.

In addition to these maintenance-oriented efforts, Shari is responsible for establishing a partnership with one of the city’s domestic violence shelters. While we were making chicken salad sandwiches for a delivery, Shari explained a little more about her connection to this group:

Shari tells me about a friend who works at the DV shelter. I ask about whether she met this woman through CKMU, and she explains, no, she is how CKMU met the DV shelter: “I knew they could use the food.” She tells me about how the shelter used to be independent but they are changing to become part of the Community Advocates network in Milwaukee. She tells me how much they appreciate getting the food, and how important she feels like food is when you are going through difficult times. “It can make the difference and give you energy,” she explains. (FN, September 30, lines 29-35)

Existing community knowledge and relationships as well as the values and priorities of CKMU leadership contribute to the process of partnership formation between CKMU and Milwaukee’s community service sector.

Thus far, the focus has been on what CKMU is prioritizing in terms of new partnerships. Our discussion now turns to times when CKMU has been sought out by agencies for food assistance.

Requests for support. As an organization based upon community partnerships, examining how CKMU’s partnerships develop reveals much about its place in the larger social and community service system. Due to the natural turnover of agency staff, many of CKMU’s community partners were not aware of how their relationships began. However, several partners that did recall this process shared with me how their agency had heard about and approached
CKMU. The following excerpt is taken from my interview with Megan, the Director of an agency serving developmentally disabled adults. CKMU provided meals for its bimonthly group meetings. The Director explained:

I want to say that we initially learned about Campus Kitchen through the Young Non-Profit Network, um, YNPN, here in Milwaukee. They send out different emails about things that are going on in the community and just different opportunities for nonprofits to kind of network with each other . . . . And they do different workshops. And I believe it was an email several summers ago now, letting the community know that they had some available space for different organizations to get involved ‘cause they were having a lull in the summer. So that’s how we initially got involved and we weren’t sure at the time whether it was gonna be a short-term or a long-term thing but we did have the opportunity to move into a year-round arrangement with them. (Megan, October 17, lines 6-14)

At this stage in its organizational development, CKMU utilized existing social service networks to recruit new community partners. In a sense, CKMU advertised its services. Though Megan’s explanation of how the relationship developed does imply some communication of terms with CKMU, it also communicates that the extent of the relationship was based on establishing frequency of food delivery, maintaining the provider-recipient role structure evident in the majority of community partnerships.

An additional example demonstrating CKMU’s response to requests for support comes from their most recent partner, The Milwaukee Chapter of The Foundation for Children with Cancer (FCC). After hearing about CKMU’s relationships with other area non-profits at a community meeting, the Director of the local FCC Chapter contacted Amanda. In an effort to
address the financial and nutritional struggles families face when they have a child hospitalized, the FCC wanted to begin a monthly dinner in the Hematology, Oncology, and Transplant unit at Children’s Healthcare. During our interview, the Director, Carol, shared how she learned about CKMU:

I had been expressing to people within my network the idea for what we wanted to do to support the families at Children’s Hospital, in terms of bringing meals inside. And initially, we tried to see if there were restaurants who would think this would be advantageous to them to get involved in the community and they could donate meals. We only had one restaurant that jumped on board and felt like that was something they could help with. And so I was really stuck, thinking how can we keep it going and I was talking to someone in my network, who she is an employee of the YWCA, and she knew of the Campus Kitchens Program through the YWCA and she said, “You know, there’s an organization,” and she explained who [CKMU was], she didn’t really know how you got the food or did what you did, but she knew that the Campus Kitchens program was there to deliver meals to different organizations. (Carol, October 17, lines 22-31)

She went on to explain her process of contacting CKMU, including a series of phone calls to an incorrect phone number on the MU website. Eventually Carol connected with a representative of the MU Office of Community Service and was referred to CKMU, and when contact was established with Amanda, the response was overwhelmingly positive. Carol shared how the process of partnering with CKMU advanced:

[Amanda] completely believed in the cause and what we were doing and it was something that was really, really appealing to them in terms of [what] we wanted to help the children and their families at Children’s Hospital. So her and I started talking about
when she’d be available and we kind of threw a date out there and I was able to go down and meet her and Sharon. They showed me around and told me about what they did, how they’re preparing the meals and where they get the food from. Just so I can understand a little more about the program. And Amanda told me, as I packed up my trunk outside, that actually she asked me if it was okay if she met me at Children’s ‘cause she would like to serve the meals as well. And I was like, all the way, preparing everything and my hope that she would want to serve, and that’s been an extra blessing. Every time we’ve been there, she’s been there. (Carol, October 17, lines 38-47)

For Amanda, supporting and prioritizing this new partnership made sense for many reasons. She explained:

So, with Marquette, Marquette has a long-standing tradition with Children’s Hospital. The hospital used to be located on what is now University grounds—what used to be Children’s Hospital is now University-owned student apartments. So, it’s—and as a part of that, the University also hosts a huge, huge run/walk every fall to help raise money for Children’s. They, this year I think they had, I want to say close to 10,000 people walking. It’s just been a mass of people who are just excited to help the kids. So we also, when I first heard that we had this opportunity to work with Children’s I was like, the University, we have to make this work—cause the University is involved. I also have a little family history with Children’s as my partner’s nephew received treatment there last year. So, if we can do anything to help Children’s, we wanted to. So, for us, for me, it was something that we felt we really needed to do. (Amanda, October 20, lines 137-146)

The relationship among CKMU, FCC, and Children’s Hospital provides additional evidence of the contextual influence of MU on CKMU’s development of community partnerships. With a
staff of one and an LT uninvolved with community partner development, energy directed towards creating additional partnerships is limited. Though individual and institutional values are reflected in the formation of new partnerships, when aiming to better understand how CKMU relates to its community, examining ongoing partnerships is essential.

**Continuing Partnerships**

In the nearly two years Amanda has served as Coordinator, two new sites have been added, with only one existing partnership ending. Primarily, CKMU maintains its community partnerships through whatever changes in staff and student leadership occur. The majority of CKMU’s community partners receive meals from CKMU but do not interact with its volunteers or staff beyond this exchange. These sites are known as drop-off sites. Three of the 11 community partners are referred to as stay-and-serve or stick-around sites. Because CKMU representatives interacting with the stay-and-serve sites not only interface with agency staff but also with consumers, I will distinguish between stay-and-serve and drop-off sites when referring to a community partner. Although qualitative differences between stay-and-serve and drop-off sites exist, both types of partnerships equally contribute to this category’s construction.

Once partnerships are underway, changes and modifications are infrequent. This section focuses on these continuing partnerships. From my observations, interviews, and other sources of data, I constructed two properties to explain the maintenance and communication with ongoing community partners. The first, Food Quality, illustrates that both CKMU and its community partners focus their communication on food-related issues, including food needs, allergies, and preferences. The second property, Delivery Issues, demonstrates that outside of specific communication about the food itself, interaction between CKMU and its community partners continues to stay close to the established function of this relationship—meal distribution.
Food quality. During the student volunteer focus group, food quality was brought up by multiple participants as a point of pride. “We don’t just serve Oliver Twist slop,” Paul commented during the group interview (October 11) and other students agreed: Providing quality food is important. Several of CKMU’s community partners also indicated the quality of the food as a highlight of their relationship with CKMU. One community partner indicated during his focus group how the healthier food delivered by CKMU had been a positive for the members of his group, stating, “Our agency used to get the guys what they asked for on our budget—pizza or whatever. But now they [CKMU] brings fresh fruit, spring salad. . . . at first they [the group members] resisted but now they are more open” (October 14, 2011).

Typically, community partners expressed satisfaction with the quality of CKMU’s food. Additionally, feeling comfortable with discussing concerns or needs related to the food with CKMU’s Coordinator or other representatives was typical. One community partner shared being impressed by CKMU’s interest in providing her group with such high-quality foods. She explained:

Shari has asked me, “What are some of the requests?” They had questions about families eating the green salad, I can’t even remember, one day Sharon sent over a like a dozen things that could go in the salad—it was amazing—and the families love that fresh, they want that, if it’s green and fresh. (Carol, October 17, lines 120-123)

Though delivering high-quality food was clearly a priority for CKMU, stay-and-serve sites exhibited some advantages in terms their relationships with CKMU and the resulting capacity to communicate their food preferences directly. The following excerpt from field notes taken during lunch at a stay-and-serve site illustrates this idea:
I overhear a conversation at Amanda’s table that has to do with the CKMU food—it’s a request for more cheese to be included in the meals. String cheese has been included in the past and one woman expresses her love of it and hopes it will be back. Another woman expresses how much she likes the yogurt that is there today and was also in last week’s meal. (FN, September 28, lines 54-57)

During my six weeks with CKMU, deliveries to the stay-and-serve site referenced above were done exclusively by Amanda, with feedback about the food being given directly to her. Feedback calls attention to food quality and preferences of those receiving the meals. However, in some cases, simply knowledge about those eating and reflection on their (perceived) needs underscored the need for high-quality food.

Of the three stay-and-serve sites, one was an entirely student-run delivery shift. This twice-weekly delivery was known as “Kids Café” and involved CKMU’s students spending a couple of hours with pre-school and school-aged children, serving them an afternoon meal. Multiple student volunteers shared that, with Kids Café in particular, they considered the nutritional needs of those receiving the meals. One student comment suggests that creating quality meals is a way to demonstrate thoughtfulness towards those receiving the meals:

I think it’s just, well, the nourishment, ‘cause a lot of times the people who we’re giving the food to, they don’t have the opportunity to have fruits and vegetables all the time, you know, cause healthy food is expensive, so, the fact that we try and incorporate all the different, you know, parts of the food pyramid, and dairy and protein and starch and whatever. (Lindsay, September 29, lines 58-61)

Other students (Mary, October 13, lines 114-122; Michael, October 14, lines 146-148; Paul, September 30, lines 176-181) similarly indicated focusing on increasing the vegetables and
general healthiness of the Kids Café meals, while keeping the meals appealing to the kids receiving them.

Though direct communication has its privileges, drop-off sites also shared their comfort with providing feedback regarding the food. During our interview, one (drop-off site) community partner commented:

Pretty much we, you know, we just see them [CKMU representatives] once a week when they drop the food off, check in with them, if there’s anything they’ve thought of, like a month ago she [Amanda] asked just to make sure that we checked with the families to see if there are any dietary restrictions or anything like that, to help them out. Otherwise it’s a pretty basic [exchange], just telling us what there is. And if we have any requests, we feel comfortable talking to them about that. (Margaret, October 13, lines 48-52)

While this is an important starting place for communication, the focus on food quality can also be seen as a limiting factor in building deeper partnerships. One afternoon when the Coordinator was unexpectedly kept home with a headache, I had the opportunity to ride along with the LT member who stepped up to take over the day’s drop-off deliveries. In this instance, checking in with community partners regarding food quality was the maximum interaction—something done only with those who are familiar. The following excerpt from that afternoon’s field notes speaks to the limited nature of communication:

We arrived at the first drop-off site. [The LT member driving] said, “I am not sure which house to go into—I forget which one I went to last week” and I tell her Amanda always goes into the house on the left. We buzz the door and a staff member lets us in. She says, “We’re from Campus Kitchen with your food,” and the staff person tells us to “Take it to the kitchen.” I lead the way, as [the LT member] appears unsure of where the kitchen is.
We drop the food off on the counter—chili, cottage cheese, and bread. . . . Back in the car and heading to the next drop-off location, I ask about feedback from community partners—how it works and what she has heard. She tells me that “usually they’ll just tell us if it’s really bad. Places I know better, I’ll ask them how everything was, but [that place], I didn’t—I have not seen the same person there twice.” (FN, October 10, lines 39-49)

In my observer comments, I noted concern that I seemed more familiar with this site than a two-year LT member. In this case, a lack of familiarity impacted communication about even the most superficial of topics.

**Delivery issues.** As the discussion around food quality demonstrates, CKMU relies heavily on face-to-face interaction to maintain their community partner relationships. Although multiple community partners also indicated using email or phone calls to get in touch with Amanda, face-to-face communication appeared to be the norm. As the manager of one drop-off site stated:

> We use telephone to communicate, we use email—email is so popular. We see them face to face when they come to deliver the meals Monday evenings, of late. They have been in different days in the past but right now it’s Mondays. And that’s pretty much how we communicate. . . . We’re sharing information, they’re finding out what our needs are (Shirley, October 11, lines 41-43 & 47-78).

Mode of communication certainly provides information about the cultural norms regarding interaction between CKMU and community partners; however, examining the content of these interactions also provides salient information about these relationships. Closely related to the
focus on food quality are the non-food related delivery issues about which community partners and CKMU representatives also regularly communicated.

One example of the type of delivery issue regularly cited by community partners was explained by a representative of a drop-off site. She informed me during our interview:

Eight meals is usually good, but if we for some reason know that we’re gonna have, you know, an increase in participants, we’ll just give her a call or send her an email and it’s never been a problem to adjust the number of meals that we’ve needed. (Megan, October 17, lines 68-70)

In my interview with the Coordinator, she also cites the number of meals as a prime reason for communication with community partners. She explained that, with drop-off sites, this is primarily her responsibility:

[M]any of these [drop-off site meals] are the ones that I will take, not quite as exciting, so we don’t— if students aren’t available, if our LT isn’t available to take them out, I don’t mind taking them out. It gives me a chance to make sure that I am checking in with the guests [through] our site contact and making sure that what we sent out last week was good. Checking in to see how many people they have, how their census is if it’s a shelter or a residential setting. Making sure that we’re sending enough food if they’ve got more people coming in. If it’s the domestic violence shelter and they have a ton of teenaged boys living there, we’ll try to make sure we’re sending enough food, so try to keep that communication really open so that they’re, they feel comfortable telling us what they need. So we can adjust. (Amanda, October 20, lines 361-368)

Amanda goes on to explain how communication around delivery issues has helped CKMU respond to community partners’ changing needs and schedules, stating:
[W]hen we were checking in with [one of the drop-off sites] that we work with, they were wondering why we bring food when we do. Because they have a new, a fairly new staff person in the last six months, and so, she was just checking in and said would it be possible to move things around. And so we’re working at in the next couple of weeks, seeing if we can move their delivery around a little bit, change the time a little bit so it’s more convenient for them, cause we had just been going on inertia. (Amanda, October 20, lines 369-364)

Amanda’s recognition that the weekly, high-volume delivery schedule largely results from inertia suggests an underlying assumption by CKMU that community partners will speak up if their needs change. While many partners indicate their comfort with just that, representatives from at least one stay-and-serve site informed me that, unless the issue was vital, they would rather not make waves. From the point of view of this representative, CKMU was giving them something—a gift—and she felt uncomfortable levying anything that might be construed as criticism (FN, October 11, lines 26-33).

When community partners do communicate their needs regarding delivery issues, CKMU representatives are responsive. During the community partner focus group, one drop-off site representative shared her experience negotiating with CKMU about individual versus congregate meals. She explained that the staff of her agency had been receiving their food in bulk form instead of individual meals. Because their agency administered a housing program where all consumers resided in their own apartments, they felt that individual meals would be easier to serve the women, since they could take the meal home. She indicated having talked about this reasoning with CKMU and indicated a smooth transition to individually packaged meals, stating “it’s worked out better for us” (October 14).
Some issues similarly impact community partners, whether they are stay-and-serve or drop-off sites. One such issue that would necessitate communication with CKMU was unexpected closings. Speaking to this concern, one community partner explained that this contact is fairly smooth:

Emails, phone calls, you know. Amanda’s awesome. Usually I try to email her and keep her abreast when we’re going to be closed because there’s an activity going on or there’s a snow day or something of that sort. Sometimes those snow days can be kind of tricky. Because we go by what the radio is saying, the weather forecast. So sometimes we have missed it, not on their part but on mine. You know, making a decision we’re going to close by three [o’clock] when sometimes they are already en route with the food. (Carla, October 4, lines 80-84)

As these examples demonstrate, communication around delivery issues is a necessity for CKMU and its community partners. However, this narrow range of communication contributes to CKMU’s community partners holding on to a conceptualization of their role as “recipients” rather than “collaborators.” Interestingly, multiple community partner agencies conveyed openness to and interest in furthering the relationship with CKMU. However, due to these other ways of relating being theoretical, discussion in this section does not include these potential future relationship dimensions. These instances will be further discussed in the response to Research Question Four.

Although the content of interactions between community partners and CKMU representatives most often remains tied to superficial issues related to food quality or delivery needs, both sides of this relationship characterize the partnership as “smooth” and friendly. In my discussions with community partners, Amanda’s pleasant personality is repeatedly cited as a
positive aspect of the relationship with CKMU. This supports the idea that sites perceive a benefit from involvement with CKMU aside from food delivery.

A few important departures were noted from the general nature of relationships between CKMU and their partners. The leader of a men’s group recalled CKMU having provided food for a cook-out event; another community partner indicated a similar experience with CKMU catering a special event at her agency. Amanda described one example that reached beyond special occasion food delivery. In our interview she outlined her new role as the ServSafe instructor for a culinary job skills training program operated by one of CKMU’s major partners: HeartLove Place. She explained:

We’ve done the ServSafe, and this next round we’re going to incorporate more of the, okay, now you have your ServSafe, you know how to do the stuff, now how do you go and get a job. So we’re hoping to involve a little more of that in this next round. And they run three classes a year, so, we’ll be able to, and the successes that we had for completing the course and graduating the course in partnership with the partner agency was heads and shoulders what we able to do by ourselves. So, in the past, we have sometimes struggled. I know the kitchen here has struggled with having students, recruiting students, getting enough students, having students continue and finish, and then have them pass their ServSafe test at the end. It was a big challenge. So working with, partnering with our, one of our sites, we are able to serve a lot more people effectively. Instead of having a class of five people, they are able to hold a class of 30. And last, first round we have 33 in the class and then take the test, and we had 19 pass on the first try, which—amazing. We were super excited about that. (Amanda, October 20, lines 564-574)
Amanda also shared that in the past, students have taken on special projects of interest to them. She recalled a recent LT member who constructed a nutritional education component for the delivery to the pregnancy clinic. However, as was discussed during the explanation of her role, Amanda’s approach to managing the LT and other student volunteers focuses on what she views as the essential functions of CKMU, rather than promoting special projects with community partners. While it is possible for students to pursue their interests, CKMU lacks any structure to support new ideas, and there is little evidence that creating new programming is an organizational priority for CKMU.

Throughout my field stay, as evidenced by observations, interviews, and focus groups, the relationships between CKMU and its community partners presented as minimal, structured around a narrow view of the role of CKMU in the community. Although the perspective of this research frames these findings in terms of limitations, it is important to note that, without exception, community partners expressed a high level of satisfaction with their relationship with CKMU. Moreover, exceptions to the norm of thin relationships do exist. Some of these exceptions and opportunities for growth stem from the interest of student volunteers. In the next section, the role of students in CKMU will be further explored.

**Student Volunteer Culture of CKMU**

Like most organizations that rely heavily on volunteer labor, CKMU involves its volunteers on a variety of levels. Student volunteers arrive at CKMU from several paths; moreover, the impact of their CKMU experience also varies. In this section, I will explore student participation with CKMU through discussion around the depth, purpose, and impact of this engagement. I will draw on the perspectives of students and the Coordinator, as well as my own observations, to describe students’ understandings and expectations within the two typical
levels of involvement: LT and non-LT. For both levels of volunteerism, several key motivations were identified; I will also utilize multiple perspectives to convey three explanations for participation in CKMU: Scholarship Status, Service Interest, and Socialization. Finally, I will explore the ways in which volunteering with CKMU impacts and benefits students through discussion of three areas: Food Knowledge, Community Interaction, and Critical Reflection.

**Variable Depth of Involvement**

With nine LT members and more than 200 non-LT or “on-call” students, the ways students interface with CKMU are not uniform. During my stay, I noted several students (and one student group) that appeared to be regularly scheduled and committed volunteers. However, the main way students self-described their status within CKMU was, as one student explained during the focus group, either as a member of the LT or just a regular volunteer (October 11, 2011).

**“We facilitate the process”: The LT.** Members of the LT take their role in CKMU seriously. They sign up with Amanda at the beginning of each semester to lead shifts, expecting to be either the last one in the kitchen or to act as the responsible party heading up an off-campus delivery. An early demonstration of this dedication came in the first evening I spent with the student cooking shifts. I noted: “All the clean-up is over. [Three] LT members stay to let the potatoes finish cooking. Other volunteers leave for the night” (FN, September 12, lines 222-223). Similar situations occurred repeatedly during observations. Furthermore, the non-LT student volunteers consistently looked to the LT for direction.

Along with managing the cooking shift and kitchen space, and ensuring tasks are completed properly, LT members also worked to create an enjoyable atmosphere in the kitchen.
During an LT meeting, Paul discussed his desire to build community during cooking shifts. This excerpt from my field notes details one of his subsequent efforts:

Paul notes that “we didn’t do introductions at the beginning of shift” so he calls everyone over for end-of-the night introductions. Paul explains that “we are all about community and family here—hugs!” and has everyone introduce themselves, tell their year at Marquette, their major, the weirdest things they have ever eaten, and one thing from their Marquette bucket list. (FN, October 3, lines 52-56)

This example evidences an explicit effort to create a friendly, social atmosphere. Multiple informal instances also exist—LT turning on music during the cooking shift, or joking with new volunteers. In the next section focusing on the purpose of engagement, I will further discuss the relaxed atmosphere of the cooking shifts—an aspect of organizational life largely carried out by the LT.

Encompassing both the expectation of responsibility and the opportunity for an enjoyable leadership experience, another member of the LT discussed with me her understanding of the role:

She tells me that she usually says that it’s fun, not stressful, but that you get to work with lots of different students and facilitate the process. I asked her about this idea of facilitating the process—what does this mean? She replied “For the cooking shift, I may be leading the shift, making sure the menu comes out, but it’s not like you need to chop an onion this way—you don’t have to hover, because everyone cooks in their own way and as long as it turns out okay, that’s fine. But if someone needs more help, then I can direct them more, too.” I inquire about LT responsibilities besides leading cooking shifts. [This LT member] says she feels like the LT is responsible for promoting the Campus
The Coordinator’s perception that the LT is vital to CKMU operations contributes to its construction as a serious responsibility. Responding to my question about the LT role, Amanda shared:

I want [them to, and] I hope that they feel empowered to be independent, to have their own ideas, to do their thing. And to be able to work with students and see how they can grow as leaders. Whether it’s just helping organize five people in making a meal or . . . to us[ing] those skills that they figure out here later on in life. To continue that and not just be leaders here but be leaders other places in the university. . . . [They are learning] communication—communication, accountability. . . . I think accountability and responsibility are the big ones. They are responsible for making sure that the food we send out is prepared safely and is stored safely so that we can get it out safely. . . . With the multitude [of safety concerns] with foods that are possible, it’s really nice to be able to trust them and to train them [to be knowledgeable]. I don’t know if I was 20 years old if I would have been as responsible about other people’s food as they are. As they expect to be responsible for—the food that comes out of this kitchen. Also I hope that they feel . . . that their experience [is one] that they can relate [to others]. And I have seen it, they have related their experience to [other students and] have inspired others to come to the kitchen. (Amanda, October 20, lines 57-60 and 64-71)

While Amanda’s comments focus on LT cooking shift responsibilities, student-run delivery shifts provide another opportunity for LT members to exercise this leadership role.
The following excerpts depict the set of responsibilities typically connected with a delivery shift:

3: 48pm: We arrive at HeartLove Place. Paul tells us “we’ll be working with the older classroom of kids” today and that first we would be going to the kitchen to warm up the food—today it’s sausage sandwiches, yogurt, and carrot sticks with ranch dressing. Paul walks us down the hall to the classroom before he goes back to the kitchen. We say hello to the teacher and all the kids introduce themselves. . . . [Two student volunteers] start playing a game of Sorry! with three kids. Two kids are doing math homework. Paul is back from the kitchen and he sits with these kids and works on the homework problems with them.

4:30pm: Paul leaves and comes back with a cart of the food. [Two student volunteers] pass out plates and cups, pour water, etc. . . . After the kids are done eating Paul picks up the giant stuffed gorilla and chases the kids around the room. They giggle and scream. We say goodbye to the kids and take the dirty dishes to the kitchen. (FN, September 15, lines 80-90 and 109-112)

Though this stay-and-serve delivery was complete in less than 90 minutes, this shift provides a diverse range of leadership opportunities, from ensuring safe food service standards to interacting with agency staff to modeling relationships with the kids in the room.

Although the LT is not frequently called upon to go beyond the routine of leading cooking or delivery shifts and heading up special events like Turkeypalooza, several instances that necessitated one or more members of the LT to “step up” and assume responsibilities generally performed by the Coordinator occurred during my six weeks with CKMU. Following a competitive marathon over the weekend, the Coordinator communicated with the LT that she
would not be coming in Monday, October 3rd. When I arrived to attend the cooking shift that evening, I noted how the LT had smoothly assumed preparation for the evening shift:

I arrive at the kitchen where several student volunteers and LT members were already working. I learn from Mollie that she and Paul arrived early and planned the menu for today. They had some ideas from Shari’s handwritten menu. I ask if the deliveries for today were cancelled, and Mollie told me someone on LT took them. The laptop was up, and they filled in the menu sheets, but there was no note from Amanda. I asked them how many other times situations like this occurred. Paul could remember other times that the LT had made menus on the spot. (FN, October 2, lines 9-14)

Being on the LT is a significant role. So much so that most of the members I spoke with seemed to have reflected on what this role meant. During my third week with CKMU, one of the LT members inquired as to what I felt the differences between LT and non-LT volunteers were. My field notes read:

As we are packing up, Paul asks me more about my research questions and explains to me he’s really interested in the differences between students who are on the LT and those who regularly volunteer but aren’t involved at that level. I asked him what he thought about this issue and he said he felt like people who weren’t on the leadership team didn’t know about the agencies, except those who came on deliveries, which Paul felt was a small number compared to those who come to cooking shifts. (FN, September 29, lines 55-60)

Non-LT members also contribute to LT role construction. Explaining what he felt would be major differences between his role as a regular volunteer and joining the LT, Michael shared in our interview:
Yeah, I bet they spend a lot of time planning and talking with Amanda and coming in early, leaving late. It seems like something that would take an extra time commitment, which is interesting, but for me, this semester, not feasible. (Michael, October 14, lines 84-86)

LT membership could be pejoratively characterized as mechanical—carrying out a set of pre-defined tasks. Alternatively and more closely aligned with Michael’s remarks, taking on the LT role could be understood as assuming essential organizational responsibilities.

“Grunt work”: non-LT. As several of the LT members recall about their own pre-LT participation, non-LT volunteers are much less likely to have awareness and knowledge about CKMU’s community partners, network of branches, or even the food recovery component to the organization. The following interaction, as recorded in my field notes, depicts the beginning of an evening cooking shift. Here, differences between the LT and non-LT roles are clearly illustrated:

More student volunteers have arrived—[three], all of whom have volunteered at least once before. Everyone dresses casually for CK, and almost everyone wears the preferred closed-toed shoes. Mollie from LT assigns all the volunteers a task. One person is unwrapping donated sandwiches and removing the tomato. Paul explains this makes the sandwich last longer, that the tomato is the first to go. Another student is putting together bags of fresh veggies. Another student is chopping up pepperoni to add to the ravioli sauce. . . . Fran is working on filling lunch bags with frozen meals from Trader Joes (from the food bank) along with fruit, cheese, and rolls. I ask Fran if she knows where these meals are going and she says “no”—Mollie hears this and comes over to explain to
Fran a little bit about Progressive Healthcare and their OB clinic, where these meals are headed. (FN, September 26, lines 109-114 & 118-120)

As was typically the case, non-LT are assigned tasks, and, unless they exhibit some interest in learning more about what is happening with the food, non-LT’s are not provided with any explanation. On another evening, I was chopping vegetables with several non-LT members, who shared their understanding of their role:

[T]hey just felt like they were here to work, “to do grunt work,” whatever they were told to do. I asked them what their impressions of the structure of CKMU were, and one offered that [the two LT members leading the shift] were kind of in charge, adding “they tell people what to do and seem to know their way around.” (FN, October 4, lines 75-78)

In exceptional cases non-LT student volunteers deepen their involvement. In one example, Amanda began having a student ride along with her during an afternoon of several drop-off deliveries. She explained to me that she has been concerned about taking people along in the past because it was typically less fun and interactive than the cooking shifts. But, she explained:

[The student accompanying Amanda] is a freshman and was very excited about CK—that [this student’s] brother went to Gonzaga College high school in DC, which has a CK branch, and that she had been hearing about it and was super-excited to be a part of [CKMU]. (FN, September 20, lines 106-108)

Parallel to pre-existing knowledge of CKP spurring participation in CKMU, some students had personal connections to one of CKMU’s community partners, and linked with CKMU as a chance to contribute to that partner. Following the first student-led delivery to CKMU’s newest community partner, Children’s Hospital, one first-time volunteer shares that her boyfriend, who
was also a first-time volunteer this evening, had a baby cousin received treatment in this same unit, but did not make it. They both say they would come every week if the frequency of the delivery was increased (FN, September 20, lines 173-175). After just one evening, these two students voiced their commitment to weekly shifts with CKMU, illustrating the power of personal connection.

**Alternative Paths to CKMU**

During my six-week stay with CKMU, I spent many hours alongside student volunteers. Motivation, for these students, seemed to stem from several key places. It would be misleading to imply that these are discrete categories. Rather, the three areas included in this section are intended to demonstrate some of the main forces leading to student volunteerism and motivating first-time volunteers to return to the kitchen. As the selected data demonstrates, blended motivations are the norm.

**“Getting hours”: Scholarship status.** As I discussed in the response to Research Question One, the Burke Scholarship Program substantially impacts the ability of CKMU to operate the way it does. From the perspective of many student volunteers, it was their scholarship status that introduced them to CKMU. Further, the requirements of their scholarship—namely, the 300 required hours of community service—influenced their decision to increase involvement with CKMU.

A freshman recipient of the scholarship, Mary, explained that she decided to volunteer with CKMU because “some Burke Scholars did, too. ‘Cause a lot of them are like on the Leadership Team and they’re like, ‘It’s a great place to start out volunteering and getting hours cause it’s like laid back and stuff’” (Mary, October 13, lines 15-17). Similarly, Lindsay, now a junior, recalled her introduction to CKMU during our interview:
Since I’m a Burke Scholar, we have our retreat at the beginning of the year. I was a freshman, kind of like looking for opportunities and places to do service that sounded interesting to me. And we were given a list of places, and Campus Kitchens was on the list. (Lindsay, September 29, lines 12-14)

Burke Scholars are selected from a highly competitive pool of applicants with impressive records of high-school service. One MU Administrator underscored that Burke Scholars would ideally pursue service opportunities that build leadership skills. From her perspective, this makes CKMU a natural fit for these students:

They all say they see it as a great leadership opportunity, and again, that’s another element to the scholarship program that we really like. So there have been Campus Kitchens Coordinators over the years [who] have been really great making sure some of these kids [Burke Scholars] have gotten on the Leadership team. So again I think it’s a great leadership opportunity and a great confidence booster for them. And a way for them to feel like they are doing something they care about, so even some of that early initiative of starting it up, right. . . . I think [the] kids [participating now] like the idea that it was a program in many ways started by students. (Phyllis, October 12, lines 85-91)

While Burke Scholarship recipients may fit in especially well with CKMU, as will be discussed shortly, their commitment to service is not unique.

**Service interest.** Students receiving the Burke Scholarship have already demonstrated a significant commitment to the idea of service. However, with only 10 yearly recipients, the number of MU students invested in community service far exceeded the maximum number of scholarship recipients. While driving to HLP for a stay-and-serve delivery shift, LT member Joel told me about his service experience and interests:
He talks about how service helped him get into college more than his grades. I ask if he is also a Burke Scholar—no, he says, he has the Ignatius scholarship. Joel tells me about another group he works with—Best Buddies. He’s on the Board with the MU chapter. They are linked with people in the community who have disabilities and do activities as a group as well as individually with their buddies. (FN, September 13, lines 130-134)

Joel went on to describe how CKMU is another chance for community service, a different kind of opportunity to contribute.

Numerous students expressed that it was their general interest in service, rather than a specific interest in CKMU, that led them to volunteer. One student succinctly phrased his motivation, responding to my “question of the week,” by writing, “I started working at the Campus Kitchen for the same reason I came to Marquette. I wanted to help other people and the Campus Kitchen provided the work for me to do just that.”

Most regular CKMU student volunteers also engaged in service through efforts other than CKMU, further demonstrating the central desire to participate in service, with CKMU simply being one such opportunity. As an active volunteer with several service efforts, Michael described during our interview how his ideas around service developed:

And as a kid I would be like, “What are you doing that for [Mom]? Hardly anybody recognizes what you’re doing and you don’t get paid for it. It seems like a waste of time.” And then I realized how much enjoyment she got out of it and the same with my dad. He did a lot of volunteering with Boy Scouts and helping with the church board. So they were a great example, and when it kind of clicked in the end of middle school and definitely in high school, I got really involved in service clubs, did my Eagle project my
senior year in high school, a big service project for my church…. I can’t bring myself to stop. (Michael, October 14, lines 226-232)

Although students across the board expressed their commitment to service, their definitions were at times ambiguous. While CKMU provides a structured opportunity to engage in the service students’ identify as personally important, intentional and ongoing reflection is lacking. Without including the reflective component, CKMU may be able to fulfill a desire in students to contribute to their communities; however, the complexities surrounding injustices such as food insecurity are avoided.

“A really good group of friends”: Socialization. The idea of “doing service” and being a contributing member of the community is central to how CKMU’s student volunteers construct their roles and understand their place in the organization. However, when students discuss their experiences with CKMU, the social aspect of their participation was an equally common category. In Paul’s words, “the cooking shifts are great ‘cause they’ve created great relationships with people. I mean, most of my best friends are with Campus Kitchens” (September 30, lines 222-223). Perhaps because many of the LT members are also recipients of the Burke Scholarship, friendships often carried over into CKMU space. However, in our interview, Michael pointed out that the time spent at CKMU also helped create new friendships, sharing that “our Monday group has become a really good group of friends. Like I said, besides [one volunteer] I knew everybody, the fact that [that student] has jumped in there—he’s a great friend now” (Michael, October 14, lines 207-208).

The friendly, laid-back atmosphere of the student-led cooking shifts is clearly illustrated in the following photo. A few of the LT members leading Monday cooking shift created an
award out of the side of an egg crate known as “Volunteer-of-the-Monday;” this photo shows the award (which was brought back weekly) being handed off from one awardee to the next.

![Figure 6. Volunteer-of-the-Monday award photograph](image)

These traditions add to the culture of student volunteerism at CKMU and reinforce the idea that spending time at CKMU is a low-stress, enjoyable service choice.

Although many of the current LT members shared additional reasons for deepening their engagement beyond the social aspect, students on the LT were just as apt to highlight how much they enjoyed their time with CKMU. Lindsay, an LT member, reflected during our interview about her early involvement, stating:

So Mollie and [another volunteer] and I would just have a ton of fun. We would usually just end up wrapping pastries the whole time, or like doing dishes in the back. . . . I don’t know, we just always ended up talking about something ridiculous, like, it would just be a lot of laughing and stuff. So, I think the social aspect is what I loved about it. Honestly. (Lindsay, September 29, lines 96-99)
Maintaining the enjoyable, light-hearted atmosphere was valued by members of CKMU’s leadership. The day following the student focus group, I was riding along on a drop-off delivery route with a different member of the LT. I noted the following in my field notes related to the importance placed on a “fun” kitchen atmosphere: She “commented that ‘keeping it fun’ was really important to her. She added that she liked how some of the ideas were posed in a relaxed kind of way, like having a food inventory party.” (FN, October 17, lines 14-16)

Keeping it fun was not equivalent to avoiding topics of seriousness. Field notes from one evening shift reveal how easily students move between lighthearted chatter and socially complex topics:

The atmosphere in the kitchen is friendly and talkative. There is no music playing tonight, but everyone is chatting about dorms, food on campus, classes, exams coming up, professors they think are difficult graders, and where they are from around Wisconsin. Lindsay brings up Milwaukee being a segregated city and the others seem to have heard this as well. [One volunteer] asks about the food scraps and composting; Lindsay explains about the Urban Ecology Center and the rat problem. (FN, September 19, lines 121-126)

One student even noted how substantive conversations during cooking shifts contributed to CKMU being enjoyable:

We talked a lot about the whole homelessness in general thing. Paul brought up how the recession really hit Milwaukee hard, even before it hit the rest of the country, really. How it’s a big city but it’s still [in many ways] a small city. It’s hard for people to get back on their feet around here, and that’s something the city is working on. (Fran, October 10, lines 287-290)
For this student, discussion with her peers around issues related to hunger helped connect cooking shift activities to her interest in service.

**Multiple Benefits of Participation**

Much agreement was found around motivations for student participation—CKMU’s student volunteers, many of whom are introduced to the program via their scholarship status, are interested in doing service in a relaxed, social environment. However, in terms of how CKMU participation benefits students, greater differences emerged. Because students bring to their CKMU volunteerism different backgrounds, levels of awareness, and bases of knowledge, the personal impact of participation varies.

**Food knowledge.** Like most full-time MU students, volunteers with CKMU primarily relied upon the campus cafeterias for meals. Of the several students I spoke with who were residing off-campus, minimal cooking remained the norm. Therefore, creating hundreds of meals a week—even when following carefully constructed, detailed directions left by the Coordinator—enhanced participants food knowledge through exposure to a variety of foods and preparation techniques while instilling in them a sense of accomplishment. One student shared that her desire to increase her knowledge of food and cooking influenced her choice to become a CKMU volunteer:

[A new volunteer] mentions she doesn’t cook much and would like to learn—bringing her to CKMU in addition to wanting to do service. Mollie, laughing, tells a story about a cooking shift where they were making chorizo, but weren’t sure about whether it was cooked, and weren’t sure about the casing. They ended up taking the casing off and boiling the chorizo, which resulted in it falling apart in the water. (FN, September 14, lines 161-165)
Many cooking shifts provided evidence of students learning either something new about a particular food (i.e., kohlrabi donated from the farmers’ market) or learning a basic cooking technique (i.e., reducing tomato sauce). The following photo shows an LT member transferring some chunky vegetable marinara into another pan, demonstrating to two other student volunteers how to stir to the bottom of the pan to prevent the sauce from scorching.

![Figure 7. Student volunteer cooking instruction photograph](image)

Because volunteer time spent with CKMU so frequently takes place during cooking shifts, students absorb an array of food-related knowledge. As the photo above illustrates, some of this know-how centers on cooking skills. In addition to preparation techniques, students also learn about food preservation. The following excerpt from my field notes demonstrates how practices such as freezing and drying are commonplace in the CKMU kitchen:

I work with the two girls to crush dried spices up, pick out the stems, and put them in jars to use. [The LT member running the shift] brings some freezer containers over to the two girls, who are friends and arrived together and said they volunteered together last
semester. They spoon the reduced tomato sauce that is cooled down from yesterday into the freezer containers. (FN, September 15, lines 139-143)

Though the learning that takes place is often without explicit instruction, time spent by students in the CKMU kitchen results in an increased knowledge of different foods and how to prepare them, as well as an awareness of basic preservation techniques.

“Take it to the kids”: Community interaction. Although interacting with the community partners is not the most frequent way students contribute to CKMU operations, for many it is the most meaningful. In particular, students point to one stay-and-serve site where they feel needed: HeartLove Place (HLP). Two deliveries per week are led by members of the LT to the day-care and after-school program at HLP. Paul, who headed up one of these shifts during my six-week stay, communicated that, aside from his connections with other student volunteers, his closest bonds were with the kids at HLP:

[L]ooking at who in the clients that we work with. . . . I would definitely say I have the closest relationship with the kids there. I’ve known them for the longest. Some of them I’ve known since freshman year, so it’s a good two, it’ll be two and ½ years or something like that. And of course a lot of them have left and there’s a lot of turnover. But I would say partly . . . because if you’re engaging with someone on a weekly basis for that period of time, you’re definitely going to form a close bond with them. (Paul, September 30, lines 224-229)

Noted in my observations were several examples of the kind of comfortable relationship to which Paul referred. On September 15th, for example, I noted Paul’s interactions with the kids at HLP:
[One] little girl has yogurt all over her lips—Paul says, “I like your lipstick” and she giggles and wipes her face. The kids are not eating the carrots—Paul opens a little container of ranch dressing and dips a carrot in and eats it. Two of the kids try this. (FN, September 15, lines 103-105)

With enthusiasm akin to Paul’s, Joel, the LT member leading the other stay-and-serve weekly delivery to HLP conveyed his fondness for the site to the new student volunteers accompanying him, stating, “HLP is my favorite cause you get to spend time with the kids and they remember you” (FN, September 13, lines 107-108).

In fact, during our interview, Joel explained that CKMU’s relationship with HLP was the major reason he was involved at all:

It’s not that I didn’t want to go other places, but it was like if I was going to do it every week, I would enjoy it more if I got to take it to kids and be with the kids and, especially since, you know, in high school that was predominantly what I did, I would tutor after school, and I loved working with the kids. And that was the one thing that I wanted to do and there was an open Leadership Team shift for that, so that was the one that caught my attention that I went for. (Joel, October 10, lines 33-37)

While the opportunity for community involvement was certainly a driving force for many students’ initial participation, it was the impact of these interactions that influenced how students viewed their roles and contributions. To paraphrase a remark that stimulated nodding during the student focus group: Being a part of CKMU is something I can give, to be a member of the community, not just a college student in Milwaukee (October 11).

**Critical reflection.** MU’s Service-Learning Office has a minimal relationship with CKMU. Because students typically engage with CKMU via on-campus cooking shifts, from the
perspective of the Service Learning Office, opportunities to engage in service-learning were minimal. Therefore, students are not typically processing their CKMU experiences in a directed way. However, transformational moments are happening for some students.

The food recovery process was cited by several students as eye-opening. One student shared the following thoughts and questions in an anonymous response to the “Question of the Week.” The question posed was: “Has volunteering with CKMU changed how you think about the food system, and if so, how?”

Volunteering with CKMU has caused me to start thinking about food as more than something that comes from Sendik’s grocery store and appears on my plate. It brought up a lot of questions: food is [a] right, and there’s plenty of it, so why does hunger exist? How do I and how does Marquette University as a whole fit into that situation?

As crates full of recovered food were weighed out at the close of cooking shifts, more students began to notice and comment upon the amounts collected from only a small portion of MU’s campus dining options.

During our interview, Mollie, a LT member, conveyed how reflection on the food system—its waste and injustices—has resulted in a deepening of her commitment to CKMU:

[T]he whole food redistribution movement, or food justice movement, you know whatever you want to call it, has become something that’s like very much a central focus and something that I want to become more involved with or something that I’m passionate about. So, I guess Campus Kitchens now is kind of more of an expression of something that I’m passionate about more than something that’s just enjoyable. I mean, it is still really enjoyable and kind of a social time during the week, which is great, but, it’s really, carried over into other things that, other aspects of my life I guess. After kind of
learning more I started composting at home, and then we started composting in our apartment now, I got involved with Growing Power. So it kind of carried over into other things. . . . I guess, for me, food justice in really simple terms is that everyone gets the nutrients he or she needs…easily. It’s having access to healthy and affordable and safe food. And I think that, you know, Campus Kitchens can’t do that perfectly, like we have to deal with the resources that we’re given, but I think that it’s a huge step in the right direction. Because part of having access, universal access to food, is changing the way that we use it. And I think that here we look at what we have and we figure out, you know, a creative way to use it while still making it a healthy and enjoyable meal.

Actually now that I am talking this out, I think part of why Campus Kitchens is a good example of something working for food justice is because we have such limited resources and we still do what we do. Which is, you know, provide meals to people that we would eat ourselves, and that will hopefully, you know, help… I don’t know, nourish them.

(Mollie, October 17, lines 47-54 and 59-68)

This sophisticated interpretation of food justice, however clearly related to CKMU participation, was outside the norm for student volunteers. More typically, students were beginning to notice and question the sources of food waste in their everyday lives. As one student shared during our individual interview:

It’s [CKMU] made me think a lot about food waste. I know like when you go places and you don’t want something a lot of people just throw it out instead of just like asking for a sandwich if you don’t want cheese, just get no cheese. I mean, it might only be one slice of cheese, but that could go to somebody and stuff like that. And I didn’t really think about how much waste— I know sometimes I do, but you can’t really hand your plate of
food to people and be like, do you want my leftover food? (Mary, October 13, lines 156-160)

With this remark, Mary is highlighting how, for her, participating with CKMU went beyond exposing her to food waste; it provided an immediate outlet and way to respond to this new knowledge.

Beyond their increased awareness around food waste, several students shared how their involvement with CKMU prompted thinking about other forms of waste. One (non-LT) student, Fran, shared during our interview how a conversation with CKMU volunteers struck a chord with her:

Like plastics and things—like how many containers we get at Campus Kitchen and we wash them out and reuse them. Recycling has always been one of those things that’s like, yeah, I recycle, but I don’t really know where it goes from there or how it gets reused or if it does. Definitely something to look into. We were just talking about it and we thought the compost thing would be great ‘cause they did have it a few years ago. And people were like, oh, what about animals, and it’s like, well, there’s other places in the area that have composting and it works out, so there’s got to be a way to make it work. We talk a lot about random social issues in the kitchen sometimes. (Fran, October 10, lines 277-283)

Stimulating critical thinking is vital to CKMU’s progressive growth. By connecting recycling, composting, and food waste, Fran has independently entered into reflection about the problematic food system and its place within the natural environment.

Throughout this section, I have further explored the roles of student volunteers. Engaging on two basic levels, LT and non-LT, student volunteers express similar motivations for
participation—they want to be of service to the community. And, while many cited required
service hours as their initial draw to the on-campus option, they enjoy that CKMU provides
service opportunities in a fun way.

Service is not clearly defined by MU, CKMU, or the student volunteers. Moreover, there
is a lack of facilitated idea development or reflection. The data related to critical reflection
captures some of the significant moments of transformation for CKMU’s student volunteers.
What the examples also demonstrate are missed opportunities—that within the rich service
environment of CKMU and the academic environment of MU, connections fail to exist with the
variety of ideas and disciplines related to food rescue and distribution. The implication of
CKMU’s disconnectedness will be further explored in Chapter 5. In the next section, additional
attention to student reflections on and ideas about CKMU will be included in the discussion.
Successes and contributions as well as opportunities and challenges are explored from a variety
of viewpoints, including those of student volunteers.

Stakeholder Constructions of CKMU’s Successes, Challenges, and Contributions

Throughout this investigation of CKMU—detailing the daily operations and overarching
structural influences, examining community partnerships, and exploring the role of students—
key stakeholders have demonstrated their vested interest. These stakeholders include individuals
such as Shari, the “super-volunteer,” and Amanda, the Coordinator as well as groups of student
volunteers, community partners, representatives of CKP’s National Office, and members of
MU’s staff and administration. In this section, I will convey how these stakeholders understand
CKMU in two major areas: Changing Lives and Stretching the Mission. These areas serve as the
categories of this section. While I strive through the presented data to reflect the perspectives of
the aforementioned stakeholders, my perspective and particular interests as the researcher also play a key role, particularly due to field notes serving as a major source of data.

Discussion of the first category provides insight into the current impact of this organization. CKMU’s successes and contributions are divided into two sub-categories: The Social Service Sector and Students and Other Volunteers. These sub-categories contain multiple properties that demonstrate how CKMU’s stakeholders see the organization changing lives. CKMU’s contributions to the social service sector include the high quality of meals and the ability of the organization to target those in need. In the discussion of how CKMU contributes to the lives of its volunteers, I will return to an area touched on in the response to Research Question Three—heightened environmental awareness. Students involved with CKMU frequently attributed this awareness to their participation. Although less specific than increased attention to environmental concerns, another way the lives of students and volunteers are impacted by CKMU participation is simply through the feeling of satisfaction, an idea identified frequently in the data.

After exploring how CKMU is changing lives, I will move on to the next category: Stretching the Mission. Included in this category are issues that stakeholders identified as challenging, areas that stakeholders expressed interest in developing, and potentialities of interest to this researcher that were underrepresented in the case. The four properties included in this category are Developing and Implementing Programming, Deepening Community Partnerships, Expanding Student Leadership, and Enhancing Connections with MU. By examining some of the challenging aspects of CKMU’s organizational life, the reader will be primed for the discussion of opportunities and the broader implications of this case included in Chapter 5.
Changing Lives: “We Support What They Do,” The Social Service Sector

As the largest city in Wisconsin, Milwaukee serves as a hub for social services. It is through this wide array of service providers that CKMU delivers its meals. According to one student focus group participant, volunteering with CKMU allows students to maximize their service by contributing to eleven different organizations. As we have seen from the findings thus far, relationships between CKMU and its community partners are predominantly defined by meals and issues related to meal delivery. However, within this focus on meals, two important strengths are identified. The first relates to the professionalism of CKMU operations; the food delivered is both nutritious and handled safely according to current restaurant standards. The second property explicating how CKMU contributes to the social service sector relates to the meal recipients. Although CKMU does not engage in any type of means testing or make inquiries into the economic status of meal recipients, there are multiple indications that these meals are reaching people experiencing food insecurity. By providing high-quality meals to people in food insecure situations, CKMU contributes to the social service sector of Milwaukee.

**Food safety and quality.** During the six weeks I spent with CKMU, the emphasis placed on nutritious, high-quality ingredients and the level of attention paid to the safe handling of food represented an area of organizational pride. As was discussed in the response to Research Question Two, food quality was a focus of community partner relationships. Combined with the commitment to safe food practices, there was a consensus among stakeholders that professionalism was an area of success for CKMU. Multiple community partner representatives named the quality of meals as a successful part of their relationship with CKMU. One drop-off site representative highlighted the high quality of meals during our interview, stating:
I think they do a really good job making it [the meals], making sure they have a grain. I think they do a really good job trying to make it as well-rounded of a meal as it possibly can be. And actually this last time that they brought some stuff in I was really excited to see—they had just formed a new partnership with the farmer’s market [and] there was actually some fresher produce in there and that type of thing as well. I would say we have been very satisfied. (Megan, October 17, lines 45-49)

Megan’s remarks show that community partners value the attention CKMU participants give to meal planning and execution. Similarly, the case manager from another drop-off site commented that receiving meals from CKMU has broadened the horizons of those receiving meals:

I am just happy to have been able to have been contacted by Marquette Campus Kitchen to have this opportunity to provide some meals for the families. And the other thing that it teaches is healthy eating. . . nutritious eating, you know. We have a corner store on each corner around here. They get chips and a soda and call it a meal. This way [with CKMU meals] they have fruits and vegetables and meat and grains. [With CKMU meals my clients are eating] nutritious things that are good for their body and giving them an opportunity to think that there are other ways to prepare your meals that are healthy.

(Carla, October 11, lines 165-167 & 171-175)

Sharing Carla’s concern about “food deserts” and limited access to healthy foods, LT member Paul referenced how knowledge of community food resources contributed to his attentiveness in meal planning. He explained that awareness regarding what limited food options were available in community partner neighborhoods raised the bar regarding nutritious meals:

[When you drive up to HeartLove Place, you can really kind of see that there [aren’t] a lot of [quality foods available nearby]. Even if you were a parent that was necessarily
going to go out and find quality food or even like nutritious food. There really isn’t a lot to offer as far as supermarkets. [There isn’t] any grocery store in the area. In fact, I think it’s kind of funny, well, not really funny, but I think it’s pretty poignant that one of the nicest buildings there is the KFC that’s on the right hand side of the road. And there’s some other fast food there, like along Dr. King drive. And so I think that beyond just the fact that the kids are getting away with eating bad food, if there really isn’t a lot in the neighborhood to eat [as far as] good food, and depending on the transportation situation for the closest [grocery store], besides like going to a small little, like, I don’t know, quick convenience store type place where [food options are limited]… Besides that, you’re really not going to have a lot out there [in terms of] fresh produce. (Paul, September 30, lines 199-208)

Related to the attention to nutritious meals was the careful handling of food and the professional level of food safety standards. Commonly recorded in my field notes were instances of students checking cooking times, food temperatures, and utilizing delivery bags that promote food safety by maintaining steady temperatures during transport. Amanda explained during our interview how CKMU maintains its high standards of food safety:

[W]e have a binder that students take on delivery that has… a Hazardous Analysis Critical Control [HACCP] Point form to use in the kitchen of that site where they are heating up the food. . . . It’s the standard of ServSafe and the National Restaurant Association for making sure that your food is being served and prepared safely. And we [use this form] in the kitchen during our food prep shifts and before the students leave the kitchen. We have both menu planning and HACCP forms that are saved onto the computer every night. (Amanda, October 20, lines 296-299 & 303-306)
One example of the form used to track safe handling of food is included in Appendix L. This form includes safe ranges of temperature for a variety of food types and is easily referenced by those recording actual temperatures to ensure safety. An additional form (one of the “C-forms” related to the cooking shift), included in Appendix M prompts students and other volunteers to create balanced meals by including protein, starch, vegetable and dessert lines. The example included in Appendix M was typical in terms of CKMU’s efforts to include fresh fruit as desserts.

**More than nourishment.** Beyond their professional planning and handling of food, CKMU prides itself on serving large numbers of people in need. The first lines of the “about” section of its website reads, “The Campus Kitchen at Marquette currently serves over 2,000 meals per month….that’s a lot of food for hungry people!” For someone perusing the website, their introduction to CKMU includes attention to the quantity of meals while also underscoring the goal of fighting hunger.

Community agencies partner with CKMU for the purpose of meal distribution and, while several expressed ideas about expanding their relationship, representatives from the seven organizations I spoke with indicated strong satisfaction with CKMU’s service. Moreover, meals were repeatedly characterized as “needed,” highlighting CKMU’s contribution to food security via its partnerships with social service agencies. One community partner clearly stated at the beginning of our interview that CKMU’s provision of meals was a necessary service for those with whom she worked:

Our women are in poverty situations. They do receive food share or food help from the government, but sometimes it runs out, having so many mouths to feed. So I thought it was a good thing to have an extra meal. (Shirley, October 11, line 18-20)
Similarly, the manager of the “stay-and-serve” site for low-income seniors felt the meals made a real contribution. She shared her take on CKMU during our interview:

I think [CKMU matters to guests] just because it’s an extra meal. See, they [seniors attending this site] do go to the food pantries and they don’t get [a good selection]. This is something nice for them. It’s very easy to warm it up in the microwave—I have heard them say that—“Is that all cooked already?” And she says, “Yes it is, you just warm it up.” (Mabel, September 23, lines 189-191)

By noticing how the meals are created to be easily reheated, Mabel highlighted one way CKMU volunteers attempt to be responsive to the preferences of meal recipients. As one student focus group participant shared, CKMU tries to “cater to the needs” of its community partners.

Another community partner discussed how, because her agency provides a variety of healthcare services, not all of her clients receive CKMU meals. She explained that her staff directed CKMU meals to clients with special needs. In her comments about the contribution of these meals, she touched on the psychological aspect of food insecurity and expressed that regular receipt of meals from CKMU was helpful in ameliorating food-related stress:

Food is an important part of making sure they’re [clients of this agency] healthy and they have energy. And for some of them it’s a stress reliever, too, they don’t have to think about where they are going to find food. For most of these, the four women we have, most of them are older, or disabled in some way. So getting food for them, going to a food pantry, that’s not as easy for them as it would be for someone else who I know can get up and move around and you know, but for these women it’s not as simple and either mentally getting themselves together enough or physically to make it there, stand in line,
or you know, walk wherever they needed to go. For these women, they really appreciate
[the meals]. (Margaret, October 13, 109-115)

These comments demonstrate that meals are reaching people in need of food. CKMU achieves
this while partnering with a variety of community agencies, some focused on poverty-related
issues and others not.

The manager at a program providing services to people with developmental disabilities,
another of CKMU’s drop-off sites, also spoke to the idea that meals from CKMU contributed to
overall food security for her clients:

I think [the impact] is huge. Times are tough for everyone out there right now and I think
for the individuals we serve to know that two to four times a month, depending if they get
to take a meal home or one or two meals home with them, they don’t have to worry about
that. It’s a really positive thing. (Megan, October 17, lines 121-123)

Although the mission of Megan’s agency does not target people in poverty situations or
experiencing food insecurity specifically, there is recognition that those living on disability and
other fixed incomes see food as a flexible expense.

**Changing Lives: Students and Other Volunteers**

Community agencies partnering with CKMU and receiving meal deliveries clearly feel this
organization makes an important contribution. The other major beneficiary group of CKMU is its
volunteers. As LT member Lindsay shared during our interview:

I don’t think it’s just about the giving of resources and food, it’s more about just kind of
unifying and working together. I think we can all learn from each other. And obviously
I’m getting benefits from service and I think the people I interact with at my service sites
are also benefiting. So I think it’s like a two way street thing. (Lindsay, September 23, lines 373-376)

One area of benefit for many volunteers, particularly students, was an experiential connection with the natural environment. Additionally, students and non-students alike communicated a feeling of satisfaction and personal meaning resulting from their participation with CKMU.

**Engaged environmentalism.** Perhaps the most obvious way CKMU facilitates engaged environmentalism is through redirecting food that would be otherwise tossed in the dumpster. As one MU administrator stated, CKMU “provide[s] this great way for the Campus community as a whole to deal with this issue of food waste. That, you know, that’s a really, really important thing” (Phyllis, October 12, lines 133-134). Monday through Thursday student volunteers collected bags of prepared salads, sandwiches, and bakery items from Marquette Place and, later in the evening, from The Brew. The photo below illustrates the typical amount of recovered food nightly from Marquette Place.

*Figure 8. Food collection photograph*
Having observed multiple food recovery shifts, the routine became expected: Collected items were brought back to the kitchen and greeted with much enthusiasm from student volunteers. Earlier on during my six-week stay, beginning student volunteers expressed astonishment regarding the levels of food from “only one place on campus.” (FN, September 19, lines 139-141)

Beyond the environmentalism of food recovery, CKMU’s Coordinator as well as multiple members of the LT indicated a desire to operate a “green” CK branch. In our interview, Amanda stated, “I would say some of our biggest successes are improving... [and making] a big difference in the sustainability of the way our kitchen is run” (Amanda, October 20, lines 278-279). Detailing what she meant by sustainability, Amanda went on to explain how CKMU had reduced waste in their paperwork and through the use of reusable delivery containers: “When we first started we had binders upon binders of forms in the kitchen and we were sending out about between 100 and 120 Styrofoam containers of individual meals every single week” (lines 284-286). Securing a donated laptop and creating google-docs versions of forms that once relied on

*Figure 9. Eco-clam shells photograph*
hard copies were responsible for the decreased paper use. The photograph below shows another donation secured by CKMU: eco-clam shells.

By using the eco-clam shells, CKMU eliminated its use of Styrofoam containers. The 75 senior meals filling the eco-clam shells in this photograph would have previously been packed in Styrofoam, illustrating CKMU’s vast reduction in wasteful, unsustainable packaging.

While multiple choices made by CKMU illustrate the organization’s commitment to environmental values, whether this environmental dedication indicates a holistic view of the food system is less certain. Two efforts to promote environmentalism within CKMU may be interpreted as recognizing connections within the food system: gardening and composting.

During my stay with CKMU, the composting routine was undergoing transition. This was a much discussed topic during cooking shifts, where night after night student volunteers asked LT members, “Are we composting?” (FN, September 19, lines 125-126; FN, October 3, line 64). Although composting had been a regular part of CKMU operations, rodent problems temporarily closed the facility CKMU had been utilizing. Following a lead provided by Shari (FN, September 30, line 40-41), Amanda was able to identify a new partner and restart composting within a few weeks. She shared during our interview the importance of composting to CKMU:

We also compost, that’s another one of our big things that we started. Because we work with food that is on the edge, because we work in food recovery, food that might not make it, there is some that is just ready for the compost bin. We were able to originally, when we started, working with a community center that had—the Urban Ecology Center—a neighborhood environmental education center that had composting on-site. And when they had to close down their compost bins for the summer for repairs, it took us a little bit but we were able to connect with another non-profit organization in the city
that was working towards expanding composting in the city of Milwaukee. It worked out, we just started last week with this new organization and it’s working out great. So they’ve got a drop off composting site actually in the same location where we garden, so we’re really looking forward to being able to continue to build that relationship. Right now, last year we only had one plot, next year we should be able to fill up two or three maybe. And make a bigger and better garden for our students and for our guests.

(Amanda, October 20, lines 332-343)

As was referenced during Amanda’s discussion of composting, CKMU also began cultivating a garden plot in the summer of 2011. The photo below shows the group of plots, each about three by five square feet. During the first attempt, Amanda explained, they planted just one plot. Next year, she has plans to expand to three or four areas, dependent upon student interest.

![Figure 10. CKMU garden area photograph](image-url)
As a food rescue and redistribution organization, it stands to reason that students volunteering with CKMU are exposed to prepared food surpluses. However, when students are also provided with opportunities to engage with production aspects of the food system like composting and gardening, seeds are planted that may grow into a more holistic and environmentally-grounded understanding of the food system.

**Satisfaction and personal meaning.** Student volunteers expressed commitment to CKMU’s environmentally-aware nature. Outside of this specific area of success, many explained that their involvement was meaningful to them for personal reasons. LT member Mollie articulated a feeling shared by other student volunteers—participating in CKMU promoted identity as a *real* community member:

I think sometimes being in college can seem like your college-world and you have your outside-real-world. And having my friend [from home] come with me and be a part of Campus Kitchens and like be down here in the kitchen was just kind of a reminder that Campus Kitchen is a part of Milwaukee and like the real functioning world. It’s not just a college organization that, I don’t know, that meets once a week or something like that. It was [important], that it can be outside of “the Marquette bubble,” which I think people talk about a lot. (Mollie, October 17, lines 149-154)

While CKMU successfully facilitated students’ feeling of belonging to what, for many, was a new city, for other volunteers the sense of meaning resulted from a more personal place. One such example resulted when CKMU began its relationship with the Foundation for Children with Cancer (FCC) and Children’s Hospital. After serving hot meals to families on the Hematology, Oncology, and Transplant floor, I listened and recorded Paul’s comments:
While we are waiting for the van to be brought around, Paul tells me about how his father is a two-time brain cancer survivor. He explains that that’s why this site means so much to him and why he pushed for the frequency of delivery to be increased. When his father was first diagnosed and being treated, he told me, he was only two years old. He thinks it would have been a great help to his mother, who had to drive back and forth from their home in rural Wisconsin to the hospital in Minnesota, to have a hot, healthy dinner served to her. (FN, October 18, lines 93-98)

Paul, a junior and two-year LT member, was already a dedicated element of the CKMU team. However, due to the meaningfulness of the FCC partnership to him personally, Paul was instrumental in increasing the frequency of this delivery from once to twice monthly (FN, September 21, lines 5-6).

For Paul, the FCC partnership broadened what he thought of as the mission of CKMU. Another student shared how the overall experience she has had with CKMU has shifted her thinking and empowered her to be more active regarding issues of waste:

[CKMU has] definitely opened my eyes to things. I mean, the variation and how much waste there is and stuff like that. I would like to think that everyone who volunteers here is like, [given the opportunity to] open their eyes and be inspired to do something and be more vocal about it. And then, kind of like the water drop, the water drop that ripples [and impacts the water around it]. If you tell someone, they can do stuff. (Mary, October 13, lines 201-204)

The discussion in Research Question Three around student motivations and the relaxed environment of the kitchen helps to frame these ideas of meaning and satisfaction. However, one
perspective not represented in that discussion was Shari’s. CKMU’s super-volunteer sums up how being involved with CKMU has added meaning to her life:

I really like playing with the food. . . . Other people don’t understand that. But it gives me a lot of pleasure. It gives me a lot of peace of mind. It gives me an outlet for my frustrations. . . . This is something I can give somebody else. I may not be able to build houses or give you tons of money, but I can do that. (Shari, October 12, lines 324-325 & 328-330)

Volunteers of all stripes echoed Shari’s sentiment: Involvement with CKMU may be a service to others, but the satisfaction and sense of meaning reaped from participation equally benefits those contributing their time.

**Stretching the Mission**

Participants in CKMU generally focus on their successes and indicate pride regarding their involvement. While different stakeholders all recognize there is opportunity for growth, the energy amongst CKMU’s community partners, volunteers, and Coordinator is overwhelmingly positive. In this discussion of challenges and opportunities, I begin with the related issues of programming and partnerships. The National Office named programming as one of three core functions for CKP branches (M. Roche, personal communication, March 2010). CKMU, while excelling in the area of meal distribution, has struggled with creating and delivering community programs. Intertwined with the challenge of programming is the challenge of connecting with community partners beyond meal delivery. Drawing heavily on interview data, my construction of these challenges attempts to be representative of CKMU’s stakeholders’ perspectives.

Following discussion around these two areas, I will move on to exploring the challenges and opportunities around the notion of expanded student leadership. Finally, the explication of
the category of challenges and opportunities concludes by focusing on an area of operations 
where an expanded role for students has potential to take hold: enhancing connections with the 
host institution, MU. The properties contained in this category represent the ideas and comments 
of CKMU’s major stakeholders and shed light on organizational choices and consequences.

**Developing and implementing programming.** Programming is one of the ways CKP 
branches relate to their communities. As CKMU’s Coordinator, Amanda recognized the lack of 
programming. While she denied feeling any pressure from the National Office regarding 
programming, she did share this impression of their expectations: “One of the big things is that 
nationally-staffed kitchens also try to work in some of the culinary job training that is done by 
the DC Central kitchen” (Amanda, October 20, lines 540-541).

During the six weeks I observed and participated with CKMU, the organization was not 
involved in culinary job skills training. However, as was discussed in the response to Research 
Question Two, CKMU has partnered with one of their meal sites around a similar program run 
through that agency. The following excerpt from my field notes details the challenges involved 
in CKMU’s attempts to independently operate a job skills program and also provides a basic 
understanding of the partnership with HLP’s program:

Back in the car, Amanda discusses the culinary job skills training program that has been 
restarted in conjunction with HLP. She found out that Heartlove ran a similar program, so 
they partnered and now CKMU (Amanda) administers the ServSafe test for food safety. 
Amanda explains that CKMU’s program used to be six to ten weeks, modeled after 
DCCK’s culinary job skills training program, and would take four to five hours a week of 
Coordinator time to manage—they had to plan lessons, etc. and it was very time 
consuming, while the results were not great and lots of folks were not passing the
ServSafe test. The week before Labor Day they got a new class started and it is primarily run by Heartlove, with Amanda coming in for ServSafe training and testing for one week. (FN, September 12, lines 115-123)

Certainly having Amanda proctor the ServSafe exam benefits HLP and their culinary job skills training program. However, to classify this as programming of CKMU may be overstating the relationship. Programming, as Amanda referenced when relaying the challenge of lesson planning, is a time-consuming undertaking.

Though many members of the LT spend upwards of five hours per week volunteering with CKMU, I did not witness instances of LT or other student volunteers being involved in programming. As was discussed in the response to Research Question Three, there is no pressure exerted on the LT to create new programming. However, particularly in relation to “stay-and-serve” sites, several LT members I spoke with did have thoughts about programming. The following excerpt from my interview with Paul details one of his (many) ideas. Paul’s brainstorm had not moved beyond the conceptual stage at the time of our interview; he also discussed the challenges contributing to the failure of this idea to transpire:

I kind of originally had the goal of trying to set up like a satellite kitchen. It would be a whole different model, and I think originally. A lot of times I’ll have an idea and I won’t follow through on it, because of the time it really takes to follow through on it. And I don’t necessarily have that myself, nor does Amanda necessarily have, it would take a lot of people and it would be difficult to do. We have had a lot of Leadership Team members who have volunteered a lot more in the past—it’s been difficult to get commitments from people this year. ‘Cause when I started the Leadership Team it was like 4 or 5 people and now it’s like 12, 14 something like that. However, I still feel at times like we’re not too
far beyond that 5 number team, sometimes, and of course some people have time commitments and things like that. But I think we could try . . . I don’t know if that would ever work out . . . trying to start a new site. I don’t think we have the commitment and the manpower to do it. (September 30, lines 383-392)

The concern regarding “manpower” Paul identified when discussing his satellite kitchen idea was also a challenge from the perspective of community partners. During my interview with the program manager of a center serving people with developmental and intellectual disabilities, she shared having explored some possible programming ideas with Amanda. At the time of our interview, this site received “drop-off” meals from CKMU twice monthly; however, busy schedules interfered with initiating new programming:

I think we kind of briefly talked about it and then I think it’ll just be a matter of figuring out [the logistics]. And at that point she [Amanda] really didn’t know what volunteers were going to look like and when she would have them and that type of thing. And we actually had a busy summer here. We’re actually going through a name and brand change and a couple fundraisers and things like that. So, by no means is it back-burner, it’s just something that we haven’t fully pushed through with yet. So . . . I think we were talking about, something as a possibility we talked about bringing some of the individuals we serve down there to actually compile the meals and like put them in the bags and get them ready to go…is what I think that we were envisioning. (Maggie, October 17, lines 102-107 & 111-113)

Maggie’s programming idea enables CKMU to build upon the existing delivery relationships, potentially creating a more interactive kitchen.
During our interview, Amanda shared another programming idea that focused on existing community partnerships—involving the kids at HLP in CKMU’s garden. Having characterized programming as the most challenging aspect of CKMU operations, Amanda further articulated what specific challenges she anticipates related to this programming idea:

We do have a plan next year—with the test-run of our first Campus Kitchens garden this past summer—we are planning to incorporate our youth guests [and get them] more involved. We work with a really great kids program at a community center and we’re hoping to have them next year help us start seeds. “Simple seeds.” One of the challenges with incorporating, like getting kids incorporated in our garden, is that they live and they meet far away from where our garden is. So it will create a slight challenge for us to be able to get them involved in the garden. But, we’re hoping that by . . . get them starting seeds, that they can see growing in the cup, in the window at their center. We’re hoping that we can keep conveying and showing them pictures throughout the summer of their garden growing. So that they can see [their contributions]. And then as things are harvestable and we can send to them and let them see [that] these are the beans that we planted. And they’re delicious and they are fresh and [they were] grown with love and caring. (October 20, lines 232-243)

These examples demonstrate that CKMU stakeholders are interested in programming; they have ideas about places to begin, programming that would benefit existing partners, and ways to make inroads into new areas. However, as Amanda succinctly put in during our interview, the real problem with programming is “time and figuring out [logistics]. Really just finding the resources to put it together” (October 20, line 249).
Deepening community partnerships. Responding to Research Question Two, I demonstrated how food and delivery issues were relied upon for partnership maintenance. Within the category of challenges and opportunities, I will describe the challenges related to deepening partnerships—often similar to those experienced around developing programming. Because the challenges and opportunities around programming have been discussed, this property begins by exploring what baseline knowledge exists among community partners and CKMU volunteers related to their counterparts. Awareness by stakeholders of other stakeholders may be the first step in deepening these relationships. Ideas from various perspectives regarding how such partnerships could move forward will also be included.

Due to CKMU being the “case” on which this research concentrated, I had little contact with meal recipients beyond the stay-and-serve senior lunch site and the twice weekly HLP after-school “Kids Café” program. In an attempt to gather information and learn more about the perspectives of meal recipients, I disseminated a two-question survey (Appendix N) to both agency staff and clients. Of the 11 agencies and 13 programs CKMU partnered with, nine programs received these surveys. Of those nine, six returned surveys. A total of five agency staff and fifty meal recipients responded regarding their awareness that “some of the meals provided through this agency are delivered by the Campus Kitchen at Marquette University.” Staff responses, not surprisingly, indicated 100% awareness regarding CKMU’s role with their agencies. Overall client awareness, however, was more variable. Appendix O provides a summary table of responses. Of the 50 client respondents, 29 (58%) indicated awareness of CKMU. Interestingly, knowledge was only slightly higher within stay-and-serve sites (64%) versus drop-off sites (54%). This information helps to shed light on the challenges around
deepening partnerships: Before building something more than food delivery, basic awareness needs to be established.

Though awareness of CKMU by their community partners and meal recipients shows a need for growth, agencies and those they are serving may have greater awareness of CKMU than participants have of those they are serving. During an LT meeting, several students identified this issue as they were talking about what types of training were most needed for new CKMU volunteers. The following excerpt from my field notes captures the issue:

Paul mentions that he thinks the most helpful training type thing would be for new volunteers to have more information about the sites for delivery, maybe a spotlight on a certain site every week. Amanda likes this idea and says she has a volunteer, a student who’s interested in CKMU but cannot make any of the shifts due to her school and work schedules, so Amanda may have her put together some short presentations. [Another LT member] adds, “I would like to see those, too. I wasn’t on the LT last year and even though I came quite a bit, I didn’t know where the food was coming from or where it was going. I knew about Casa, because I had been there before, but not the other places. And actually I still don’t, really.” Paul also mentions that he would like to work on some way of sharing with the volunteers the emphasis on nutritionally-sound meals and balanced offerings. He feels like some of the new folks would better understand choices that were being carried out in cooking shifts if they had more background information on the nutritional needs of the different sites. (FN, October 4, lines 133-144)

Though Paul brought up providing information about community partners for new volunteers, the conversation indicated this was a need even for those on the LT. Moreover, the discussion of different sites’ nutritional needs speaks to the challenge of keeping all volunteers abreast of
relevant information that will help them connect with sites with which they may not have the opportunity to personally interact.

During my stay with CKMU, interaction between meal recipients and CKMU representatives took place at three sites; of these three, two involved students. For community agencies whose CKMU drop-off deliveries have become part of the routine, they did not necessarily recognize that expanding that relationship was even a possibility. One staff person at a drop-off site described her openness to eliminating the middle-man and allowing students to relate directly to those receiving meals. At the time of our interview, Amanda was dropping off this weekly delivery and the meals were distributed by agency staff to designated families. As the staff person noted:

I mean, if they wanted to either go on the deliveries with or if they felt comfortable delivering the food and chatting with the patients, that would be fine as far as my understanding. Just checking in with them, ‘cause usually . . . some of them are quicker visits, some of them are—depending on what’s going on with them, longer. One of the people that we deliver to, that’s usually a longer visit ‘cause she just needs a little bit more time to chat and, but then some of them are meets-us-on-the-front-porch, “How-are-you-doing?” and “I’m-good,” get the food and that’s it. So it kind of depends and you figure it out. . . . I didn’t know that the students were doing it at all… [but] I would be open to that, yeah. (Margaret, October 13, lines 84-90)

Opening the door to greater student interaction creates opportunities for relationships to extend beyond food-related issues. When students have connections to the community partners, ideas for site-specific relationship-building activities emerge. During our interview, Paul shared an idea that would target the site he is most involved with—HLP:
[An] idea that I kind of got both from when I was up in DC but also talking with Amanda, just because of the requirement on her to do the food training, or the chef training that she didn’t, I’m not sure I should say this, but didn’t necessarily want to do or didn’t want the hassle of putting that together. So I had thrown out the idea of trying to do some nutritional education component of the program. And maybe you could start testing it out at HeartLove Place, and it might be difficult ‘cause you wouldn’t have [a] solid number and the kids are doing other stuff. . . . I don’t know if necessarily that will take place or not, but it’s something I think would be cool if we could add that in. When I look at the kids, they don’t eat very well, and then like other day, they said, “My mom she doesn’t feed me squash.” Well, maybe then we can serve as someone who will introduce them to squash if they’re not getting introduced to it at the family level. (Paul, September 30, lines 393-398 & 406-410)

From community partners and students alike, solid ideas exist for moving beyond a delivery-oriented relationship. Clearly, opportunities abound in this area. However, even more than explicit stakeholder discussion of challenges, noticing the high level of interest yet the low level of change occurring in these partnerships suggests substantial challenges.

**Expanding student leadership.** One opportunity for building programming and deepening community partnerships could be expanding the role of LT members and other student volunteers. From the perspective of students, however, fulfilling their current role often felt like enough of a challenge. Cooking shifts garnered the bulk of student participation. Being that students interacted with CKMU primarily through the kitchen space and cooking shifts, it stands to reason that many of their ideas around being more effective leaders and volunteers centered around the challenging circumstances they noticed in this arena.
During the student focus group (October 11), discussion included the disconcerting reality of food waste. There was a consensus among focus group participants that CKMU could reduce its food waste with more careful planning. The following photo shows a trashcan in the CKMU kitchen space filled with donated food that was not able to be turned around quickly and became unusable.

Figure 11. Trashcan in the CKMU kitchen space photograph

Having filled this or similar trashcans with food they had been initially responsible for recovering sparked ideas in several students. They shared during their focus group ideas about how to better approach managing the donated food. Responding to my question regarding challenges for CKMU, students began their own discussion and shared ideas about how to better approach managing donated food. Increasing involvement in menu planning was suggested by one LT member. The notion of assigning a “point-person” to “go through and see what needs to
“be used” was also brought up. Discussion around this issue occupied approximately 15 minutes of the one-hour group, and entered the realm of specific planning. One student posed the idea of creating a bulletin board with a grid with food inventory and use-by dates. Another student floated the notion of having the Tuesday evening crew take on a leadership role with food inventory management. Cumulatively, these ideas speak to both the challenges and opportunities around student involvement.

Demonstrating a similar focus on the student cooking shift role, one LT member suggested the following idea during our interview:

I know like I have worked to try to change up some of our meals. Try to make them more unique. When I’m at my individual kitchen shifts, it kind of usually works out where, sometimes I’ll be kind of the person who goes around and supervises and makes sure everyone else is doing stuff. But a lot of times it happens that I am taking on the unique food item for the night. And then, which might be kind of unfair on my part, I shouldn’t always do that. But that’s kind of what I like to do, try to add something that gives a little more character to it. (Paul, September 30, lines 36-42)

From Paul’s comments, the reader is reminded that high-quality food is a point of success and pride for CKMU participants. Additionally, Paul alludes to the challenge LT members face when attempting to balance the desire for meals to be interesting and tasty with not over-directing his peers.

Enhancing connections with MU. Student ideas around how to improve kitchen shift operations speak to the commitment of at least a portion of CKMU’s student volunteers to the effectiveness of the overall organization. Tapping into the student-status of CKMU’s LT and other student volunteers may be one specific opportunity for students to expand their role within
CKMU. Evidence of MU’s overarching influence on CKMU was provided in the response to Research Question One. Even beyond the messages of service and the structural supports of service-oriented scholarships and employee volunteering, the connections between MU and CKMU are substantial. CKMU’s spacious kitchen area, complete with restaurant-grade equipment and separate walk-in refrigerator and freezer, exists on MU’s property. Moreover, the on-campus food service options of Marquette Place and The Brew are the single largest source of prepared, recovered food. In spite of these far-reaching connections, CKMU’s Coordinator, student volunteers, and even multiple members of MU staff and administration, all identified the relationship between MU and CKMU as highly variable. Again, the established nature of CKMU’s daily routine presented challenges when considering the devotion of time required to enhancing connections with MU.

Food recovery is one area where connections with MU could grow. In the following excerpt from field notes, Amanda discusses some of the challenges with increasing the food recovered from MU cafeterias:

As we drive back to the kitchen, Amanda tells me about an email she received from an employee of Marquette in some sort of sustainability role. They contacted her because of the compost and told her about some rolls that one of the dining halls had given them to compost; they felt the rolls were still good food and therefore contacted CKMU/Amanda. Amanda then told me that when Shari had called to tell her about not being able to come in Friday or over the weekend, that she had also told her that her boss at Straz dining hall says she is not allowed to save food for Campus Kitchen anymore, because of liability concerns. (FN, October 10, lines 106-112)
In my observer comments, I noted surprise that Amanda did not have a relationship with the MU sustainability staff. Again, CKMU’s lack of integration results in challenging circumstances for CKMU.

Although logistical considerations like staff and volunteer time were commonly shared challenges for many of the areas discussed in this category, several students identified their interest in increased food recovery shifts. During a meeting of the LT, one student brought up an opportunity for CKMU to enhance connections with MU by soliciting additional food donations:

[An LT member] brings up that MU’s new president is being inaugurated and that the event following it will likely have a bunch of food waste. Amanda says she will make calls to MU catering and arrange for CK to pick up. (FN, September 13, lines 250-252)

In addition to securing food from special MU events, students were aware that MU operates many more dining halls than are donating to CKMU. As an experienced member of the LT, Paul spoke to this issue during our interview:

Maybe it would be nice if there was a way that we could directly meet sometime with some of the Sodexho managers. That would be something maybe, if there was a way to talk to them, when the Sodexho manager that we worked with, when she was there, Amanda would talk to her and therefore she had a good sense of our mission. When you don’t have, like right now, we don’t really have that, at least I don’t think we have that, maybe we do, but a lot of times we’re working through the more general manager. I don’t know how good Amanda’s working relationship is with them. I think it would be great, I’m sure they must have to all be together and discuss, have general meetings. So I mean, that just makes sense. So I would, if there was a way, a few LT and Amanda could come and just say hey, this is what we’re doing. You can slap a few pictures up so you have a
personal connection. And you say, hey, we would really appreciate getting some more food, something like that. I think we could maybe do better. (September 30, lines 122-132)

Paul noticed the opportunity to enhance the connections between CKMU and MU dining service (administered by Sodexho); however, his knowledge around the current status of these relationships was less clear, presenting a challenge in moving forward in this area.

In addition to building up the food recovery relationships, other opportunities to enhance CKMU’s relationship with MU exist. Critical thinking and reflection regarding CKMU participation was discussed in the response to Research Question Three. In addition to the unstructured, individual reflection students engage in, the Burke Scholarship Program provides a processing structure for service experiences. Phyllis, a member of MU’s administration, discussed the efforts designed to promote reflection among Burke Scholars’ during our interview (Phyllis, October 12, lines 96-97).

For many CKP branches, this kind of reflection occurs through service-learning courses. Representatives from MU’s service learning, however, struggled to find a good fit between CKMU and their service-learning designated courses. During our interview, one member of the service-learning staff explained:

We are not currently doing much with them [CKMU] in terms of service learning. It a little more depends on the Coordinator. We have done [in the past] a writing project with them, for the “Writing for the Professions” course. [Members of that course] helped write a brochure for them to use at some point. . . . So we have used it [CKMU] more for what we would consider special projects. . . . [U]sually because the students don’t [get client interaction]. They need more client interaction than they would get from a cooking shift.
So cooking shifts don’t work too great for service learning. It’s only really when they have a delivery shift where they have a lot of client interaction that really provides that [service-learning opportunity]. (Susan, October 3, lines 13-16, 25-26, & 31-33)

This narrow characterization of service-learning opportunities available through CKMU conveys the depth of challenges when seeking to enhance connection in this area. Having served in the Coordinator role for nearly two years at the time of my stay, Amanda felt structuring reflection was one way MU could better support CKMU. However, she did not see the service-learning office as the way to pursue this support. During our interview she shared her dream of partnering with another MU office for this support—Campus Ministries:

We are working towards getting the students more involved, more connected to what they are doing. One of the challenges with Campus Kitchen is that we cook food on this day, and the people who cook the food don’t necessarily serve the food. And to find more reflection and more connection within that dichotomy would be really nice. So perhaps having someone who’s involved with Campus Ministry, which when I was a student, one of the big things that they [Campus Ministry] did was [pose to students], “Hey, think and talk about what you’re doing.” So that may be a nice connection to have. (October 20, lines 439-445)

Regardless of which offices are best positioned to provide a reflective structure for students, creating more of these opportunities for students is another way connections between CKMU and MU could be enhanced.

**Chapter Summary**

The purpose of this chapter has been to present the major findings of this case study. The chapter is arranged according to the four research questions. I presented data through categories
and associated properties that spoke to the overall purpose of the study. In examining the structure and organization of CKMU, I identified two major sources of undergirding institutional influence: Marquette University and the CKP National Office and network. The influence of these contextual forces found in the data is consistent with findings from the pilot research discussed in Chapter 3. Importantly, these undergirding influences were less palpable than CKMU’s daily routines in terms of impact on structure and organization. Exploration into the daily routines of CKMU was organized according to major roles and demonstrated how personal values inform organizational tasks.

The subsequent section focused on CKMU’s community partnerships. Findings demonstrated how initial energy found in partnership construction tends to head towards an inertia-bound state. In these ongoing partnerships, exchanges between CKMU and its partner organizations center around food and delivery-related issues. While several exceptions in the data were noted, relationships between CKMU and its community partners are predominantly characterized by a provider-recipient dichotomy.

Following the discussion of community partner relationships, I presented findings related to CKMU’s student volunteers. As the primary workforce of CKMU, students were found to participate on two main levels: LT and non-LT. Motivations were also explored, and students were found to connect with CKMU via three impetuses: scholarship status, service, and socialization. Likewise, benefits of participation were also described through three properties: food knowledge, community interaction, and critical reflection. These three areas indicate potential for CKMU to contribute to students in concrete, social, and intellectual ways.

Finally, my response to Research Question Four included discussion of CKMU’s successes and contributions, demonstrating the value of this organization to the community and
to its participants. CKMU routinely supports its community partners through the delivery of high-quality foods. CKMU’s professionalism in terms of food safety also provides a level of assurance for its meal recipients. Volunteers also reap benefits from their work with CKMU.

When considering the challenges CKMU contends with, the common thread of time constraints and busy leadership emerged. From my experience as a social worker, the expression “You can’t see the forest for the trees” is commonly used to characterize non-profit and other social service organizations. CKMU’s challenges also reflect this notion: With only so many hours in the day, securing sufficient food, creating meals, and distributing them through a broad range of agencies leaves little room to explore programming, expand student leadership, and enhance relationships with MU and community partners.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study is to better understand the culture of the Campus Kitchen at Marquette University (CKMU) and its relationship to the broader community. Four research questions guided this investigation:

1) How is CKMU structured and organized?
   a. What values, beliefs, and role constructions are evident among CKMU staff and volunteers?
   b. How are individual and institutional values reflected in CKMU?

2) How are relationships constructed and maintained between representatives of CKMU and representatives of community partner agencies?

3) What are the cultural norms for student engagement?
   a. How do students construct their roles as CKMU participants?
   b. What motivations do students express for participation in CKMU?

4) How do CKMU stakeholder groups think about the successes, challenges, and contributions of CKMU?
   a. What is CKMU’s connection to food security?
   b. How does CKMU demonstrate an environmental understanding of the food system?

An ethnographic case study design was utilized to explore this study’s purpose and research questions. Because of my interest in understanding CKMU’s culture, data collection
took place over a six-week period, and I embedded myself into CKMU’s routine. My participant observations included shadowing the Coordinator, attending student-led cooking shifts, riding along on drop-off meal deliveries, taking part in meal deliveries to stay-and-serve sites, assisting with food recovery and collection, and attending relevant meetings. Individual and focus group interviews were another source of data. I also collected documents, took photographs, and solicited participation in two researcher-generated data sources: Questions of the Week (for students) and Two-Question Surveys (for community partners and meal recipients).

Using the constant comparative method, I analyzed data inductively throughout the field stay. I also continued this analysis following data collection in an iterative fashion as I constructed the categories and properties presented in Chapter Four and summarized in the table on page 105. Computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS) program Atlas.ti supported my data organization and coding processes. The four guiding research questions served as the organizational framework for the presentation of findings; categories and properties were constructed within each of the four areas of inquiry.

Investigation into the structure and organization of CKMU resulted in the identification of two major forces: Undergirding Institutional Influences and Daily Routines. I referred to these forces as the categories for this area of inquiry and provided data from multiple sources and perspectives to delineate the sub-categories and properties each theme contained. My response to Research Question Two focused attention on community partner relationships, detailing how these relationships are constructed and maintained. The categories for this area were Initial Energy and Inertia-Bound; the latter category highlighted the tendency of CKMU and its community agency partners to remain in similar patterns of delivery over time. Responding to Research Question Three, I concentrated on student volunteerism—outlining the different levels
of engagement, revealing the predominant purposes motivating involvement, and exploring the benefits of participation. CKMU’s successes, contributions, challenges, and opportunities were discussed in response to Research Question Four and included stakeholder perspectives on how CKMU contributes to both the social service sector in Milwaukee and the lives of participating volunteers. The final category was Stretching the Mission; it contained properties that posed areas of challenge and opportunity for CKMU.

This chapter will present the conclusions drawn from these findings. Theoretical and practical implications will be reviewed, and suggestions for future research offered. Every aspect of this study, beginning with its purpose and research questions, reflects the selected conceptual framework. The framework I have used throughout this study draws together ideas from community food security (CFS), critical theory, and the core professional values of social work. For purposes of concision and clarity, I have referenced this framework as CFS; it shaped research design, data collection, and data analysis processes. Thus, the findings and conclusions discussed in this chapter stem from a CFS lens—one which values an interconnected, participatory, and justice-oriented food system.

Because of CKMU’s food security mission and its relationships with numerous community agencies, I selected a CFS conceptual framework as a good fit. However, CKMU does not explicitly state that CFS goals are a focus of its organizational mission. By investigating CKMU through a CFS lens, the conclusions and implications discussed in this chapter may or may not have relevance for CKMU and for the larger Campus Kitchens Project (CKP) organization. CKMU operations may be effectively targeting its desired mission. What these conclusions do offer CKMU and CKP is an alternative way of viewing its organizational mission and role in the community. In this chapter, I offer a pathway to progressive organizational
growth by detailing conclusions drawn from the findings of this study, examining their implications for theory and practice, and exploring suggestions for future research. Through intentional reflection on and modifications of its mission and activities, CKMU has the potential to contribute to the CFS movement through food security interventions that surpass addressing food insecurity in isolation and focus on systemic change.

Conclusions and Discussion

Multiple findings related to each of the four research questions were presented in Chapter Four. In this section, I present three broad conclusions derived from these findings:

1. Operations at CKMU suggest a limited conceptualization of the organization’s mission;
2. the narrowly conceptualized mission is mirrored in community partner interactions; and
3. student leadership opportunities reflect CKMU’s (default) organizational priorities. During the discussion of these conclusions, I will connect findings from this case to previous research in relevant areas. Highlighting the difficulties encountered when attempting to organize case study reports into a five-chapter research report model, Stake (1995) underscored that “the case is not a problem or hypothesis” (p. 128). Borrowing from Stake’s suggestion to include vignettes in case study reports, I have elected to utilize data to bridge connections between the findings of this case and previous research.

Operations at CKMU Suggest a Limited Conceptualization of the Organization’s Mission

In October of 2011, the “About” section of CKMU’s website stated that 2000 meals per month are prepared and delivered by CKMU—quite a large number for a primarily volunteer organization. Securing a consistent supply of food and organizing meal plans to meet this delivery schedule occupies a good portion of time, primarily that of the Coordinator, as discussed in the Daily Routines finding. Working through existing agencies allows this high level of meal
distribution to occur because engagement with people in food-insecure situations is facilitated by these agencies. This structure enables CKMU participants to focus on the meal-related issues of food procurement, preparation, and deliveries. During my period of observation, the three weekly stay-and-serve deliveries were shared by student volunteers and the Coordinator, while the more common drop-off deliveries were predominantly handled by the Coordinator. Regardless of the personnel delivering meals, CKMU executes its extensive delivery schedule to the satisfaction of its partners. However, its mission remains too closely tied to meal distribution to be considered one pursuing food system change. Through exploring the findings of this study, I constructed three areas that contribute to CKMU’s limited conceptualization of its mission: (1) casting itself in a support role; (2) the narrow focus of outside support; and (3) ambiguity pertaining to the meanings of service.

**Casting itself in a support role.** CKMU’s role is succinctly stated by the Coordinator; “We support what they do.” Naturally, the “we” referred to CKMU while the “they” Amanda referenced are the community partner agencies. With this remark, Amanda was suggesting that CKMU is primarily a supporting character in the missions of its non-profit partners. Obviously, the meals provided by CKMU reduce food costs for recipient agencies. And, through this cost defrayment, CKMU supports the mission of its partners—whether they are providing a safe place for kids to go after school or serving families in homeless situations.

Importantly, as was discussed in the findings illustrating CKMU’s contributions to the social service sector of Milwaukee, these meals are reaching people who struggle with food security. However, a major consequence of CKMU relegating itself to a supporting role is a narrowing of its own mission and a compromised ability to approach community partners with a collaborative agenda of food system change. An additional consequence of CKMU’s casting
itself as a supporter of other non-profits may be an ambiguous understanding of its contributions to food security. Investigations into other community-level food security interventions have noted the difficulty in impacting food security of participants (Lightman, Herd, & Mitchell, 2008). Because CKMU does not assess the food security status of its recipients, its effectiveness in this area remains unknown.

**Narrow focus of outside support.** Marquette University (MU) and the CKP National Office were both identified as undergirding institutional influences on CKMU. When examining the ways in which these institutions involved themselves in CKMU operations, however, meal distribution is again the emphasis. MU, by allowing employees to volunteer with CKMU during semester breaks, subscribes to the notion that CKMU operations entail a specific set of prescribed tasks: securing food, cooking, and delivering meals. Similarly, as findings pertaining to emergency support revealed, examples of CKP staff directly assisting CKMU focused on preserving the meal delivery schedule.

While this is valuable support, maintenance, rather than organizational growth, is achieved. By focusing support on maintenance, CKMU’s understanding of its own mission remains limited. CKMU may be the anomalous CKP branch in garnering significant but narrow support from its host institution: Whereas CKP’s National Director Maureen Roche named service-learning courses as a major source for CKP volunteers across branches, there was not a single indication during my six weeks with CKMU that student participation had been spurred by a service-learning requirement. CKMU may be the exception to the rule in this case; however, the lack of involvement from a service-learning perspective also contributes to the narrow focus on meal-related tasks. This may be a cyclical phenomenon, as staff in the MU Service-Learning Office indicated that they did not generally refer students to CKMU for service hours due to
CKMU’s limited capacity to provide students with opportunities outside of on-campus cooking shifts. Teacher-researchers from a variety of disciplines have cited challenges around making sense of connections between the service and academic components of their courses (Burton & Reynolds, 2009; Dotson-Blake, Dotson, Glass, & Lilley, 2010; Klink & Athaide, 2004). Evidence of these challenges is also present within courses specifically focused on food-related issues; however, Sullivan-Catlin (2002) suggests that the thematic focus on hunger she incorporated into two iterations of an introductory-level sociology course was helpful in closing the distance between anti-hunger service projects and major sociological concepts such as socialization and inequality.

Beyond the expected challenges related to course-planning, CKMU is faced with demonstrating the applicability of its operation to academic learning. Research demonstrating how food-related issues are incorporated into several disciplines (Gottlieb & Fisher, 1996; Sullivan-Catlin, 2002; Wright, 2006) provides one potential starting place for CKMU to articulate these connections. Additionally, the CKP National Office and network have the capacity to be helpful in this regard; they could share information about prior and existing service-learning courses with CKMU (and other branches) struggling to establish these connections.

**Ambiguity around the meanings of service.** Although MU’s Service-Learning Office shied away from CKMU as a student placement site, numerous student volunteers cited their interest in service as motivating them to become involved with CKMU. By exploring findings related to service, understanding around the development of CKMU’s mission is enhanced. The organization’s narrow, meal-related focus may be reinforced by student participants who are flooded with messages about service but are not provided structures and opportunities to unpack
and critically reflect on the meaning of service or the differences between types of service efforts. Several findings from this study underscore the importance of service to CKMU. From its student volunteers, to its Coordinator, to its host institution, the notion of “service” was repeated often in connection with CKMU. However, while service was central to CKMU, I suggest that students’ engagement could be characterized as “simple-service,” meaning service that contributes to a need but does not challenge the systemic issues from which that need results. In contrast, the contributions of “justice-oriented service” would be geared towards interventions that simultaneously provide a tangible, in-the-moment contribution and address problematic systems.

Perhaps because the simple-service model implies being of service to others, the provider-recipient binary was not typically challenged by CKMU’s operations. Previous research speaks to the difficulties in breaking down this dichotomy, even when CFS principles are an explicit aspect of programming. Using social network analysis, social work researchers Freedman and Bess (2011) detailed the tendency towards centralization in decision making within Food Security Partners, a CFS-oriented program in Tennessee. Although decreasing interaction amongst stakeholders indicates a step away from the CFS value of democracy in the food system and towards the more traditional roles of provider and recipient, it is important to note that these findings are not presented in absolutes. Interventions aimed at creating change are imperfect, and noting successes and obstacles is essential for future progress. The notion of change taking place on a spectrum is included in another example of CFS programming. In their discussion of one community food assessment (CFA), Jacobson, Pruitt-Chapin, and Rugeley (2009) underscored how public meetings with key stakeholders contributed to breaking down the provider-recipient binary common in social services. As the findings included in the discussion
of community partner relationships demonstrated, communication between representatives
(Coordinator and student volunteers) of CKMU and its partners tended to become routine, with a
pronounced focus on food quality and delivery issues.

**Narrowly Conceptualized Mission of CKMU is Mirrored in Community Partner Interactions**

As I discussed in the previous section, how participants view the role of CKMU matters; perceptions regarding the mission are concretized through activities and then reproduced through the culture. While the food rescue practices of CKMU illuminate systemic food issues, for the community, CKMU’s intervention falls along traditional lines of meal distribution via social service agencies. Casting CKMU as a support service to other organizations limits its capacity to contribute to CFS-oriented interventions, in part because CKMU approaches partnerships with a simple-service mindset. Thus, building enduring, collaborative relationships is not emphasized. The brief interaction time and service that disproportionally benefits students both show how CKMU’s limited self-concept manifests in its interactions with community partners.

**Brief interaction time.** Findings discussed in the response to Research Question Two evidence that interactions between CKMU and its community partners are limited, with concrete focus on food and delivery-related issues dominating these relationships. In their discussion of healthy partnerships between campus and community, Bringle and Hatcher (2002) asserted that these relationships travel through similar stages and experience similar dynamics to those associated with interpersonal relationships. In order to maintain healthy relationship, the authors suggest several tactics, including “develop[ment] and use [of] effective means of gaining regular feedback from community partners and students about the nature of the campus-community partnership (e.g., equity, satisfaction, common goals)” (p. 510). Formation of advisory groups
and development of interdependent goals are also presented as ways to promote healthy campus-community relationships.

Although many of the agencies that receive meals from CKMU have been doing so for several years, the majority of these community partners receive drop-off donations. Typically, contact between representatives of CKMU and the staff of agencies receiving drop-off deliveries lasted less than 10 minutes. Deliveries constituted the primary source of communication, with contact outside of deliveries occurring infrequently. As one community partner explained: “I try to email [Amanda] and keep her abreast when we’re going to be closed because there’s an activity going on or there’s a snow day or something of that sort” (Carla, October 4, lines 80-82). Carla’s comments were indicative of the communication and interaction patterns described by most community partners: Unless a schedule or other meal-related need arose, there was no need to communicate with CKMU. And, when communication was necessary, it occurred through Amanda.

Again, it is the CFS conceptual framework that shines a critical light on CKMU’s limited methods of relating. In his explication of CFS values, Fisher (1999) stressed that programming and interventions should focus on creating a democratic and community-responsive food system that ensures representation of a variety of systems and individual perspectives. An example of one such programming effort was described by Burns (2007) in his piece detailing the positive interactions amongst Somalian refugees and people of diverse religious traditions in a Denver, Colorado area community garden. Offering an additional contrasting example to the more surface relationships that characterized CKMU’s community partnerships, Jacobson (2007) reported on the process and outcome goals of a CFA and underscored the role of strong relationships in creating an accessible and just food system. These examples emphasize that,
with intentionality and conscious effort, food security interventions can create pathways of communication and contribute to community building.

Although CKMU’s operations engaged a wide array of service provider types, raising the potential for a variety of perspectives to inform programming, the norm for these relationships was a narrow meal-centered focus. Moreover, the majority of agencies and recipients did not interact with student volunteers. In spite of these findings, community partners overwhelmingly indicated satisfaction with CKMU. When asked about her relationships with student volunteers, a representative of a drop-off site summed up the feeling of many of the community partners with whom I spoke:

I didn’t know students by name, so much. All of them are so energetic, I marvel at them carrying those heavy packages of food. They just swing them around like they’re nothing. I guess that’s youth. They come, you know, with smiles and willing to serve, distributing the food. (Carla, October 11, lines 101-103)

As opposed to viewing students involved with CKMU as collaborators and forming multi-faceted relationships, community partners generally seemed to feel students were respectful and pleasant, although interaction with them was minimal. While many community partners indicated a fondness for and genuine relationship with CKMU’s Coordinator, Amanda, the majority of partner agencies did not interact at all with CKMU’s student volunteers. Additionally, as was noted in the results of the two-question surveys, a large contingent of meal recipients was not aware that a portion of their meals was provided through CKMU.

During my six-week field stay, partner relationships were characterized by a limited scope; however, exceptions existed, particularly at stay-and-serve sites where relationships were often more developed. A significant level of data supported the idea that those involved with
CKMU were interested in stretching the organizational mission. Ideas and interests related to creating interactive programming more in line with CFS were shared by multiple stakeholders. One of the program ideas mentioned by a representative of a community partner agency, CKMU’s Coordinator, and several student volunteers, involved working with the kids at HeartLove Place on a gardening project. Previous research (Lautenschlager & Smith, 2007) exploring the impact of an inner-city youth gardening program in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area noted positive outcomes for the youth involved, including improvement in their food choices, environmental responsibility, and ethnic tolerance. These findings indicate promise for CKMU’s future growth in this area: Gardening at CKMU is expanding this year and nutrition was named as an area of interest by several LT members and other student volunteers.

**Community interaction disproportionally benefits students.** For those community agencies that did interact with students, relationships not only mirrored CKMU’s meal-focused style of operations, they also appeared to produce “lopsided” benefits. While student volunteers and community partners would similarly describe their interactions as infrequent and focused on meal-related issues, students were more apt to identify personal benefits resulting from these exchanges. In the article “Campus-Community Partnerships: The Terms of Engagement,” Bringle and Hatcher (2002) suggested that successful campus-community partnerships must “find ways to preserve the integrity of each partner and, at the same time, honor the purpose of the relationship and the growth of each party” (p. 513). The meal-delivery purpose of CKMU’s partner relationships was honored; however, these narrow interactions afforded more opportunities for student growth.

Findings delineated multiple benefits for students participating in CKMU. One social benefit identified in this study’s findings was community interaction. Literature from service
learning similarly highlights community interaction as a positive outcome for students. In the book *Where’s the Learning in Service Learning?*, authors Eyler and Giles (1999) suggested that exposure to diverse aspects of their communities stimulates caring and, subsequently, a curiosity that serves as a catalyst for learning. They explained:

> For many students, much of the power of a service experience comes because they get to know and like the people they meet in the community, and this sympathy leads the students to want to learn more about them and their situation. It is easy to have opinions about homeless policy in the abstract; the need to find out how this policy works becomes more compelling when the policies affect someone you know. (p. 87)

These remarks cast human relationships as the central force in facilitating personal growth and learning for students. Although community interaction was found to be a benefit for CKMU student participants, much of the data showed that this involvement was as much about increasing geographic familiarity as it was about building human relationships. During our interview, Paul expounded on this idea:

> I would say [when you’re involved with CKMU] you have this tangential knowledge [about Milwaukee] that you wouldn’t necessarily have [otherwise]. When I started my HeartLove Place shift this year, [I was] trying to explain [to the new volunteers] about the different communities, some of just the economic status [aspects]. I think it helps to put [the volunteer experience] in perspective. Especially because one of our volunteers is a freshman, and she’s also from out of town, and if you don’t really have a perspective on Milwaukee. . . . Generally I find . . . a lot of Marquette students, they very rarely, unless they are actively engaged in an activity like Campus Kitchens, getting out into most of the broader Milwaukee community. . . . Marquette prides itself on being active, and it is,
compared to a lot of other colleges, but it definitely has a strong service identity rooted in
the Jesuit values, but . . . besides going to the Wisconsin Avenue area or parts of East
Town, maybe Miller Park, besides that, a lot of people really don’t [spend time in
Milwaukee], especially into a lot of the socially depressed areas. So you don’t necessarily
have as full an understanding of the community of Milwaukee. (September 30, lines 341-
353)

Paul clearly felt this knowledge of the area was a benefit to him, and his sentiment was shared by
other members of the LT who had participated in deliveries. When asked about relationships
with people in these areas where deliveries occurred, the limited nature of the interactions clearly
contrasts with the level of interest and caring Eyler and Giles (1999) referenced. In our
interview, Lindsay shared that meeting new people had been an important part of her experience.
Following up on this idea, I asked her to tell me about a relationship that had impacted her. She
shared:

The first one that comes to mind is the security guard at the YWCA. I was bringing the
New Hope Project meal there every week last semester. And I kind of got to know him
‘cause I would come in and he had to walk me down the hall to drop off the food, and we
would just have little conversations and . . . talk about family or the holidays or what he
was planning on doing. . . What I was doing, if I was like, “Oh, I’m not gonna be here
this week, cause it’s fall break,” he would be like, “Oh, that’s too bad” and that kind of
thing. So I guess that’s the first one that comes to mind. (September 29, lines 169-174)

Being able to talk with someone from a different area of town—having a reason to do so—these
opportunities felt significant to Lindsay and other students. However, while student volunteers
were seen as “pleasant” and “energetic” these surface interactions did not appear to stimulate relationship growth or hold comparable significance for community counterparts.

**Student Leadership Opportunities Reflect CKMU’s (Default) Organizational Priorities**

Findings explicating CKMU’s daily routines and exploring the variable depth of student engagement demonstrated that a large percentage of student volunteer time is dedicated to preparing the high volume of meals CKMU distributes weekly. Student volunteers also predominantly manage food recovery, with the four-times-a-week collection from Marquette Place occurring as an aspect of the evening cooking shifts. By examining this division of tasks, one might conclude that CKMU classifies these activities as student leadership opportunities. However, this assumes that organizational priorities are discussed, weighed, and agreed upon by stakeholders. The homepage of CKP’s National website greets its readers with the declaration: “Student-Powered Hunger Relief,” going on to state, “We are the future of hunger relief. We’re training the next generation of leaders to implement innovative new models to combat hunger, and we’re bringing those models to communities around the nation” (http://www.campuskitchens.org/national). Due to the focus on prescribed roles and the facilitation of meal-related tasks, CKMU’s operations do not reflect prioritizing innovation. Multiple researchers investigating IHE-community partnerships cite clear articulation of goals as essential to the success of these projects (Bringle & Hatcher, 2002; Eyler & Giles, 1999). However, during my six-week field stay with CKMU, I did not witness any discussion of organizational priorities. While Amanda expressed openness towards students taking on special projects, the norm for the LT centered on “shift work”—cooking shifts, food recovery shifts, and meal delivery shifts.
Roles are flexible but prescribed. As I rode along on student-led meal deliveries to HeartLove Place and spent time with LT members during cooking shifts, I learned that Amanda sends out an email early each semester, and LT members sign up to lead certain shifts. This information suggests that LT roles are pre-determined. Data depicting the daily routines of CKMU’s core roles described the LT from multiple perspectives, reinforcing the notion of established roles. Didactic instructions also contributed to the prescriptive nature of LT roles and limited opportunity for the LT to engage creatively. A typical first task for LT members leading cooking shifts was to set-up the CKMU laptop and read through the instructions for the evening. These instructions, provided by Amanda, clearly outlined what tasks needed to be completed during the shift. Rather than planning meals based on the influx of surplus foods, LT members carried out the tasks associated with creating preconceived meals.

When tasks are overly prescribed, critical engagement suffers. Freire (1970) suggested that oppressive conditions are unconsciously reproduced by both the oppressors and the oppressed due to blind acceptance of existing structures. Lack of critical reflection combined with lack of opportunity to engage in change-oriented activities also result in reproduction of the status quo. For CKMU’s student volunteers, adhering to predetermined tasks results in a continuation of the student role functioning as middle management. Furthermore, the oppressive provider-recipient structure remains intact.

Reproducing oppressive conditions is far from CKMU’s intention. Findings suggest that keeping student involvement enjoyable and social is a top concern. My time spent shadowing Amanda, as well as comments she made during our interview, indicated her openness to student’s taking initiative and independently defining their involvement. As she explained some of the time challenges related to programming, Amanda provided an example of a student who
had ventured outside of the traditional cooking shift, food recovery, and meal distribution tasks. She explained:

We have had some [students] in the past, I want to say maybe three or four years ago, before I started, we had a student who interned through the Carville Foundation, and taught a Healthy Eating for Two [class] at the Health Center that we still work with. . . . It was, I think, maybe a semester-long program where she taught a curriculum of healthy eating for pregnant women to the women being served by this health organization that we partnered with. (October 20, lines 249-254)

Amanda referenced this student’s efforts to demonstrate how CKMU is open to students pursuing their own projects and interests within the construct of CKMU’s LT. However, it is telling that to provide such an example, Amanda had to reach back years into CKMU operations: No instances of this type of student leadership came to mind during her tenure as Coordinator.

**Leadership stems from facilitation of tasks.** As one LT member stated, “We facilitate the process”—a process that is about efficiently creating and distributing hundreds of high-quality meals. Students stepping into the LT have generally volunteered previously with CKMU and have an understanding of what being on the LT means, as was discussed in findings around variable levels of student involvement. LT member Mollie explained during our interview her understanding of what it meant to be on the LT:

I think my only real understanding was that the members of the Leadership Team led the cooking shifts and the delivery shifts. . . . But I just knew [the LT] as like Paul [or another student], who would kind of . . . assign tasks, I guess, and keep everyone organized. (October 17, lines 120-121 & 123-124)
Mollie’s perception regarding LT responsibilities was echoed by non-LT and LT student volunteers alike. Although students shared ideas for growth, among the LT members with whom I interacted, assuming responsibility for creating the meals seemed to fulfill their desire to contribute to CKMU.

Again, in contrast to the formulaic contributions of CKMU’s student volunteers, literature reporting on CFS-oriented projects stresses the importance of participant involvement in development and strategic growth processes (Kobayashi, Tyson, & Abi-Nader, 2010; Pothukuchi, 2007). The two major reports chronicling the activities funded by the CFS Coalition highlight how investment from a broad range of stakeholders improved project outcomes. Though multiple challenges were documented in both these reports, the authors warned against “imposing one solution” and encouraged “creativity within the communities to find their own solutions” (Kobayashi, Tyson, & Abi-Nader, 2010, p. i). For CKMU, student volunteers (and particularly the LT) are a vital stakeholder group. However, findings indicated their collective expression of leadership was bounded by a set of clearly defined tasks.

One example of an LT member discussing his influence on CKMU reinforces the notion that the default organizational priorities around meal-related issues have permeated the organizational culture. During our interview, Paul shared how his contributions had shaped CKMU:

I think it’s been… trying to think in regards to direct shaping… I know I have worked to try to change up some of our meals. Try to make them more unique. When I’m at my individual kitchen shifts, it kind of usually works out where, sometimes I’ll be kind of the person who goes around and supervises and makes sure everyone else is doing stuff. But a lot of times it happens that I am taking on the unique food item for the night. And then,
which might be kind of unfair on my part, I shouldn’t always do that. But that’s kind of what I like to do, try to add something that gives a little more character to it. (Paul, September 30, lines 36-42)

A three-year member of the LT and the leader of both weekly cooking and weekly stay-and-serve delivery shifts during my six-week field stay, Paul had a strong commitment to CKMU. And, as was evident from the findings related to stretching the mission, Paul had many ideas regarding programming and organizational growth. The fact that he qualified meal improvement as his most concrete contribution speaks to how the implicit communication of organizational priorities manifests in LT roles, opportunities, and contributions.

Implications

Although social workers have long been on the “front lines” interfacing with people experiencing food insecurity, as a profession we are just beginning to reconceptualize food security from a community perspective (Freedman & Bess, 2011; Hazra, 2009; Kaiser, 2011; Jacobson, 2007; Jacobson & Rugeley, 2007; Jacobson, Pruitt-Chapin, & Rugeley, 2009). CFS advocates are at a similar beginning stage in constructing their values into a framework for inquiry (Anderson & Cook, 1999). Because this study was conceived and carried out via a CFS lens that incorporated elements of critical theory and the core professional values of social work, the findings of this research offer theoretical as well as practical implications. In this section, I present contributions of this research to CFS theory. I also outline what I believe to be relevant implications for practice areas, including CKP National Office and network, the CFS movement, and the social work profession. Within the discussion of practical implications, attention will be given to social work education and IHE-community partnerships.
Theoretical Implications

Investigating CKMU through a CFS-based conceptual framework demonstrates the capacity for CFS values to guide investigation into specific programs, not by using the values as evaluative criteria, but to spur questions that direct researcher attention to particular aspects of operations. Kaiser (2011) enumerated interventions in alignment with CFS values such as community-supported agriculture (CSA) and community food assessments (CFAs). Food rescue and redistribution programming was not included in Kaiser’s discussion. A review of the CFS Coalition project reports (Kobayashi, Tyson, & Abi-Nader, 2010; Pothukuchi, 2007) indicate food rescue and redistribution programming is not a prioritized intervention strategy. Although CKMU’s Coordinator and “super-volunteer” shopped regularly at the food bank, CKMU also received donations from farmers’ market vendors, and by-passed market channels by redirecting food that would be otherwise wasted. CFS is a goal, and no one program or intervention will perfectly reflect its values (Kantor, 2001). As CFS theory develops, it will need to acknowledge the compromises often made in the “real” world and incorporate knowledge and expertise from mixed examples of CFS such as CKMU.

In addition, examining ongoing programming would benefit the development of a CFS framework. In the literature, new programming is often the focus (Pothukuchi, 2007). When programs and partnerships are forming, consciousness about stakeholder involvement may be at the forefront. Findings from this study such as CKMU’s “inertia-bound” community partnerships underscore the need to continually pursue collaboration to ensure that programming stays responsive and challenges the provider-recipient dichotomy that characterizes major forms of food assistance. As a guiding set of concepts, CFS may benefit from acknowledging challenges experienced by ongoing programs to remain open to community stakeholders.
Research as well as cultural interest around food surplus and food waste is on the rise (Bloom, 2010; Caswell, 2008); yet little is known about the food rescue and redistribution programs that intervene to collect this potential waste at various points of occurrence. In his series of articles in BioCycle Timothy Jones shared findings of the Food Loss Project (FLP), including losses stemming from the agricultural sector (2005b), retail losses (2005d), and household-level losses (2006a). These studies provide a baseline understanding of the potential for food recovery to offset community needs. Findings from the case study of CKMU add a new dimension to the discussion of food waste and recovery by bridging the gap between statistics about food losses and community-level outcomes.

I began this study interested in whether CKMU’s operations and relationships to the community could challenge the notion that food rescue and redistribution programs aligned with charitably-oriented food assistance interventions such as food banks (Poppendieck, 1998). Although CKMU did not suggest a complete departure from this alignment, findings such as “engaged environmentalism” and “critical reflection” add an important level of nuance to the conversation. Additionally, findings indicate that the lack of structure and support in areas such as service learning contribute to CKMU’s challenges with pursuing CFS-oriented goals. Therefore, this study highlights the need for continued inquiry into the programmatic level of food rescue and redistribution to better understand the current and potential contributions of this intervention strategy to CFS as a movement and as a conceptual framework.

Practical Implications

Beyond its implications for CFS as a conceptual framework, this study’s findings have specific relevance for the CKP National Office and network as well as more general applications for social work practice and education. To begin, if the CKP National organization is interested
in pursuing a CFS-oriented conceptualization of food security, there are several practical applications the findings of this study suggest. First, CKP National may elect to create a protocol for acquainting its branches with CFS concepts and ideals. This could be an aspect of the trainings conducted at the annual new Coordinator “boot camp.” The CKP annual conference presents another opportunity to promote CFS ideals equally to all branches. Fisher’s (1999) articulated set of values provides a starting place for discussion amongst CKP branches. Incentives could also be used for branches to become involved in CFS efforts, with potential activities including sending representatives to food policy councils, linking with community gardens, and so forth. Such incentives would not have to be monetary but could focus on something the National Office already promotes, for example information and knowledge sharing; branches could be featured on the organization’s main website, acknowledged at the annual conference, or recognized through other non-monetary options.

The need for CKP’s National Office to promote amongst its branches the links between service learning and food rescue and redistribution is another major implication of this study’s findings. Although during my pilot trip to CKP’s National Office Director Maureen Roche identified service-learning courses as a common mechanism through which students become CKP volunteers, this was not the case at CKMU. Moreover, the findings from this study indicate a gap in understanding around connecting typical CKP tasks with learning goals. In addition to drawing on examples from branches that actively engage with service learning, the CKP National Office could look to examples from the service-learning literature and share information about courses from multiple disciplines that have incorporated food security service projects (Gottlieb & Fisher, 1996; Sullivan-Catlin, 2002; Wright, 2006).
Outside of the particular relevance and implications for the CKP organization, the findings and conclusions of this study have the potential to inform the social work profession. The majority of recent social work research related to hunger and food insecurity focuses on individual and group experiences (Kaufman, Isralowitz, & Resnik, 2005; Parish, Rose, Grinstein-Weiss, Richman, & Andrews, 2008; Pyles, Kulkarni, & Lein, 2008) or well-established interventions such as National School Breakfast Program or SNAP (Bartfeld & Ahn, 2011; Lombe, Yu, & Nebbitt, 2009). CKMU provides an example of a non-traditional food security intervention, contributing to the emerging body of social work literature stemming from a critical perspective (Freedman & Bess, 2011; Hazra, 2009; Kaiser, 2011; Jacobson, 2007; Jacobson & Rugeley, 2007; Jacobson, Pruitt-Chapin, & Rugeley, 2009). Because social work research into food insecurity interventions is dominated by inquiry into various aspects of large-scale food assistance programs that have not yielded a significant reduction in food insecurity rates, this study contributes to an area where more information is needed: community-level programming.

Considering CKMU’s level of meal distribution, this research demonstrates the capacity for harnessed surplus food to make a significant contribution to meeting the food needs of community members in need. Statistics from large-scale food recovery programs, such as the 83,000 pounds of food per day delivered by City Harvest in New York (http://www.cityharvest.org) or the 1.77 million meals delivered in 2010 by D.C. Central Kitchens (http://www.dccentralkitchen.org/files/2010_annual_report.pdf), have previously illustrated the impact of redirecting food that would be otherwise wasted. However, findings outlining CKMU’s impact add a new dimension to what is known about the role of food rescue and redistribution in the community, specifically, the need for both daily routines and growth strategies to stem from a clearly articulated mission understood and shared by all stakeholders.
The potential for community-level food recovery to address local needs has been noted by social work researcher Anupam Hazra (2009). In his work around food security in India, Hazra underscored the need to focus on sustainable, community-level interventions, citing India’s coexisting agricultural surpluses and malnutrition. While the food CKMU is harnessing is neither entirely local nor totally sourced from surpluses, CKMU’s operations demonstrate an imperfect example of the potential for waste harnessed at the local level to support the food needs of community members.

This study has additional implications for social work education due to the IHE-community partnership dimension. Previous research examining service-learning has illuminated the transformational potential of service-learning courses and their related projects (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Gorman, 1994; Wang, 2000). Food waste and the harnessing and redirecting of that waste present multiple learning opportunities for students including an increasingly environmentally-based critique of the dominant food system.

CKMU student volunteers repeatedly expressed their dedication to the environment and included diversion of food from the dumpster as a manifestation of that dedication. However, only a small percentage of students were directly involved in food recovery. Of those who were, the lack of reflection related to this undertaking may have allowed it to slip, for some volunteers, into the task-oriented realm which characterized cooking shifts. Cook, Bond, Jones, and Greif (2002) discussed how embedding their outreach center into the University of Maryland School of Social Work has helped to build and strengthen connections with the community. CKMU was also known in the community as a part of MU; however, the surface nature dominating community partner relationships underscores the opportunities available for CKMU to delve deeper.
**Recommendations for Future Research**

The purpose of this study was to better understand the culture of CKMU and investigate its relationship to the broader community. Based on this study’s findings, I recommend the following directions for future research:

1) Since beginning this project, the cultural attention to food waste in the United States has grown dramatically. Perhaps the best evidence of this increase stems from a Food Network special entitled “The Big Waste,” where world-class chefs were challenged with creating gourmet meals exclusively from food heading for the garbage. Given this cultural shift, I recommend returning to the study of CKMU at a later date and investigating changes in the experiences and perceptions of students and other volunteers to food waste and recovery practices.

2) CKMU’s branch does not have a strong connection with service-learning courses. I suggest conducting a similarly designed ethnographic case study focusing on a CKP branch that is closely connected with service-learning and comparing the findings from such a study with those from CKMU. Such a comparison has the potential to yield valuable insights around the similarities and differences in organizational culture, student and community engagement, and the implementation of programming.

3) An additional comparative opportunity exists between nationally-staffed and affiliate CKP models. CKMU represents one of five nationally-staffed branches, with the remaining 26 branches operating as affiliates. The affiliate model is rapidly growing, and comparative information is needed in order to ascertain the differences between these two models. Areas of exploration for this type of comparative research could include investigating the extent to which
an affiliate branch is embedded into its host institution, the types of support that occur, and the extent to which feedback structures support this interaction.

4) Quantitative research also has potential to provide insights into CKP and its contributions to the communities of its respective branches. One of CKMU’s community partners shared during the focus group interview that receiving meals from CKMU has been essential to his organization’s capacity to provide food. Another community partner informed me during our interview that the food provided by CKMU serves as an attendance incentive (Carla, October 11). Research examining changes in the food budgets of partner agencies, measuring the food security of meal recipients, and numerically evaluating the reduction of on-campus food waste would all promote understanding of the effectiveness and impact of CKP.

5) The variability of student engagement and critical thinking about the food system and service experiences presents an additional opportunity for future research. I suggest designing an interview study focusing on student volunteers across CKP branches. Exploration into the values of these students, their impressions of the organization, and their ideas around the benefits of participation have the potential to advance CKP as an organization and enhance the contributions of CKP to positive outcomes for students and their respective communities.

6) This ethnographic case study of CKMU utilized a CFS conceptual framework. Due to the pervasive impact of this framework on study design, analysis, and the communication of findings, another suggestion for future research would be to repeat this case study, employing a conceptual framework more focused on organizational culture. By changing the lens for inquiry, contrasting dimensions of CKMU would be revealed.

7) Finally, participatory action research has great potential to support the progressive growth of CKP. During my six-week stay at CKMU, numerous entries in my researcher journal
captured frustrations related to my limited role and temporary status. By positioning a researcher as an active participant in the ongoing operations, opportunities to incorporate CFS values and to help students process and reflect on their experiences will not be missed. This angle on future research with CKP has the potential to contribute not only to CKP, but to solidify the position of food rescue and redistribution as a tactic of CFS as well. Multiple possibilities exist for participatory action research, including conducting a “strategic planning” intervention with CKMU or another branch of CKP for stakeholders and participants to identify their goals. Following such an event, the researcher would help to operationalize the goals, following up with stakeholders and incorporating feedback at pre-determined intervals.

**Chapter Summary**

The purpose of this chapter has been to convey and discuss three broad conclusions drawn from the findings of an ethnographic case study of CKMU. To frame these conclusions I first reminded readers of the study’s CFS conceptual framework and its impact on all aspects of the study. The first conclusion is that operations at CKMU suggest a limited conceptualization of the organization’s mission. Next, I suggest that CKMU’s narrowly conceptualized mission is mirrored in community partner interactions. My final conclusion states that student leadership opportunities reflect CKMU’s (default) organizational priorities. During my discussion of these conclusions, I connect the case of CKMU with previous research from social work, food recovery, and service learning. Implications were addressed for CFS as a theoretical framework as well as for social work practice and education. Finally, seven suggestions for future research were offered.
Concluding Thoughts

The findings and conclusions of this study suggest that what is not happening in organizations may be of equal importance to what is happening. CKMU’s activities were geared towards maintaining a busy schedule of meal distribution, leaving little time for staff and volunteers to work on developing enduring relationships and rebuilding an unjust food system. Although many aspects of CKMU’s operations were critically examined due to the conceptual framework of this study, the implications and suggestions for future research do not suggest an easy road ahead. CKMU operations during my six-week field stay did not reflect a prioritization of CFS ideals. However, it would be presumptuous to assume that CKMU participants did not hold those values or believe in contributing to change in the food system. It is the potential mismatch between participants’ ideals and the priorities of CKMU as an organization, as evidenced by its activities, which underscores the continued need for a critical approach in future research.

Both as a social worker and an organizing member of the Campus Kitchen Task Force at The University of Georgia (CKUGA), I maintain awareness of the difficulty in surmounting divides between people providing services and people in need. Although CKUGA relies heavily on service-learning classes to draw students into volunteering, there is no guarantee of critical engagement. Recently I accompanied a student volunteer on a food recovery expedition. While discussing possible new ways to bring some of this food to the community, the student shared doubts due to lack of volunteer interest in doing deliveries. He explained that, while cooking shifts rapidly filled with volunteers, CKUGA struggled to secure an adequate number of volunteers to maintain the current once-a-week delivery. The subtext I heard: Cooking shifts are relaxing, social experience: It’s still service, something you can feel good about doing, while
surrounded by the security of your classmates and peers. Deliveries are less comfortable and involve interacting with unfamiliar populations.

CKP branches are taking on an enormous challenge, and success cannot be singularly defined. Involving students in the collection and redistribution of food that would be otherwise wasted provides a platform for students to increase their knowledge of an unjust food system by interacting with two of its problematic outcomes: surplus food and people experiencing food insecurity. This entry point into thinking about food—the interrelated processes of production, transportation, distribution, consumption, and disposal—is a starting place for change. The challenge is, once problematic dimensions of the food system have been exposed, not to settle on addressing what is most obvious or readily available, but to continue looking for connections and opportunities to contribute to a food system transformation.
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APPENDIX A

INITIAL SURVEY FROM CKMU

(the highlighted portions below represent responses from CKMU)

Campus Kitchen Project Coordinator Questionnaire
Date Completed: July 19, 2010, via telephone

1) Name of Institution: Marquette University

2) Date (Month/Year) CKP opened: October of 2003

3) What is length of time that the CKP took to open (from initial planning to meal delivery)?
   (a) less than 6 months
   (b) between 6 months and one year
   (c) between 12 and 18 months
   (d) between 18 months and two years
   (e) do not know

4) What is the undergraduate student enrollment at your institution?
   (a) less than 5,000 students
   (b) between 5,001 and 10,000 students
   (c) between 10,001 and 20,000 students
   (d) between 20,001 and 30,000 students
   (e) over 30,000 students

4) Describe the student food services on your campus:
   (a) cafeterias
   (b) cafeteria and restaurant-style options
   (c) other (please describe briefly)

5) Do your CKP collect food from outside of the campus food system?
6) If yes, please identify the types of places your CKP collects from:

(a) area restaurants

(b) catering companies

(c) farm gleaning

(d) farmers’ markets

(e) other (please describe briefly) food bank

7) Does your CKP operate year-round?

(a) yes

(b) no

8) If your CKP does not operate year-round, how many months is it operational?

9) Please share the number of (unduplicated) student volunteers in the last 12 months of CKP operations (between January 2009 and January 2010)?

(a) less than 50

(b) between 51 and 100

(c) between 101 and 200

(d) more than 200

10) Please identify (by placing an X in the box) the types of community agencies your CKP partners with for meal delivery:

_X_ homeless shelters

_X_ substance abuse recovery programs

_X_ soup kitchens (without shelter services)

_X_ domestic violence shelters
11) How often does your CKP deliver meals?

(a) daily

(b) multiple times per week

(c) once per week

(d) other (please specify)

12) Please briefly describe how your CKP addresses nutritional issues when creating meals:

In menu planning, we work with sites to check out dietary and nutritional restrictions. We try to incorporate healthy proteins and veggies as much as possible. The people we serve are often in crisis and their bodies need good nourishment to get through these times. We really try to get good healthy proteins, we don’t fry everything; we have everything baked, steamed, just prepared in the healthiest way possible. We also include a little dessert, just a little one.

13) What student organizations, academic departments, and college or university offices have been the most supportive of the CKP?

Student workers in the union, frats, finance department on campus, bursar, they help during the summer when students are gone—folks working in that office volunteer during the summer and Christmas break.

14) What would you describe as the biggest obstacle or challenge facing your CKP?

Consistency- it’s been improving. Coordinators have been coming through since we’ve started, also we’ve gotten moved around on campus between different dining halls—almost every 6 months. Moving has been a challenge. We just moved to hopefully a new kitchen space. Now the challenge will be continuing to maintain good relationships with Sodexo staff since we’re not in the same kitchen.

15) What is your age? 28

16) What is your identified gender? female

17) What is your highest level of education completed?

(a) high school

(b) undergraduate degree
18) Please identify yourself by name and by role with the CKP (Coordinator, student leader, etc.): Coordinator, Amanda

19) Please indicate (with yes or no) your availability for a possible follow-up phone call and include your contact phone number and the best times to contact you:

Yes—Thursday or Friday morning.
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## RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND DATA COLLECTION STRATEGIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Data Collection Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) How is CKMU structured and organized?</td>
<td>- <em>Observations</em> of staff and volunteer roles &amp; tasks&lt;br&gt;- <em>Interviews</em> with&lt;br&gt;  * coordinator&lt;br&gt;  * students&lt;br&gt;  * community partners&lt;br&gt;  * MU partners&lt;br&gt;- <em>Focus groups</em> with&lt;br&gt;  * student volunteers&lt;br&gt;  * community partners&lt;br&gt;- <em>Documents</em> including&lt;br&gt;  * in-house forms&lt;br&gt;  * meeting minutes&lt;br&gt;  * communication with host institution/volunteers/partners&lt;br&gt;- <em>Photographs</em> including&lt;br&gt;  * cooking shifts&lt;br&gt;  * food collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. What values, beliefs, and role constructions are evident among CKMU staff and volunteers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. How are individual and institutional values reflected in CKMU?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) How are relationships constructed and maintained between representatives of CKMU and representatives of community partner agencies?</td>
<td>- <em>Observations</em> of interactions between CKMU staff/volunteers and community partners&lt;br&gt;- <em>Interviews</em> with&lt;br&gt;  * coordinator&lt;br&gt;  * students&lt;br&gt;  * community partners&lt;br&gt;- <em>Focus group</em> with community partners&lt;br&gt;- <em>Documents</em> exchanged between CKMU and partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) What are the cultural norms for student engagement?</td>
<td>- <em>Observations</em> of&lt;br&gt;  * student leadership team meetings&lt;br&gt;  * student cooking shifts&lt;br&gt;  * student deliveries&lt;br&gt;  * interactions between students and community partners&lt;br&gt;  * interactions between students and coordinator&lt;br&gt;- <em>Interviews</em> with&lt;br&gt;  * coordinator&lt;br&gt;  * students&lt;br&gt;  * community partners&lt;br&gt;  * MU partners&lt;br&gt;- <em>Focus group</em> with students&lt;br&gt;- <em>Documents</em> including&lt;br&gt;  * researcher-generated question of the week worksheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. How do students construct their roles as CKMU participants?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. What motivations do students express for participation in CKMU?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4) How do CKMU stakeholder groups think about the successes, challenges, and contributions of CKMU?

   a. What is CKMU’s connection to food security?

   b. How does CKMU demonstrate an environmental understanding of the food system?

- Interviews with
  * coordinator
  * students
  * community partners
  * MU sponsoring office

- Focus groups with
  * student volunteers
  * community partners

- Documents including
  * researcher-generated question of the week worksheets
  * correspondence with the National Office and CKP network

- Photographs including
  * cooking shifts
  * food collection
  * practices (i.e., compost)
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### OBSERVATION TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation Setting</th>
<th>Researcher Role</th>
<th>Approximate Time Spent (hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various- shadowing Coordinator activities</td>
<td>Travel around with the Coordinator, recording her activities and asking questions.</td>
<td>60 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen- student-led food preparation shift</td>
<td>Working alongside students, taking notes.</td>
<td>50 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen- volunteer-led food preparation shift</td>
<td>Worked alongside CKMU’s “super-volunteer,” taking notes, asking questions.</td>
<td>6 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Meal Delivery-drop-off sites</td>
<td>Riding along on meal deliveries and recording interactions with community partners.</td>
<td>10 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Meal Delivery-stay-and-serve sites</td>
<td>Participating alongside and recording interactions between CKMU volunteers and their community partners.</td>
<td>30 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette Place and The Brew- surplus food collection</td>
<td>Accompanying students and/or Coordinator to recover on-campus food and recording interactions with food service staff.</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food bank- food shopping</td>
<td>Accompanying Coordinator in weekly food bank shopping.</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer’s Market- food collection</td>
<td>Accompanying Coordinator and students to the market and recording interactions between CKMU representatives and donors.</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU Student Lounge-Leadership Team meetings</td>
<td>Observing and recording both the content and the interactions and non-verbal communication of student leaders.</td>
<td>5 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CKMU Office/ 707 Building- Phone calls with CKP National Office</td>
<td>Observing and recording content and other communications expressed during weekly phone calls between the Coordinator and the National Office.</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INTERVIEW GUIDE: CAMPUS KITCHEN COORDINATOR

1. Tell me about your role with the CK.

2. Think of a time when you knew the CK was making a difference and walk me through what happened.

3. Take a minute to think of a student you have worked with who has made an important contribution to CK and tell me about that.

4. Talk a little bit about the relationship between the CK and Marquette University.

5. Think of a significant community partnership and tell me about that relationship.

6. Tell me about what being a part of CK means to you.

The table below links the above interview questions with the guiding research questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Interview Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) How is CKMU structured and organized?</td>
<td>* Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. What values, beliefs, and role constructions are evident among CKMU staff and volunteers?</td>
<td>* Question 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. How are individual and institutional values reflected in CKMU?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) How are relationships constructed and maintained between representatives of CKMU and representatives of community partner agencies?</td>
<td>* Question 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Question 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) What are the cultural norms for student engagement?</td>
<td>* Question 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. How do students construct their roles as CKMU participants?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. What motivations do students express for participation in CKMU?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) How do CKMU stakeholder groups think about the successes, challenges, and contributions of CKMU?</td>
<td>* Question 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. What is CKMU’s connection to food security?</td>
<td>* Question 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. How does CKMU demonstrate an environmental understanding of the food system?</td>
<td>* Question 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Question 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Question 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

INTERVIEW GUIDE: STUDENT VOLUNTEERS

1. Tell me about how you became involved with the CK.

2. Think of a time when you knew the CK was making a difference and walk me through what happened.

3. Take a minute to think about someone from outside of Marquette that you have met through CK and tell me about that relationship.

4. Tell me about what being a part of CK means to you.

* The table below links the above interview questions with the guiding research questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Interview Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) How is CKMU structured and organized?</td>
<td>* Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. What values, beliefs, and role constructions are evident among CKMU staff and volunteers?</td>
<td>* Question 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. How are individual and institutional values reflected in CKMU?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) How are relationships constructed and maintained between representatives of CKMU and representatives of community partner agencies?</td>
<td>* Question 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Question 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) What are the cultural norms for student engagement?</td>
<td>* Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. How do students construct their roles as CKMU participants?</td>
<td>* Question 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. What motivations do students express for participation in CKMU?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) How do CKMU stakeholder groups think about the successes, challenges, and contributions of CKMU?</td>
<td>* Question 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. What is CKMU’s connection to food security?</td>
<td>* Question 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. How does CKMU demonstrate an environmental understanding of the food system?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

INTERVIEW GUIDE: COMMUNITY PARTNERS

1. Walk me through how your relationship with CK developed.

2. Think of a student volunteer that you have interacted with and tell me about that relationship.

3. Tell me about the communication between CK and your agency.

4. Talk a little bit about how the CK fits into the community.

The table below links the above interview questions with the guiding research questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Interview Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) How is CKMU structured and organized?</td>
<td>* Question 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. What values, beliefs, and role constructions are evident among CKMU staff and volunteers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. How are individual and institutional values reflected in CKMU?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) How are relationships constructed and maintained between representatives of CKMU and representatives of community partner agencies?</td>
<td>* Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Question 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Question 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) What are the cultural norms for student engagement?</td>
<td>* Question 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. How do students construct their roles as CKMU participants?</td>
<td>* Question 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. What motivations do students express for participation in CKMU?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) How do CKMU stakeholder groups think about the successes, challenges, and contributions of CKMU?</td>
<td>* Question 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. What is CKMU’s connection to food security?</td>
<td>* Question 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. How does CKMU demonstrate an environmental understanding of the food system?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

INTERVIEW GUIDE: MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY PARTNERS

1. Walk me through how your relationship with CK developed.

2. Think of a student volunteer that you have interacted with and tell me about that relationship.

3. Tell me about a CK community partner with whom your office/department has interacted.

4. Tell me about the communication between CK and your office/department.

5. Talk a little bit about how the CK fits into Marquette University.

The table below links the above interview questions with the guiding research questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Interview Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) How is CKMU structured and organized?</td>
<td>* Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. What values, beliefs, and role constructions are evident among CKMU staff and volunteers?</td>
<td>* Question 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. How are individual and institutional values reflected in CKMU?</td>
<td>* Question 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) How are relationships constructed and maintained between representatives of CKMU and representatives of community partner agencies?</td>
<td>* Question 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) What are the cultural norms for student engagement?</td>
<td>* Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. How do students construct their roles as CKMU participants?</td>
<td>* Question 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. What motivations do students express for participation in CKMU?</td>
<td>* Question 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) How do CKMU stakeholder groups think about the successes, challenges, and contributions of CKMU?</td>
<td>* Question 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. What is CKMU’s connection to food security?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. How does CKMU demonstrate an environmental understanding of the food system?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX I

### DOCUMENT TABLE

**Part I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly reporting documents</td>
<td>CKP National Office for blank/CKMU Coordinator for completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house organizational forms</td>
<td>CKMU Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting notes/minutes</td>
<td>CKMU Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CKMU website</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter postings: following CKP National Office and Robert Egger (DCCK founder, CKP co-founder)</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CKMU facebook page</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence from CKP National Office/network members</td>
<td>CKMU Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question of the week responses</td>
<td>CKMU student volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographs of CKMU artifacts, student cooking shifts, meal delivery sites, and food collection activities</td>
<td>Researcher-generated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community partner documents (brochures, case statement, program descriptions)</td>
<td>Publicly available from community partner/recipient agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps of Milwaukee and Marquette University</td>
<td>Publicly available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Part II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Document Type (by reference #)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) How is CKMU structured and organized?</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. What values, beliefs, and role constructions are evident among CKMU staff and volunteers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. How are individual and institutional values reflected in CKMU?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) How are relationships constructed and maintained between representatives of CKMU and representatives of community partner agencies?</td>
<td>1, 6, 10, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) What are the cultural norms for student engagement?</td>
<td>3, 6, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. How do students construct their roles as CKMU participants?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. What motivations do students express for participation in CKMU?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) How do CKMU stakeholder groups think about the successes, challenges, and contributions of CKMU?</td>
<td>1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. What is CKMU’s connection to food security?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. How does CKMU demonstrate an environmental understanding of the food system?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX J

**INTERVIEWEE SUMMARY TABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Role with CKMU</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mabel</td>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>September 23, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>October 4, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>October 11, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>October 13, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>October 17, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie</td>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>October 17, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Marquette University Partner</td>
<td>October 3, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan &amp; Thomas</td>
<td>Marquette University Partner</td>
<td>October 3, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>Marquette University Partner</td>
<td>October 5, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis</td>
<td>Marquette University Partner</td>
<td>October 12, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay</td>
<td>Student Volunteer (LT)</td>
<td>September 29, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Student Volunteer (LT)</td>
<td>September 30, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fran</td>
<td>Student Volunteer (non-LT)</td>
<td>October 10, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>Student Volunteer (LT)</td>
<td>October 11, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Student Volunteer (non-LT)</td>
<td>October 13, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Student Volunteer (non-LT)</td>
<td>October 14, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mollie</td>
<td>Student Volunteer (LT)</td>
<td>October 17, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shari</td>
<td>Non-Student Volunteer</td>
<td>October 12, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>October 20, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K

CKMU MONTHLY REPORT

Overview: CKP tracks the following statistics to ascertain how your Campus Kitchen is performing, meeting the Standards of Excellence, and growing. Stats are regularly shared with current and potential donors as evidence of the success of the program in grants and in our PR material.

Guidelines:
Reporting table is attached
Due: 5th of every month
Submit to: Program Director for your region (reportsxxxx@campuskitchens.org)
- Copy and paste the table into the body of your e-mail
- Subject Line: “Campus Kitchen at ____ November Stats”

Materials Needed:
C-1: Cooking Check-in form
D-1: Delivery Check-in form
I-2: Partner Agency form
I-3: Client Information form
V-1, V-4: Volunteer Information
  V-3: Volunteer Hour Logs
F-1: Donated Food Release form.
Receipts from Food Bank
Receipts from in-kind donations
Special Event Planning Guide

Filling in the Report:
- Extra Meals: Holiday or non-regular meals served in addition to regularly scheduled deliveries. This does not include holiday meals or nonperishable grocery bags that replace normal deliveries.
- Individual Clients: Meals are typically packaged in individual meal containers and are delivered week to week to the same person at their house or an agency. This statistic does not include additional persons served at congregate sites.
- Partner Agencies: Agencies where the Campus Kitchen delivers meals.
- New Volunteers: Unduplicated number of individuals who volunteer with the Campus Kitchen in any capacity, including one-time and regular volunteers.
  *Note: CKP tallies the cumulative number of volunteers in the academic year. All volunteers are considered “new” each September. In subsequent months it is only necessary to count the number of additional volunteers, reflected on V-1 and V-4 forms.
- Pounds of Food Recovered: Recovered food may come from a variety of sources, including campus dining halls and local restaurants (note: Recovered food from the food bank should be counted separately). Use the Cheat Sheet available on the intranet to accurately determine the poundage of recovered food as you receive it.
- **Programming Statistics:** Details the number of programs that your Campus Kitchen offers.
  - Refer to the programming descriptions available on the intranet to categorize your program offerings. If you have questions, contact your Program Director.
  - A program that spans more than one month should only be counted in the month it begins.
  - Programs that are offered multiple times per year are counted each time they are offered.

Service Learning Partnerships include the number of classes your CK partners with, or the number of Service Learning opportunities your CK offers independently. Do not include multiple sections of the same class unless a different professor teaches each section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report for the month of: May 11</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Regular Meals Served</td>
<td>2620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Extra (holiday or non-regular) Meals Served</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of New Individual Clients</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Individual Clients Lost</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Partner Agencies Served</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of New Volunteers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Volunteer Hours</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pounds of Food Recovered</td>
<td>2076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pounds of Food from Food Bank</td>
<td>2574 (2126 free!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pounds of Other Donated Food</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Empowerment Programs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Participants</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Graduates (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Mega Meals Programs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Service Learning Partnerships</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Service Learning Volunteers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Educational Programs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Advocacy Programs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Advocacy Program Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of New and Piloted Programs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Participants (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX L

FOOD SAFETY EXAMPLE FORM

D-2: HACCP Delivery Shifts – In the Kitchen (all temperatures are in Fahrenheit)

GUIDELINES
1. Minimum internal temperature requirement for cooking reheated foods: **165° within 2 hours**
2. Food that will be delivered cold MUST have been cooled to 40° or below (check C-3 log)

Date: __4oct__ Supervisor: _Joel__________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Out of cooler</th>
<th>At the Kitchen</th>
<th>Out for delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Temp</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fried rice (with veg and meat)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yogurt</td>
<td>HLPT</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jello</td>
<td>HLPK</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOLDING TEMPERATURE REQUIREMENTS
HOT FOODS: hold at **135° or above**
COLD FOODS: hold at **40° or below**
Record holding times and temps for beginning and end of holding period

SERVING TEMPS
- Meat, Poultry, Seafood, Egg dishes: **145°-165°**
- Cold Foods: below **40°**
- Soups: **160°-180°**
- Other Entrees: **160°**
- Sauces/Gravies: **160°-180°**
- Vegetables: **160°-180°**

Record holding times and temps for beginning and end of holding period.
## APPENDIX M

### BALANCED MEAL FORM EXAMPLE

**C-2: Meal Description**

**Date: October 3**

**LT: Mollie & Paul**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meal Destination</th>
<th>Servings</th>
<th>Congr/ individ.</th>
<th>Meal Combo 1</th>
<th>Meal Combo 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casa MWC</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Protein – ravioli</td>
<td>Protein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Starch – ravioli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vegetable – sweet potatoes and other veggies</td>
<td>Vegetable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dessert – pastries and strawberries</td>
<td>Dessert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLPT HLPK</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Protein – tuna casserole</td>
<td>Protein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Starch – noodles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vegetable – salad and broccoli</td>
<td>Vegetable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dessert – strawberries</td>
<td>Dessert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHP</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Protein – sandwiches</td>
<td>Protein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Starch – bread in sandwiches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vegetable – salad</td>
<td>Vegetable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dessert – pastries and strawberries</td>
<td>Dessert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
** Please complete and return to agency staff person. Thank you for your participation! **

1) Were you aware that some of the meals provided by this agency came from the Campus Kitchen at Marquette University?

Please circle: YES NO

2) Please share any thoughts or comments you have about the Campus Kitchen and its place in your agency.

____________________________________
____________________________________
____________________________________
-------------------
APPENDIX O

TWO-QUESTION SURVEY RESPONSE SUMMARY

Researcher-Generated Documents: The Two-Question Survey

Of the 11 agencies and 13 programs, 9 were given surveys (6 of the 9 were returned—a response rate of 66%).

Total # of staff surveys ➔ 5
Total # of client surveys ➔ 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Program Name</th>
<th>Frequency of Delivery</th>
<th>Received?</th>
<th>Returned?</th>
<th>Response Re: Knowledge of CKMU (% aware, staff and clients)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. HeartLove Place-Kids Café</td>
<td>2x/week</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Staff (4/4) ➔ 100% Clients (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. HeartLove Place-Teens</td>
<td>4x/week</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Staff (0) Clients (1/8) ➔ 12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Casa Maria</td>
<td>2x/week</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Goodwill Senior Meals- Bethany Cavalry</td>
<td>1x/week</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Staff (0) Clients (13/14) ➔ 93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Goodwill Senior Meals- Ascension Lutheran</td>
<td>1x/week</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Progressive Healthcare</td>
<td>1x/week (and 2/x month, different program)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Staff (0) Clients (1/10) ➔ 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. New Hope Project</td>
<td>1x/week</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Staff (1/1) ➔ 100% Clients (6/9) ➔ 66.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. YWCA Transitional Housing</td>
<td>1x/week</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ARC of Greater Milwaukee</td>
<td>2x/month</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Staff (0) Clients (8/9) ➔ 89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Meta House</td>
<td>1x/week</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Repairer’s of the Breech</td>
<td>Varies- no set schedule</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Foundation for Children with Cancer</td>
<td>1-2x/month</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Women’s Center</td>
<td>1x/week</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>