

UBC Food Systems Project Group 10: AMS Community Kitchen
Ava Shannon, Megan Schneider, Olivia Yung, Shubhangi Malhotra, Yoonkyung Heo
University of British Columbia
LFS 450
April 04, 2014

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

LFS 450 Winter 2014

UBC Food Systems Project Group 10: AMS Community Kitchen

Yoon Heo - [REDACTED]

Shubhangi Malhotra - [REDACTED]

Megan Schneider - [REDACTED]

Ava Shannon - [REDACTED]

Olivia Yung - [REDACTED]

Executive Summary

Context: The AMS Community Kitchen project was created within the UBC Food Systems Projects to develop a proposed student-run facility in the UBC Student Union Building (SUB). Community kitchens are generally spaces where people come together to meet the health and nutritional needs of the community; plans for the AMS Community Kitchen were in need of foundational research on how to best approach both management and programming of the space, to maximize opportunities and to meet the unique needs of students and campus community members. In doing so, it could help meet the social and environmental missions of the Alma Mater Society (AMS), the University of British Columbia, and even the Metro Vancouver region.

Methodology: After research and discussion with our community partner, the AMS Sustainability Coordinator Collyn Chan, we decided that a qualitative method was most appropriate, namely a focussed selection of interviews with key potential stakeholders in the Kitchen, from the UBC community. Distinguishing between programming and management interviews, we developed two sets of open-ended questions. We identified interviewees either by their potential close relationship with the Kitchen due to their mandate or programming, or as groups that could advise on the organizational structure of the Kitchen. Of 22 contacts, we elicited 17 useable interviews by telephone, e-mail or in person, the results of which we discussed as a group. We also conducted a literature review and continued to meet with Collyn and other relevant decision-makers to inform our process.

Findings and Outcomes: In our programming research, we found that the Community Kitchen needs a clear mandate, and that its subsequent programming offers a chance to fill many gaps in accessibility that currently exist in the UBC food system. Fortunately, we also found that other groups

on campus find the Kitchen relevant, and are interested in collaborating. However, a programming limitation to consider in moving forward will be the physical space and its equipment.

Our parallel management research heard a need for a well-structured, autonomous organization, with a passionate student volunteer base and a staff support position.

Analysis: The specific way in which the Kitchen meets the health and social needs of students must be defined by its future governing body; its mandate will be strongest if developed in close collaboration with the various food-related groups on campus. The Kitchen will also serve student needs best if it both offers its facilities to host the events of these existing groups, and generates its own programming. The Kitchen may even be able to act as a connecting body for these groups, collaborating together for campus food sovereignty.

To organize student participation while ensuring stability and continuity, the management structure of an AMS Club, supported by a paid AMS student or full-time staff, would offer the greatest stability. Ongoing responsibilities for this governing body would be the Kitchen's financial viability, and its day-to-day health and safety duties.

Recommendations: The above recommendations are directed at both the AMS staff overseeing the Community Kitchen project, and the future Club that puts the Kitchen in motion. Moving forward, we believe that the next UBCFSP group will be able to take our research into implementation.

Introduction

The AMS Community Kitchen is a combined effort between UBC SEEDS, the UBC Food System Project (UBCFSP), and the Land, Food, and Community III course (LFS 450) created to develop a plan

for a student community kitchen on the UBC Vancouver campus. The kitchen will occupy an existing kitchen space in the “old” Student Union Building that will be vacated when businesses move into the new “Student Nest” over the course of the next two years. The AMS representative who has been our community partner, Sustainability Coordinator Collyn Chan, developed the project to obtain further research on the operational organization and programming of the space, in order to give the best chance of success and to best meet student needs with this new facility. Previously, there had only been one research effort for this kitchen, an incomplete directed studies project, so we came to realize that our project was offering the preliminary research that would form a foundation for the future of the kitchen. Therefore, we aimed to broadly assess the existing amenities and unmet needs on campus, struggling with conflicting information about the scope of our project along the way. This report outlines the research we conducted, including our methods and findings, our analysis of these findings, and our ultimate recommendations for the main stakeholders in the Kitchen.



Figure 2. The future space of the AMS Community Kitchen.

The AMS Community Kitchen is proposed to be a student-run food-centred space, occupying what is currently the AMS Catering Kitchen. In the literature we reviewed, community kitchens are generally defined as facilities where people come together to meet the health and nutritional needs of

community members (City of Vancouver, 2013, pg.89;

Engler-Stringer & Berenbaum, 2006, 2007). The AMS

kitchen has a unique context on UBC's campus, facing the challenge to balance the needs of a diversity of commuters, residents, community members, and the legal and political structure of both the Alma Mater Society and the University of British Columbia. Most fundamentally intended for the use of students for cooking and eating, the Community Kitchen holds the potential to be a food-centred social and educational space, although these opportunities will be physically limited by the existing space and its equipment. The Kitchen has further been framed by the community members we interviewed as holding the potential to address such various issues as: student budgets, social and ethnic diversity and interaction on campus, health and lifestyle challenges among students, inexperience with basic grocery shopping and cooking, and the environmental impacts of food choices from producing to packaging to composting, to name a few.

Perspective

Coming from a variety of backgrounds ourselves, the members of our group strove to approach this project open to the wide range of information we were gleaning. However, the process

of choosing subjects for our research and interpreting their input relied heavily on our own judgement and familiarity with the UBC food system, and our work should be viewed in light of our potential biases. Our choice to contact people who were in decision-making positions in recognized campus organizations, rather than broadly surveying the general population or seeking opinionated general community members, stemmed from our agreement that people in these positions would be more able to represent broad groups of students than individual students could. We also tended to assume a higher value for those who could empathize with what we perceived to be the common student experience, finding ourselves challenged along the way by the community members who did not fit this prescription, such as families living in residences. Full of our own hopes and ideas for this exciting space, we struggled to approach the project neutrally, without guiding interviews and interpretations toward our preconceived visions.

Context

As we set out to determine the best management and programming of this space, we found that we were outlining the ways in which the Community Kitchen might address the various campus and student issues referenced above, defining its role within the broader UBC food system and even the interactions that will connect it to the larger food systems in which UBC and its students participate. In fact, the Kitchen has the potential to align with many policies and goals at UBC and in the greater Vancouver community. Overseen by the AMS, the Community Kitchen can contribute to their primary Mission Statement, “To improve the quality of the educational, social, and personal lives of the students of UBC” (AMS Student Society, 1994), by creating a social space that facilitates students coming together to build community. It also has the potential to contribute to the commitment of the AMS to “reduce the ecological footprint at AMS food outlets” (AMS Student Society, 2008) by providing students with access to and education about more sustainable food.

The Community Kitchen also aligns with policies at the higher UBC level. Overarching plans often express goals of creating a lively campus social life and community, such as the UBC Place and Promise Plan which includes an aim to “Support student well-being, personal development, and outstanding campus life” (The University of British Columbia, 2012). To these, the Community Kitchen can contribute by offering a site for building social connections and networks, and by bringing communities together around food. In terms of sustainability and the UBC food system, as expressed in the UBCFSP “Vision Statement for a Sustainable UBC Food System”, the Community Kitchen can contribute to educating students about food sustainability, particularly the following components of the Vision Statement (Food System Project, 2011):

- 4. Food is culturally and ethnically appropriate, affordable, safe, nutritious and minimally processed*
- 5. Providers and educators promote awareness among consumers about cultivation, processing, ingredients, and nutrition of food products in the food system*
- 6. Food and the food environment enhance community through opportunities for participants to interact and support one another to meet common interests and goals ...*
- 10. On-campus food system actors work toward food sovereignty and agency, within the context of the wider food system ...*
- 12. Any student, staff, or faculty member desiring the opportunity to learn about food production and preparation will have access to such opportunities through on-campus land-based food production sites.*

Lastly, the Community Kitchen fits into the wider regional desire to create sustainable food systems. For example, the idea of community kitchens has a prominent role in Goal 4 of the Metro Vancouver Regional Food System Strategy, “Everyone has Access to Healthy, Culturally Diverse, and Affordable Food” (Metro Vancouver, 2011). Community kitchens specifically feature in the “Procurement and Distribution” section of the Vancouver Food Strategy where they are noted as important neighborhood food assets and sites of community building and education (City of Vancouver, 2013). We conclude that there is institutional support for a UBC community kitchen on many political levels at UBC and beyond, and that the AMS Community Kitchen could support many

of these goals and visions. For a complete list of the relevant institutional documents, see Appendix A.

Methodology

At the beginning of the project, we met with our community partner, Collyn Chan, to obtain information about her views and expectations for the project and its potential accomplishments. From her input we concluded that in order to establish the needs and opinions of the various potential community stakeholders in the Kitchen, a qualitative research method such as interviews or surveys would be the best approach. Especially because our potential stakeholders did not have prior access to any detailed information on the AMS Community Kitchen project, one-on-one interviews offered the chance to answer the questions that they might have. Furthermore, our research suggested that we could obtain non-verbal feedback from our community stakeholders by observing their voice, gestures, and reactions to the project and our interview questions (Office of the Auditor General of Canada, 2007). Since the project was specific to the UBC context, we decided after some debate that interviews with related, established UBC entities (clubs, organizations, etc.) that could represent various relevant aspects of the student population would be most appropriate. Although we acknowledged that this method might leave many voices unheard, we decided that we needed to prioritize, and limit our scope to the most productive selection of interviewees that was still manageable.

The Interviews

As a group, we discussed and developed a list of potential partners and groups that might either be interested in collaborating with the community kitchen, or would have relevant experience that could inform its planning. We divided the community representatives between those who could

inform the Kitchen's programming, either to compliment their own programming or in response to the needs they saw, and those who could offer advice on management, based on the partner's mandate (with a few bridging both categories). We had this list of stakeholders approved by the LFS 450 teaching team (see Appendix B).



Figure 1. Conducting interviews.

We formulated two sets of interview questions (refer to Appendix C), one directed at programming aspects for the Community Kitchen, and the other at potential management and organizational structures. Interview questions were open ended, non-leading, and enabled responses that would address complex issues while obtaining the maximum amount of information (Martens and Horst, 2006). To obtain accurate and useful information, we established rapport and an ongoing relationship with the interviewees (Office of the Auditor General of Canada, 2007).

We then contacted the stakeholders by e-mail and scheduled in-person, phone, or e-mail interviews depending on their preference and convenience. Interviews were conducted from February 28th to March 21st. The sample size of our interviews consisted of 22 community representatives, and the response rate was 20/22 or 91% (refer to Appendix B). There was a better response rate for in-person interviews than those proposed by phone or e-mail. Of this number, the useable data collection rate was 17/22 which is 77%. As our interviews progressed, we searched for additional food or wellness-related clubs and organizations at UBC to add to our participant sample. Our process of contacting them via e-mail, setting up a time convenient to them, and then conducting one-on-one interviews, was fairly

successful. Some interviews were audio-recorded, and all interviews were transcribed in note form and shared with the LFS 450 group. As a group we compared and discussed the interview results and the recommendations for operating the Community Kitchen. We sought feedback from the interviewees on the effectiveness of our methodology, asking them about the clarity and relevancy of the questions, and the ability of the interview to elicit the information that we needed without being leading or vague. Looking at the response rate, we can confidently say that our open question approach was successful.

Complementary Research

A literature review was also conducted to inform our understandings of community kitchens, to explore the various iterations of existing kitchens, and to support the results of our interviews. We found a limited selection of academic literature that directly discussed community kitchens using the following search terms in the UBC library database: *community kitchen*, *programming*, and *management*. The most relevant of these were by R. Engler-Stringer and S. Berenbaum, who had researched the purpose and importance of collective kitchens by observing participant behaviours in relation to food related knowledge and skills (Engler-Stringer & Berenbaum, 2006, 2007), which we supplemented with non-academic sources such as the *Community Kitchen Best Practices Toolkit* by K. Lowitt (2011), and academic literature on other specific aspects of our project such as interview methods.

Over the course of our research, we met with Collyn twice more to check in and update her on the project. We also arranged with Michael Kingsmill, a designer for the construction and renovation of the AMS buildings, to visit the kitchen space and assess the current state of the equipment. We arranged a group meeting with Nancy Toogood, the Food and Beverage Manager in the SUB, and Ryan Bissell, the AMS Chef, to gain insight into the practical aspects of running the

Community Kitchen and to bring together all the expectations, recommendations and questions from the various community representatives and clubs. Keeping in mind all the input from our community representatives, we concluded by creating a sample Community Kitchen schedule (refer to Appendix D) and discussed its plausibility with these decision-makers.

Findings and Outcomes

Programming

We were able to obtain information on the kinds of related programs that are currently offered on campus through our interviews with community representatives. These provided invaluable insight into the kind of programming that the Community Kitchen should offer to best fill the gaps that currently exist in the campus food system. For a complete list of potential program ideas, see Appendix E. The programming findings can be divided as follows:

1) *The vision provides the programming framework.*

The programming that other groups offer are tailored to their own mandates. For example, Sprouts (a food-focused AMS club and space) had aimed itself at providing an on-campus option for sustainable and affordable food for students, so their programming includes many forms of food accessibility, such as groceries for sale, a food box, a café, and educational opportunities.

2) *The gap to fill is accessibility.*

There are gaps in programming or facilities that exist on campus that the Community Kitchen has a great potential to fill. The main need that we identified is that certain similar programs or spaces that already exist might not be accessible to all students or interested groups. For example, the workshop series at the UBC Farm might not be accessible to some students because of the

location or the price. Another example is the FNH kitchen, an operational kitchen which can only be used by FNH courses.

3) *On-campus groups are interested in collaborating.*

Many of the groups we interviewed are interested in partnering with the Community Kitchen or potentially using the space for their own programs. See Appendix F for a list of groups that would like to be contacted about the development of the Community Kitchen in the future.

4) *The Community Kitchen relates to many on-campus communities.*

The Kitchen could be especially useful for certain communities that tend to be vulnerable in food security, such as first year residents or commuters, but it relates to many varied students at UBC, such as cultural groups. The participants that we chose to interview represented several distinct on-campus communities, revealing the wide range of communities and students that could potentially have a stake in the Community Kitchen.

5) *The space is an important consideration.*

The space and the equipment in the kitchen will limit the programming that can be offered. While the kitchen is currently operational, it does not contain some standard equipment of full kitchens, such as an oven, and certain products, such as meat, are not allowed to be prepared there. These limitations will have a marked effect on the type of programming that can be offered in the space. In addition, the space it incurs operating costs that will need to be covered by the management of the Kitchen, presumed to be collecting revenue of some sort. This has the potential to limit some aspects of the programs, such as affordability, as the programming will have to charge enough from its users to break even or profit.

Management

Similar to the programming outcomes, we conducted multiple interviews with various campus partners to provide insight for which management system would be the most practical, while aligning with and enacting the mandate of the space. Although some of our findings had slight discrepancies between the interview participants, the final requirements we concluded were:

1) *The Community Kitchen needs to be managed by a student volunteer base.*

The Kitchen will be under the jurisdiction of the AMS within the old SUB, and must be managed or co-managed by a board of students. It will not receive financial support from the AMS and must meet its operating costs, and therefore has no budget for paid positions.

2) *An AMS-affiliated staff person might be necessary.*

Due to the magnitude of the project, and the number of aspects required to meet the Kitchen's programming potential, many interviewees recommended that a student or full-time paid staff member be available to support or guide the student volunteers, who may change month to month, in coordinating and supervising the space. There was discrepancy, however, over the financial viability of a full-time position.

3) *It is not feasible for existing campus organizations to take on this project.*

The community partners believed that for a pre-existing group to assume responsibility for the Kitchen would more likely exhaust that group's own resources, and thereby undermine the ability of the Kitchen to realize its full potential.

Discussion

Programming

The Mandate: One of the most important aspects of the Community Kitchen will be its mandate. Ultimately this will be defined by those who plan and run the Kitchen, but our interviews

can shed light on a collective vision for the Community Kitchen. The main themes that came up in our programming interviews were:

- Health and Well-Being
 - Physical – through healthy food and nutrition
 - Mental – through social connection and community building
 - The interactions between these two
- Education
 - Nutrition
 - Food related skills (purchasing, cooking, food safety, etc.)
 - Awareness of sustainable, seasonal, local, garden-fresh food
- Accessibility
 - Open to all students
 - Affordable
- Creating student-to-student interactions and connections through food
 - Intercultural understanding and sharing culture
- Increasing campus food security
- Connecting with other related programs on campus
 - Participating in or hosting a collective of student-run food operations
 - Hosting events, workshops, and courses

It is important that the mandate include both the social aspect, and the food and nutrition education aspect of the Community Kitchen. Studies have shown that collective kitchens, a form of programming that the AMS Community Kitchen could offer, can provide positive social benefits to participants and can be important tools for nutrition education (Engler-Stringer & Berenbaum, 2006,

2007). Some of the positive social benefits that can come from participating in community and collective kitchens include: building friendships, breaking social isolation, participating in community activities, cooking and eating as a group, emotional support, and informational and tangible support (Engler-Stringer and Berenbaum, 2007). These services would support many of the goals of that the AMS and UBC have as expressed, and would contribute to a vibrant, sustainable, and healthy student community on campus.

Collective and community kitchens can also be important resources for food and nutrition related education. Food and nutrition education in these settings can happen formally and informally and different kinds of knowledge, such as awareness and how-to knowledge, can be gained by those who participate (Engler-Stringer and Berenbaum, 2006). These settings are conducive to learning about nutrition and food because of their variation in learning styles and because the settings also involve a component of social support (Engler-Stringer and Berenbaum, 2006). This aspect of the AMS Kitchen will be particularly appealing to groups who want to partner to offer educational opportunities to students, as it will provide a conducive setting to do so. Thus, it remains important that the mandate of the Community Kitchen include these multifaceted aspects of the programming.

When synthesized, a mandate based on our findings could read:

“The AMS Community Kitchen provides a space on campus that supports the well-being of UBC students through accessible and educational opportunities to engage with healthy and sustainable food. The Community Kitchen is a social space that helps students create connections around food in an effort to build community and increase food security at the UBC Vancouver campus.”

Space and Program Gaps on Campus: While community kitchens are generally “defined as community-based cooking programs in which small groups of people ... meet regularly to prepare one or more meals together ... Within this general framework there is wide variation in models of

operation” (Tarasuk & Reynolds, 1998, p.14). We found three variations: collective kitchens, where people share resources and labor to cook a large amount of food; cooking classes, where groups watch someone prepare a meal; and communal meal programs, where participants periodically prepare and share meals together (Tarasuk & Reynolds, 1998, p.14-15).

Because there are already a range of existing food and nutrition groups on campus, the Community Kitchen can offer a facility for the food-related events of these groups, a need that is currently only served by two residence kitchens available for rental, neither of which is centrally located nor advertised. It also presents an opportunity to offer the programming that does not currently exist on campus. The Community Kitchen should ideally offer both a space to host other groups, and programming of its own.

Accessibility: This gap characterized the general needs that we identified from the interviews. An accessible Community Kitchen should embody a number of key features of the program and the space:

- Affordable – asking fees that students can afford
- Convenient – having locations and times that are convenient for students
- Student-focused – geared towards students and pursuing student participation
- Established – functional and well-known
- Open – welcoming all students, groups, and communities who wish to participate

An advantage that the Community Kitchen will have is its affiliation with the AMS. This will give it a chance to be promoted through existing, well-known channels on campus, already aimed at students, which could contribute to its success. A challenge to affordable programming will be the need to cover the operating costs of the space with the revenue from the programs. The location in

the SUB will likely make the programs and space visible and accessible to most campus students, and governance by students should ensure that student needs are prioritized.

Connecting for Campus Food Security: While the Community Kitchen and UBC are inherently linked to issues of food sovereignty through the global connections of our modern food system, the concept of community food security would be most relevant to the Community Kitchen because of its association with a specific community, students at the UBC Vancouver campus, and their routine interactions with food and each other. Community kitchens are specifically identified as components of the second stage of building food security (food systems in transition) (Dieticians of Canada and Slater, 2007). The above recommendations for the Community Kitchen would connect students and various campus communities, through and to food. The potential is to use this network to build food security for the UBC community. “Community food security exists when all community residents obtain a safe, personally acceptable, nutritious diet through a sustainable food system that maximizes healthy choices, community self-reliance and equal access for everyone” (Dieticians of Canada & Slater, 2007). Community food security is both a goal and a process. It promotes change through community-based processes, such as coordinating resources, partnering, training, and advocating, which involves a wide variety of stakeholders (Dieticians of Canada and Slater, 2007). By acting as a connector, the Community Kitchen could help UBC food groups work together towards campus community food security.

Furthermore, because so many groups are interested in collaborating with the Community Kitchen, when it is well established it has the potential to function as an organizational centre for a collective or network of student-run campus food programs with a vision for a sustainable campus food system (refer to Appendix G). This would evolve the mandate and vision of the Community Kitchen but it could be a unique and valuable opportunity.

Management

Turning to the organization of the Community Kitchen, its success will be largely dependent on ensuring that the management structure is appropriate for the space. Due to the dynamic nature of the planning stages, the new AMS Club that moves forward with planning and governing the Community Kitchen will have the opportunity to structure their organization as they see fit. However, the interviews with the various community representatives can provide foundational knowledge for a potential management structure. Important aspects include:

- Student involvement
 - An AMS club consisting of student volunteers
 - Leadership opportunities for student volunteers
- An AMS student staff or full-time staff
 - Providing guidance and support for student leaders
 - Assistance in management of the space
 - Overseeing health and safety requirements
- Health and safety
 - Fulfill legal requirements
 - Organize food safety and ongoing training
- Financial sustainability
 - Must be able to fund itself and its initiatives

Student Involvement: The mandate of the UBC Alma Mater Society is to “provide members with diverse opportunities to become exceptional leaders” (AMS Student Society, 1994). Allowing students the opportunity to connect previous knowledge to hands-on programming and management experiences is pivotal to leadership development (Jenkins and Cutchen, 2011.) By

providing student leadership and volunteer opportunities, the Community Kitchen has the potential to teach students program management, small-business administration, and leadership and teamwork skills.

Through the interview process, it was evident that the most practical group to govern the Community Kitchen would be a newly constituted AMS club. Although other organizations expressed interest in the Community Kitchen and future programming aspects, the scale of the project was likely to exhaust available resources to these pre-existing groups. The AMS provides support and resources for clubs that include but are not limited to: a bank account with the AMS, office or locker space, and administrative support from Student Administrative Commission (SAC), Financial Commission, and the Vice-President Administration (AMS Student Society, 2013). Furthermore, the Club would start from a base-point organizational structure predetermined by SAC which requires executive positions such as a President, Treasurer, Vice President, and Bookings Representatives (AMS Student Society, 2012), which would ensure the stability of the Club. In addition to the positions dictated by SAC, additional executives would be needed to ensure all the programming and logistics pieces of the Community Kitchen would be fulfilled; a preliminary design of the team can be seen in [Appendix H](#).

AMS Student Staff or Full-Time Staff: To continue the progress of the Community Kitchen, it was expressed by multiple community representatives that an AMS student staff or full-time staff member should sit on the Club executive board. In addition to offering familiarity with the project, including its legal health and safety obligations, the staff member could potentially be responsible for major aspects of the operations of the kitchen as seen in [Appendix I](#) (Lowitt, 2011). However, the expectations of our community partners were unclear. Although highly advantageous, there is a lack of available funding for an AMS full-time position as indicated by Nancy Toogood; in this case a

student would have to take the initiative to propose a work-study position, competing for funding from an AMS Sustainability grant. The majority of AMS clubs do not have staff members that sit on their committees and have been very successful, but we suspect that maximizing the potential of the Community Kitchen might extend beyond the capacity of students, and we do recommend pushing for a paid position.

Health and Safety: The managing Club will have to be extremely attentive to health and safety issues, including legislation, that center around food safety, kitchen equipment, and food preparation practices. The executive board should be cognizant of these concerns and will be responsible for obtaining the appropriate training to manage the programs in the space, likely precipitating that a Food Safe certified person be present at all times. For consistency and accessibility, we found this would best be fulfilled by the full-time staff person if possible. Appendix J shows some of the important aspects of which managers of food service outlets should be aware, as identified by the World Health Organization (Jacob, 1989). Prior to the opening of the space all required food health and safety permits and training should be obtained. A list of relevant resources have been provided in Appendix K.

Financially Self Sustaining: As with any organization that is a part of the AMS, it will be a requirement for the Community Kitchen to fund itself and any of its future initiatives. It is a requirement of all AMS Clubs to present positive annual financial statements and practice good financial management, as failure to comply with these policies could result in deconstitution or loss of privileges such as free bookings, and locker or office space (AMS Student Society, 2013). Especially in its initial years, we believe that the Club executives may encounter challenges with balancing their budgets while ensuring that the programs and space for students are affordable. Generating revenue

through membership fees and by renting the space to external campus groups could help alleviate associated costs as seen in Appendix L.

Limitations

As mentioned above, a major limitation in our data collection and analysis was the fact that the people we chose and the questions we asked were bounded by our personal knowledge of the campus food system and our own familiarity with groups that we guessed would be relevant to the project. Given this Kitchen's unique context, we were also limited by the lack of information about comparable community kitchens, including at other universities; see Appendix M for an example from SFU. We would have liked to conduct a more thorough investigation of other community kitchens instead of focusing solely on the UBC community research, and this might have changed our findings.

Stakeholder Recommendations

Our recommendations can be divided between those for the AMS staff members that oversee the ongoing development of the Community Kitchen and those for the proposed AMS club that actually manages the Community Kitchen and its space.

Recommendations to the AMS Staff

1. *Coordination:* All community partners (AMS New SUB Sustainability Coordinator, AMS staff, SEEDS director) should meet before the next stage of development (ex: before the next LFS 450 project) to consolidate the goals, visions, and ideas of the Community Kitchen before moving forward with the planning of the space and programs. All partners should be kept updated on the progress of the Community Kitchen as it unfolds to ensure consistency and prevent discrepancies. Further research should be geared towards budgeting for the

successful functioning of the community kitchen as well as equipment and space management. A mandate needs to be written as soon as possible to guide the subsequent development of the Kitchen.

2. *AMS Management Support:* Develop an AMS staff position to manage the space and programming. A full-time, permanent AMS staff is preferable to a student part-time staff because of time commitment variabilities of students, especially during exam times. A permanent AMS staff would be hired at a time appropriate to the development of the Kitchen and the convenience of the AMS. However, if this role must instead be filled by a student staff, interested students will need to submit proposals for their position and apply for AMS funding in a timely manner. The staff person would need to be Food Safe trained (preferably HACCP certified), and must be aware of all proper food handling and preparation practices, and familiar with safe use of the kitchen space and equipment. It would be most convenient for the Kitchen if the staff person is available for specific hours during each day that the Community Kitchen is in use, and physically present to oversee use. At the fullest extent of their potential responsibilities, the staff person could manage schedules and budgets for the kitchen, orient Kitchen users, write a “kitchen policy” to guide users, recruit volunteers, facilitate and govern their involvement, and oversee decisions regarding the kitchen (such as grocery shopping, kitchen funds, etc) along with the volunteers frequently or on a monthly basis.
3. *Governance of the Kitchen:* Invest time in recruiting passionate and capable students for the first AMS Club during the 2014/2015 school year or during the 2015/2016 school year. These club members should be trained in food safety before taking responsibility for the Kitchen. During the functioning of the Kitchen, a record must be kept of the number and types of users

to further understand and cater to the needs of these users. A marketing campaign should be devised to promote maximum usage of the Community Kitchen. Perhaps, reward schemes should be offered to consistent and frequent Kitchen users to maximize the symbiotic relationship of profit and usage. Furthermore, a form for the usage of the kitchen must be signed by the users or people conducting workshops that include emergency contact information, food allergies and other health concerns to prevent adverse food related outcomes.

4. *Preparations:* Research and finalize an operating budget for the Community Kitchen based on the mandate that is created, or request that a student/group to do this. Such a document should begin with an inventory of kitchen equipment.

Future Management Group (AMS Community Kitchen Club)

1. We propose that a new club is constituted between 2015 and 2016 to fully manage the Community Kitchen in the future. It should be developed with a strong working relationship with AMS staff and community stakeholders. A selection of passionate student volunteers solely dedicated to the operations of the kitchen would ensure its success.
2. Club executives and members should fully understand and support the mandate of the Kitchen.
3. With the help of the AMS staff, the club should write a timeline, budget, and programming plan before the kitchen opens. Moreover, we recommend that all club members receive Food Safe certification (a service that the Kitchen could host).

Scenario Evaluation

The feedback we received from our main community partner, Collyn Chan, was mostly positive. She appreciated that we did a thorough survey of the campus community to research the gap that the Community Kitchen can fill, and that we identified possible stakeholders for the future project. She also praised the management plan criteria that we outlined. She expressed that more concrete details about moving forward with the project would have been appreciated and said that our presentation was the most useful when aligned with another LFS 450 group's research, the Skills Building project, because that provided a concrete program that the Community Kitchen could offer.

Overall, aspects of our project that went well were: identifying interested community representatives, gathering related information from them through interviews, identifying their needs and expectations, analyzing the data collected from the interviews, and utilizing that data to achieve our community partner's desired outcomes. The feedback we got from our interviewees was positive. They seem to have been well-structured, and their open-ended nature helped us explore the expectations of the community representatives regarding the Kitchen, while also raising awareness of this upcoming project and eliciting interest in future collaborations. Our interviews met our goals and expectations, and we feel that any missing information would be appropriate for the scope of future research groups.

As we have mentioned above, there were likely potential stakeholders in the Kitchen that we missed during our research. We considered conducting a survey among the UBC student population as a whole, and this may have provided insightful data on understanding each student's views and expectations of a community kitchen. However, we are confident in the approach that we took in representing a wide selection of the many voices, while focussing on those who have some familiarity with the specific food and health issues the Community Kitchen could address.

From these findings, we recommend to future AMS Community Kitchen project groups to seek out potential stakeholders that have not yet been contacted, and to conduct interviews earlier so as to leave time to follow through with their recommendations for further potential interviewees. It may also be worth considering conducting a survey of UBC students to represent their broader views and needs. We also strongly recommend to contact the primary stakeholders that are directly related to the project (Nancy Toogood, Michael Kingsmill, and Ryan Bissell) in order to obtain detailed information on the project, such as funding, kitchen space, etc, before getting into interviews with secondary stakeholders. As a recommendation for the teaching team, we firmly believe that it is necessary for all community partners in charge of the project to communicate thoroughly before commencing. We received mixed messages from various coordinators about their expectations and needs for the Community Kitchen, which made it difficult for us to proceed and ultimately required several compromises and unmet expectations. However, overall we feel that we satisfied the expectations of the initial project and the requirements from our community partner, although, as always, more could have been done if we had more time.

Reflection

Overall, our group enjoyed the experience of completing this project and were happy with the success. We appreciated that the Community Kitchen encompasses so many facets of the food system on campus, while maintaining focus on student involvement and participation. We believe our successes stem from our group's effective teamwork skills, and valuable qualitative approach which was a new challenge for those of us coming from all-science backgrounds. We found that the group work we have done in past LFS courses was essential in preparing us for the demands of this

project, including defining our goals and approaches, coordinating a variety of tasks, synthesizing and communicating the results of those tasks, and stratifying the volume of information we had gleaned.

A challenge that frustrated us was a lack of communication between the partners that are invested in this project. When we struggled with knowing the direction of the project, we learned to check in with each other, our community partner, the LFS 450 teaching team, or the project outline, and met often to thoroughly discuss our questions and ideas. Many of us gained new insight into the operations of the AMS, student clubs, and other campus organizations; while conducting interviews was also a new and educational experience for many members of our group.

Media Release

The AMS Community Kitchen is proposed to be a student-run facility in a space that will be vacated in the old SUB as businesses move to the new SUB. Our task was to explore the programming and management options that would enable the Community Kitchen to realize its full potential. We conducted interviews with twenty different representatives of campus food- and health-related organizations. From our findings, we formed a series of recommendations for the next steps towards making this space a reality.



Ideas abound for how programming in the Community Kitchen might meet various student needs and interests, from cooking classes to bulk-buying to community meals. We recommended that accessibility to students be prioritized, partnering with existing

organizations (ex: by hosting events) to make the most of the space.

Especially being a new project, the management of the space will benefit from adopting an AMS Club structure, with a passionate student volunteer base, preferably supported by an AMS staff person for continuity. As with all clubs, this group would be taking on the financial and operational

responsibilities of the space, and will have the exciting task of directing the future of this new student amenity.

References

- AMS Student Society. (2008). *AMS Lighter Footprint Strategy*. Vancouver BC: Alma Mater Society of the University of British Columbia. Retrieved from: <http://amssustainability.ca/the-ams-lighter-footprint-strategy/>
- AMS Student Society. (2012). *Club Constitution*. Vancouver BC: Alma Mater Society of the University of British Columbia. Retrieved from: <http://www.ams.ubc.ca/clubs/new-clubs/>
- AMS Student Society. (2013). *Exec Resources*. Vancouver BC: Alma Mater Society of the University of British Columbia Retrieved from: <http://www./ams.ubc.ca/clubs/resources>
- AMS Student Society. (1994). *Mission Statement*. Vancouver BC: Alma Mater Society of the University of British Columbia. Retrieved from: <http://www.ams.ubc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Mission-Statement.pdf>
- AMS Student Society. (2013). *SAC Policy Handbook*. Vancouver BC: Alma Mater Society of the University of British Columbia. Retrieved from: <http://www.ams.ubc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/SAC-Policy-Handbook-Updated-May-2013.pdf>
- City of Vancouver. (2013). *Vancouver Food Strategy*. Vancouver, BC: City of Vancouver. Retrieved from: <http://vancouver.ca/files/cov/vancouver-food-strategy-final.PDF>
- Dietitians of Canada, & Slater, J. (2007). *Community food security: Position of Dietitians of Canada*. Dietitians of Canada.
- Engler-Stringer, R., & Berenbaum, S. (2006). Food and Nutrition-Related Learning: In Collective Kitchens in Three Canadian Cities. *Canadian Journal of Dietetic Practice and Research*, 67(4), 178-182.
- Engler-Stringer, R., & Berenbaum, S. (2007). Exploring social support through collective kitchen participation in three Canadian cities. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health (Revue canadienne de santé mentale communautaire)*, 26(2), 91-105.
- Food System Project. (2011). *Vision Statement for a Sustainable UBC Food System*. The University of British Columbia. Retrieved from: http://sustain.ubc.ca/sites/sustain.ubc.ca/files/uploads/CampusSustainability/CS_PDFs/Food/UBCFSP_VisionStatement_2012.pdf

- Horst, Hilde and Martens, Riet and Riet Martens (2006). Open-ended Questions. Retrieved from: http://www.utwente.nl/mb/en/education/Organization/Educational%20policy/Assessment/Job%20aids/open-ended_questions_2/index.html#advantages_of_openended_question
- Jacob, M. (1989). *Safe Food Handling: A training guide for managers of food service establishments*. England: World Health Organization. Retrieved from: https://extranet.who.int/iris/restricted/bitstream/10665/36870/1/9241542454_eng.pdf
- Jenkins, D.M., & Cutchens, A.B. (2011). Leading Critically: A Grounded Theory of Applied Critical Thinking in Leadership Studies. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 10 (2), 1-21.
- Lowitt, K. (2011). *Community Kitchen Best Practices Toolkit*. Retrieved from: http://www.foodsecuritynews.com/Publications/Community-Kitchen_Best_Practices_Toolkit.pdf
- Metro Vancouver. (2011). Regional Food System Strategy. Retrieved from: <http://www.metrovancouver.org/planning/development/AgricultureAndFood/Documents/RegionalFoodSystemStrategy.pdf>
- Office of the Auditor General of Canada (2007) Conducting Surveys : Section 7 : Advantages/Disadvantages of Different Approaches to Collecting Data from Individuals. Office of the Auditor General of Canada. Retrieved from : http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/english/meth_gde_e_19728.html
- Tarasuk, V., & Reynolds, R. (1998). A Qualitative Study of Community Kitchens as a Response to Income-Related Food Insecurity. *Canadian journal of dietetic practice and research: a publication of Dietitians of Canada= Revue canadienne de la pratique et de la recherche en dietetique: une publication des Dietetistes du Canada*, 60(1), 11-16.
- The University of British Columbia. (2012). Place and Promise: The UBC Plan. Vancouver, BC: The University of British Columbia. Retrieved from: <http://strategicplan.ubc.ca/files/2009/11/UBC-PP-Layout-Aug2012.pdf>