

## GOALS

### **Have we made progress towards the six goals?**

#### **Goal 1: Michigan institutions will source 20% of their food products from Michigan growers, producers and processors.**

- Sixty eight percent of food service directors reported purchasing local foods in a 2013 survey, up from 54% in 2012.<sup>1</sup>
- More than 100 of Michigan's nearly 150 hospitals have committed to locally sourcing 20% of their food by 2020 through the Healthy Food Hospitals initiative.
- As of October 1, 2014, 21 institutions had joined the Cultivate Michigan campaign, pledging to purchase 20% of their food from Michigan sources by 2020.
- While no Michigan universities or colleges have formally signed on to the Real Food Challenge, student groups advocating for shifting food budgets to "real food" – locally-based, fair, ecologically sound and humane food sources – continue to grow in strength and number.<sup>2</sup>
- In the 2011-2012 school year, 48% of produce purchased through the U.S. Department of Defense Fresh Fruit and Vegetable program for 869 participating Michigan schools was sourced from Michigan.<sup>3,4</sup>

#### **Goal 2: Michigan farmers will profitably supply 20% of all Michigan institutional, retailer and consumer food purchases and be able to pay fair wages to their workers.**

- In 2014, a study showed local food sales represent 17.7% of Michigan's total food consumption sales.<sup>5</sup>
- The 2012 U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Census of Agriculture reported that average net cash income per farm in Michigan increased from \$23,368 in 2007 to \$42,738. This indicates that income of area farms is increasing overall, though more Michigan farms continue to report net losses (28,082) than report net gains (24,112).<sup>6</sup>
- The State of Michigan does not conduct regular studies of prevailing wages for farmworkers despite having approximately 50,000 working the fields during the summers. Federal regulations specify an adverse effect wage rate, the minimum wage that must be paid to both U.S. and guest workers by employers of H-2A (guest) agricultural workers to prevent wage depression. In 2013, that rate was \$11.30 per hour for Michigan. However, data from migrant resource service units show that migrant farmworkers in Michigan earned, on average, \$8.28 per hour.<sup>7</sup>

## PROGRESS TOWARDS GOALS AND SHARED MEASUREMENT

The Michigan State University Center for Regional Food Systems (CRFS) continues to work to develop strategies for best assessing progress towards the six goals of the charter. In September 2014, CRFS contracted with the Gretchen Swanson Center for Nutrition to facilitate a process of developing a shared measurement system to enable partners across the state to collect similar data to better understand progress on key indicators for the charter goals, both locally and statewide.



Photo by Jude Barry

**GOALS**

**Goal 3: Michigan will generate new agrifood businesses at a rate that enables 20% of food purchased in Michigan to come from Michigan.**

- As of 2012, Michigan had 1,841 licensed food processors generating nearly \$25 billion in economic activity and employing more than 130,000 residents.<sup>8</sup>
- The Michigan Good Food Fund is a public-private partnership loan fund currently in development that will finance healthy food processing, distribution, retail and food entrepreneurship projects that benefit underserved communities across Michigan. The value of this fund currently stands at \$3.5 million.

**Goal 4: Eighty percent of Michigan residents will have easy access to affordable, fresh, healthy food, 20% of which is from Michigan sources.**

*The target percentage in this goal was originally based on a 2009 report that claimed nearly 60% of Michigan residents lived in areas with limited access to healthy food.<sup>9</sup> However, the methodology in this report was limited and has not been repeated since. The following statistics assess food access in a number of different ways and also report fruit and vegetable consumption, which is dependent on having adequate access.*

- In 31 of Michigan’s 83 counties, 20% or more of the population has low access to grocery stores.<sup>10</sup>
- Data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) indicates that 63.9% of census tracts in Michigan have at least one healthy food retailer located within the tract or within one-half mile of its boundaries, which is below the national average of 69.5%.<sup>11</sup>
- Only 15.3% of Michigan adults report consuming the recommended five or more servings per day of fruits (including juice) and vegetables. Nearly 38% of Michigan adults report consuming fruits less than one time per day and nearly 25% report consuming vegetables less than one time per day.<sup>12</sup>

**Goal 5: Michigan Nutrition Standards will be met by 100% of school meals and 75% of schools selling food outside school meal programs.**

*The voluntary Michigan Nutrition Standards, adopted by the Michigan State Board of Education in 2010, encouraged schools to start improving the healthfulness of foods and beverages served and sold to students, paving the way for them to meet the requirements of the new, mandatory federal standards. The updated USDA standards are similar to the Michigan Nutrition Standards in many ways, but the state level guidelines also apply to foods sold or provided outside of school hours, which is not true of the USDA standards. The USDA standards also only apply to schools participating in the National School Lunch and Breakfast programs.*

- According to a 2012 CDC survey, 66.6% of Michigan secondary schools sold unhealthy<sup>13</sup> food and beverages outside the school meals program, down from 73.3% in 2010.<sup>14,15</sup> Detroit schools are well ahead of the state average: only 23.5% sold less nutritious food and beverages, down from 33.5% in 2010.<sup>16</sup>
- As part of the Healthy Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010, USDA developed stricter nutrition standards for school breakfast and school lunch programs, which first took effect in school year 2012-2013.
- The USDA “Smart Snacks in School Rule,” which went into effect July 1, 2014, required, for the first time, nutrition standards in all areas outside of the school meal programs including cafeteria “a la carte” lines, school stores, snack bars and vending machines.
- A March 2014 survey showed that 82% of school districts in Michigan are serving meals meeting the updated USDA standards, compared with 86% nationally.<sup>17</sup>

**Goal 6: Michigan schools will incorporate food and agriculture into the preK through 12th grade curriculum for all Michigan students and youth will have access to food and agriculture entrepreneurial opportunities.**

- According to the CDC, 94.5% of secondary schools in Michigan with a required course on health education (87.4% of schools) tried to increase student knowledge on nutrition and dietary behavior.<sup>18</sup>
- Approximately 6,700 high school students (0.4% of high school students) are learning about food and agriculture through the Michigan FFA (Future Farmers of America) program. This figure continues to increase by about 300 students annually.<sup>19</sup>

**AGENDA PRIORITIES**

**What is the status of the 25 agenda priorities?**

The successes reported under the agenda priorities here relate directly to the strategies articulated for each agenda priority in the Michigan Good Food Charter. For details see [www.michiganfood.org](http://www.michiganfood.org)

**AGENDA PRIORITIES SCORE: 47/75**

Being Implemented: 10 priorities x 3 points = 30  
 Gaining Momentum: 4 priorities x 2 points = 8  
 Slow Progress: 9 priorities x 1 points = 9  
 Minimal Action: 2 priorities x 0 points = 0

**47 points out of 75 possible**

In the 2012 report card, the score reported was 42.

**Being Implemented**

**10**

**#1 – Expand and increase innovative methods to bring healthy foods to underserved areas**

The availability of farmers markets, community gardens and other venues for accessing healthy foods continues to improve. In 2013, there were 300 farmers markets in Michigan, a growth of 20 markets since 2012 and 83 since 2010.<sup>20</sup> Innovative programs like Fresh Food Share, operated by Gleaners Community Food Bank, provide access to healthy, Michigan-grown food in new ways and many Michigan communities have a growing number of community gardens.

**#2 – Improve school food environments**

For the first time, USDA developed nutrition standards for foods sold in schools outside the national lunch and breakfast programs, which took effect July 1, 2014. The Michigan Nutrition Standards also continue to be a resource for healthy food guidelines, particularly in areas not covered by USDA’s Smart Snacks in School rule.

**#3 – Link public benefit programs to healthy food access**

Michigan continues to be among the national leaders in Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) sales at farmers markets. In 2013, 111 farmers markets reported \$1,207,522 in SNAP sales, an increase of about 10% from the previous year. The Double Up Food Bucks (DUFb) program, which matches what SNAP users spend at farmers markets with up to \$20 of tokens for Michigan-grown fruits and vegetables, operated across the state at over 90 farmers markets, two food share programs, three mobile food trucks and a network of Detroit farm stands in 2013. The program grew by 20 additional sites in 2014. DUFb was also piloted in three retail stores in 2013 and expanded to six retail stores this year.



Photo courtesy of Detroit Public Schools

**AGENDA PRIORITIES****#5 – Establish food business districts**

The Michigan Food Hub Network, co-coordinated by the Michigan State University Center for Regional Food Systems (CRFS) and Morse Marketing Connections, LLC, celebrated its second anniversary in June. By partnering with local food hub facilitators and hosting statewide meetings and webinars, the network has reached more than 1,000 people over the last year with educational and networking opportunities. Numerous communities continue to develop food hubs or districts and interest is expanding in Muskegon, Benton Harbor, Jackson and Saginaw, among other areas.

**#6 – Use policy and planning strategies to increase healthy food access in underserved areas**

A growing number of Michigan communities have formed or are forming food policy councils (or similar groups) to address this issue, among others. In June 2014, the Michigan Association of Planning adopted a Food Systems Planning Policy and is beginning to develop capacity to support communities in implementing the policy's recommendations.

**#8 – Encourage institutions to use their collective purchasing power to influence the food supply chain to provide healthier food and more foods from Michigan**

The Michigan Farm to Institution Network launched in April 2014 to bring together institutional food buyers, growers, processors and distributors around the goal of serving more Michigan foods in institutions. The network launched the Cultivate Michigan campaign at the same time as a way to support institutions in pledging to purchase 20% Michigan foods by 2020 and tracking their progress.

The Food Bank Council of Michigan administers the Michigan Farm to Food Bank program, which allows food banks to contract with farmers to grow rows specifically for them. In 2013, six of seven member food banks participated in the program, working with 12 farmers who produced more than 1.1 million pounds of food for the food banks.

**#12 – Implement a reimbursement program to provide an additional 10 cents per school meal**

The Michigan Land Use Institute launched a pilot of this program in 23 schools in northwest Lower Michigan with donations from local businesses, individuals and grants. It continues to raise funds to support a two-year pilot (fall 2013-spring 2015) and will track impacts with the goal of informing sustainable implementation elsewhere in Michigan and statewide.

**#15 – Direct \$10 million to regional food supply chain infrastructure**

In 2012, the Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (MDARD) awarded nearly 50% of its \$2 million Value-Added/Regional Food Systems Grant funding to support five food hub development projects. For 2014, MDARD committed another \$875,000 to the Value-Added/Regional Food Systems program to facilitate processing, aggregation and distribution of Michigan crops and livestock.

Additionally, in 2013, Michigan received a \$3 million Healthy Food Financing Initiative award from the U.S. Departments of Treasury, Health and Human Services and Agriculture that will provide the initial financial resources for the Michigan Good Food Fund. The Michigan Good Food Fund will continue to grow with additional financial partners to provide flexible capital to good food enterprises across the value chain.

**AGENDA PRIORITIES**

**#20 – Ensure that all state and higher education business, work force and economic development programs include farming and agriculture in their target audiences**

Since 2012, MDARD has more than doubled the number of staff dedicated to economic development in farming and agriculture. During this same time, MDARD has more than doubled the number of staff dedicated to providing technical assistance. In 2014, the work of the Michigan Food Policy Council transitioned to an Interdepartmental Collaboration Committee-Michigan Food Policy subcommittee, a structure that will allow for implementation of previously developed recommendations and continued coordination of state agencies and food system stakeholders.

The Michigan Energy Office awarded Michigan State University a grant to provide energy audits, renewable energy assessments, and technical assistance to agribusinesses through its Farm Energy Audit Program. Over 300 farms and rural businesses have taken advantage of these services and have achieved upwards of 30% energy savings.

**#22 – Include Michigan food and agriculture in state marketing efforts**

The Pure Michigan campaign features Michigan agriculture in some of its advertisements, Michigan commodities have participated in the Pure Michigan advertising program, and guidelines are in place for using the brand as a label for Michigan foods. Unlike the earlier “Select Michigan” brand, where only 50% of the processed product needed to be directly sourced from Michigan, fresh product must be 100% sourced from Michigan to carry the Pure Michigan label, and 75% of ingredients in processed products must be directly from Michigan.



Photo courtesy of Michigan Team Nutrition

**AGENDA PRIORITIES**

**Gaining Momentum**

4

**#18 – Develop a farm-to-institution grant program**

CRFS has provided Farm to School grants for the fourth year. Twenty-one schools, preschools and early childcare programs each received \$2,000 for the 2014-2015 school year. This program provides the model for a larger scale program.

**#19 – Direct state agencies to maximize capital access for farm financing**

The Michigan Passive Solar System Revolving Loan Program was part of the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Revolving Loan Fund Program, established in 2010. Under the program, a total of \$600,000 in low-interest loans, from \$5,000 to \$15,000, was made available for family farms or nonprofit 501(c)(3) organizations to install passive solar systems, also known as hoophouses. As of fall 2014, all of the available dollars have been lent. As the loans are repaid, the funds go into the original Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Revolving Loan Fund Program, where the dollars are no longer earmarked solely for passive solar systems. However, farms and nonprofits can still apply for loans from the fund for such projects.

**#21 – Contingent upon further market assessment, establish a state meat and poultry inspection program**

The CRFS Livestock Work Group has convened stakeholders from the meat and livestock value chain in Michigan to produce an outline of challenges and solutions in developing local and regional markets. In response, a statewide study was executed to review the capacity of the Michigan meat processing industry. Additional studies to better understand the overall capacity of the local meat value chain in Michigan are underway. USDA awarded the work group \$500,000 to support capacity-building of local and regional meat producers and processors in the state through research and a market intermediary.

**#23 – Incorporate food and agriculture into local economic development plans**

Many communities, especially those receiving funding for food hubs from MDARD, are utilizing food systems as an economic development strategy. The Governor’s Regional Prosperity Initiative, a voluntary competitive grant process, is now in its second year of providing \$2.5 million annually to support collaborative, comprehensive regional economic planning. The initiative does not specify farming and agriculture as a required component or partner; however, in most regions, local partners are working with MDARD to ensure that there is a food and agriculture component to regional prosperity plans.

The Michigan Economic Development Corporation (MEDC) made \$200,000 in grants available to help farmers markets expand and awarded \$77,000 to help food trucks get started in the state fiscal year 2013. Though these funding sources are no longer available, MEDC continues to award funds through its Community Development Block Grant program for farmers markets located in low/moderate income communities.



Photo by Katy Joe DeSantis

**AGENDA PRIORITIES**

**Slow Progress**

9

**#4 – Training and technical assistance to launch new and improve existing grocery stores**

Through the Michigan Good Food Fund, launching in early 2015, partners are looking to expand efforts to provide technical assistance to the retail sector, both to help prepare retailers to receive loans from the fund as well as to assist loan recipients.

**#7 – Preserve farmland**

Land conservancies and conservation districts continue to be active on this issue. The Kent County Agriculture Preservation Board has permanently preserved just over 3,000 acres of farmland in Kent County. A new group, the Kent County Farmland Preservation Initiative, has formed to advocate for the existing farmland preservation program so that acreage might continue to increase.



Photo by Dean Connors

**#9 – Expand opportunities for youth to develop entrepreneurship skills and learn about good-food related career opportunities**

While there are numerous programs educating young people about career opportunities in food and agriculture, they are not available in all communities. The Michigan FFA has a membership of 6,700 high school students who learn agriscience in the classroom. Last year, the Detroit Food Academy engaged over 100 young people across six Detroit high schools in an experiential leadership program culminating in the launch of students’ own food businesses. Programs like the Northern Michigan University Hoophouse and Bay Mills Community College Farm are also introducing young people to opportunities in the food system.

**#10 – Establish Michigan as “the place to be” for good food**

Many organizations in Michigan are helping to bring good food into the mainstream and FoodCorps is helping to instill good food values into a new generation. Between September 2013 and July 2014, seven FoodCorps service members serving in five community-based organizations across the state organized 1,554 good food educational programs for school youth and reached 4,938 school children with these programs. In the 2014-15 school year, a new FoodCorps site opened with the Detroit Public Schools Food and Nutrition Services Farm and Garden program, hosting two new FoodCorps members.

**#11 – Incorporate good food education into the preK-12 curriculum**

While statewide integration of food and agriculture into curricula is not yet a reality, numerous educators, schools and districts are taking the initiative to incorporate these themes into lesson plans, including Detroit Public Schools, Eastern UP Intermediate School District (ISD) and Traverse Bay Area ISD. In the 2013-14 school year, the Agrarian Adventure, based in Ann Arbor, facilitated Farmer in the Classroom visits for 734 students in 12 schools. A growing number of school teachers are utilizing school gardens in lesson plans.

**AGENDA PRIORITIES****#13 – Amend Michigan’s General Property Tax Act to exempt certain on-farm renewable energy installations**

In 2012, legislation was passed phasing out the tax on industrial personal property. Beginning in 2014, commercial and industrial personal property of each owner with a combined true cash value in a local taxing unit of less than \$80,000 is exempt from property taxes. An additional legislative package was signed into law, with the necessary constitutional changes affirmed by the voters in August 2014, to ensure local governments are not harmed by the repeal and get full revenue by redirecting part of the use tax to non-essential municipal services.

However, energy installations were not included in this new law. Legislative discussions regarding the energy efficiency and renewable energy standards established in Public Act 295 of 2008, which extend through 2015, continue. There will be opportunities to raise the issue of taxation of on-farm renewable energy installations in these other legislative discussions.

**#16 – Implement a food safety audit cost-share or reimbursement program**

The Upper Peninsula Food Exchange is part of a nationwide pilot program to help diversified growers obtain food safety certification called Group GAP. The program is coordinated by the USDA and the Wallace Center, and supported by a Specialty Crop Block grant to Michigan Food and Farming Systems. The U.P. pilot is focused on small farms; larger farms are piloting Group GAP in other parts of the country. The project is being closely monitored to assess its feasibility for continuing in the future. Lessons learned from the project’s first year will be shared broadly, to benefit all Michigan farmers.

**#24 – Examine all of Michigan’s food- and agriculture-related laws and regulations for provisions that create unnecessary transaction costs and regulatory burdens**

In 2012, a package of bills passed repealing one act, 18 of MDARD’s 98 total regulations and 217 of the MDARD’s 878 total rules. The intent was to eliminate antiquated, redundant or otherwise unnecessary policies, including the “Seal of Quality” Act, and rules addressing grain dealers, cherry producers, registration of family farms, tomato seed certification, and Dutch elm disease.

In May 2014, the Agriculture Commission added a new “primarily residential” site category to the Selection & Odor Control for New/Expanding Livestock Facilities Generally Accepted Agricultural and Management Practices (GAAMPs). The new category defines “primarily residential” sites as unacceptable for commercial farming if there are more than 13 homes within one-eighth of a mile or one home within 250 feet of the proposed site location. The changes only would apply to those farmers selling products. Proponents have argued that the original Right to Farm Act and associated siting GAAMP was never intended to address smaller commercial operations with 50 or less animals. Opponents believe that the change will discourage small farming operations. One legislator has convened a workgroup to look at the issue and its impact on urban farming operations.

**#25 – Develop systems for collecting and sharing production and market data**

Businesses in Michigan, such as Ag Squared and Local Orbit, continue to develop software that can be used for collecting production data to specifically meet the needs of small food businesses. MarketMaker helps to link producers and buyers. The Cultivate Michigan campaign offers a mechanism for tracking purchases of Michigan foods among participating institutions. Hoophouses for Health is collecting production data from participating farmers. However, there is not yet a mechanism for synthesizing or making the information broadly available to farmers and food entrepreneurs.



**AGENDA PRIORITIES**

**Minimal Action 2**

**#14 – Set targets for state funded institutions to procure Michigan foods**

*As in 2012, this risks being perceived as an unfunded mandate and consequently rejected by lawmakers.*

**#17 – Provide financial incentives for farmers for development of food system infrastructure to support institutional local food purchasing programs**

*LSimilar to the 2012 situation, the current budget climate leaves little opportunity for funding this strategy. However, with the development of the Michigan Farm to Institution Network and the Cultivate Michigan program, momentum is building to better understand the needs of farmers to supply local institutional markets.*



Photo by Jude Barry

- <sup>1</sup> Matts, C. & Smalley, S. (2014). *Farm to School in Michigan: Still going strong*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Center for Regional Food Systems. Retrieved from <http://foodsystems.msu.edu/resources/mi-fts-going-strong>
- <sup>2</sup> Personal communication with Katie Blanchard, Real Food Challenge. September 25, 2014.
- <sup>3</sup> Michigan Department of Education. (2012). *More fresh produce being served in Michigan school meals*. Retrieved from [http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-37818\\_34785-272947--,00.html](http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-37818_34785-272947--,00.html)
- <sup>4</sup> Mutch, K. (2013, October). *School Food FOCUS Upper Midwest Regional Learning Lab presentation*. Great Lakes Regional Farm to School Meeting, October 28. Retrieved from <http://www.slideshare.net/GreatLakesFarmtoSchool/school-food-focus-upper-midwest-regional-learning-lab>
- <sup>5</sup> Miller, S., Mann, J., Barry, J. Kalchik, T., Pirog, R. & Hamm, M. (2014). *Valuing Michigan's local food system*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Center for Economic Analysis and Michigan State University Center for Regional Food Systems. Retrieved from <http://foodsystems.msu.edu/resources/local-food-econ>
- <sup>6</sup> United States Department of Agriculture Census of Agriculture. (2012). *Table 4. Net cash farm income of the operations and operators: 2012 and 2007*. Retrieved from [http://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2012/Full\\_Report/Volume\\_1,\\_Chapter\\_2\\_US\\_State\\_Level/st99\\_2\\_004\\_004.pdf](http://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2012/Full_Report/Volume_1,_Chapter_2_US_State_Level/st99_2_004_004.pdf)
- <sup>7</sup> Julian Samora Research Institute at Michigan State University. (2014). Preliminary data.
- <sup>8</sup> Michigan Department of Agriculture. (2012). *Michigan's food & agriculture industry*. Retrieved from [http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mdard/1262-AgReport-2012\\_2\\_404589\\_7.pdf](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mdard/1262-AgReport-2012_2_404589_7.pdf)
- <sup>9</sup> Craig, R. (2009). *Economic impact of new or expanded retail food store developments by using PA 231 and other tools to promote healthy and affordable food options in Michigan*. Lansing, MI: Agriculture Development Division, Michigan Department of Agriculture.
- <sup>10</sup> Low access is defined as living more than one mile from a supermarket or large grocery store, if in an urban area, or more than 10 miles from a supermarket or large grocery store, if in a rural area. Data is from the United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, Food Access Research Atlas, February 2014, as reported in: Citizens Research Council of Michigan. (2014). *Addressing Michigan's obesity problem* (Report 387). Retrieved from <http://www.crcmich.org/PUBLICAT/2010s/2014/rpt387.pdf>
- <sup>11</sup> Citizens Research Council of Michigan. (2014). *Addressing Michigan's obesity problem* (Report 387). Retrieved from <http://www.crcmich.org/PUBLICAT/2010s/2014/rpt387.pdf>
- <sup>12</sup> Michigan Department of Community Health. (2014). *Prevalence estimates for risk factors and health indicators, State of Michigan, selected tables, Michigan Behavioral Risk Factor Survey 2013*. Retrieved from [http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mdch/2013\\_MiBRFS\\_Standard\\_Tables\\_FINAL\\_466321\\_7.pdf](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mdch/2013_MiBRFS_Standard_Tables_FINAL_466321_7.pdf)
- <sup>13</sup> As used here, "unhealthy" refers to sales of any of six food and beverage categories tracked by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: cookies, crackers, cakes, pastries or other baked goods; salty snacks; chocolate candy; other kinds of candy; soda pop or fruit drinks and sports drinks.
- <sup>14</sup> Note: the CDC added sports drinks to their definition of "less nutritious foods and beverages" in its 2010 survey, which changed the percentage of schools meeting this criteria significantly. Our 2012 report card cited school percentages based on the 2008 definition; therefore, the 2012 report card numbers are not comparable to those reported here.
- <sup>15</sup> Demissie, Z., Brener, N.D., McManus T., Shanklin, S.L., Hawkins, J. & Kann, L. (2013). *School health profiles 2012: Characteristics of health programs among secondary schools*. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved from [http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/profiles/2012/profiles\\_report.pdf](http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/profiles/2012/profiles_report.pdf)
- <sup>16</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>17</sup> The Pew Charitable Trusts and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. (2014, March). *Serving healthy school meals: Michigan schools need updated equipment and infrastructure*. Retrieved from [http://www.pewtrusts.org/~media/legacy/uploadedfiles/phg/content\\_level\\_pages/other\\_resource/KSHFKITSMichiganpdf.pdf](http://www.pewtrusts.org/~media/legacy/uploadedfiles/phg/content_level_pages/other_resource/KSHFKITSMichiganpdf.pdf)
- <sup>18</sup> Demissie, Z., Brener, N.D., McManus T., Shanklin, S.L., Hawkins, J. & Kann, L. (2013). *School health profiles 2012: Characteristics of health programs among secondary schools*. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved from [http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/profiles/2012/profiles\\_report.pdf](http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/profiles/2012/profiles_report.pdf)
- <sup>19</sup> Personal communication with Randy Showerman, State Advisor, Michigan FFA Association. September 2014.
- <sup>20</sup> Smalley, S. (2014). *Bridging the gap: Connecting Michigan families with local food and farmers* (2013, 5th ed.). D. Montri, A. Shreve, G. Cobb (Eds.) East Lansing, MI: Michigan Farmers Market Association. Retrieved from <http://mifma.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/2013-Bridging-the-Gap-Report.pdf>

Photo by Katy Joe DeSantis



Photo by Abby Harper



---

Michigan Good Food is a policy initiative centered on the Michigan Good Food Charter, which was developed with input from hundreds of people across Michigan. The 2014 report card is intended to assess progress made on the goals and agenda priorities of the charter, which was released in June 2010.

[WWW.MICHIGANFOOD.ORG](http://WWW.MICHIGANFOOD.ORG)

CONTACT:

**Michigan Good Food Coordinators at the  
Michigan State University Center for Regional Food Systems**

**Jude Barry**  
517-432-0308  
barryjud@msu.edu

**Kathryn Colasanti**  
517-353-0642  
colokat@msu.edu

**Liz Gensler**  
517-353-1914  
gensler@msu.edu