A Message from the Stanford Food Institute

As the founder of the Stanford Food Institute (SFI), my vision includes making Stanford Residential & Dining Enterprises’ (R&DE) commitment to diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging a central focus of all we do. Within this framework, we’re prioritizing supplier diversity across Stanford Food Institute, Stanford Dining, Hospitality & Auxiliaries, and R&DE Finance & Administration.

To achieve this, we have designed a comprehensive, long-term program to support Black farmers as part of R&DE Stanford Dining, Hospitality & Auxiliaries, [1] overarching racial equity plan and sustainable food program, One Plate, One Planet [2]. We are grateful for our long-time community partner, Farms to Grow, Inc. [3] for working with us on this important initiative and are pleased to have this work supported with seed funds [4] from the Stanford Office of Community Engagement [5] in collaboration with the Doerr School of Sustainability’s Office of Diversity, Equity & Inclusion.

Our objective also extends to building a new model that other universities can embrace by freely sharing findings from our purchasing program and research initiative. This toolkit is a testament to that commitment.

Wherever we sit in the food system, or the food industry, each of us has a responsibility to address the systemic racism Black producers have faced for generations. Upon exploring this toolkit, I trust you’ll recognize the positive opportunity we each possess in contributing to the revival of Black farmers in America.

Dr. Shirley Everett
Senior Associate Vice Provost for R&DE
Senior Advisor to the Provost on Equity and inclusion

[2] One Plate, One Planet
[5] Doerr School of Sustainability’s Office of Diversity, Equity & Inclusion
Executive Summary

In 2020, the Stanford Food Institute and Farms to Grow, Inc. partnered to increase Stanford Dining, Hospitality & Auxiliaries’ purchasing from Black farmers. Recognizing the scarcity of Black farmers among the suppliers of other large wholesale buyers, SFI and Farms to Grow produced two toolkits. The toolkit you’re currently reading aims to help foodservice operators purchase more food from Black farmers. The second is designed to assist Black farmers in gaining access to institutional foodservice distribution channels. This initiative seeks to reduce barriers for farmers aiming to enter wholesale markets.

Foodservice operators are encouraged to share these open-source toolkits with their distributors and any Black farmers from whom they intend to purchase.

In this toolkit, you’ll find an exploration of the history of Black farmers in the United States, emphasizing their resilience against systemic racism. The voices and experiences of 10 Black farmers are highlighted through insightful interviews. Drawing from in-depth interviews with individuals across the supply chain, we bridge the gap between Black farmers and foodservice operators with recommended actions foodservice operators can take to build and maintain trust-based purchasing relationships with Black farmers.

It concludes with information on cultural awareness and the principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

KEY FINDINGS:
- Historically and still today, Black farmers have faced structural racism and discrimination.
- This historical and present-day treatment has rightfully made many Black farmers distrustful of large institutions.
- Black farmers encounter numerous barriers to wholesale markets, including a lack of available information, unfair pricing, and extensive transportation and food safety requirements.
- Many Black farmers are eager to overcome barriers and collaborate with wholesale buyers and distributors, enabling them to access larger markets, grow their enterprises, and advance their families’ and communities’ health, wellness, and intergenerational wealth.
- Black farmers primarily use sustainable farming techniques and have for generations.

TOP RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FOODSERVICE PROFESSIONALS:
- Build trust-based relationships: Get to know farmers as people first before talking about business. Learn about the barriers they may have faced and their future business goals to best advocate for them through the supply chain.
- Connect with the Black farming community: Reach out to regional food hubs, aggregators, and community-based organizations (such as Farms to Grow, Inc.) that have strong existing relationships with Black farmers. The Black Farmers Index [6] and National Black Growers Council [7] are good places to start.
- Create sustainable partnerships: Develop long-term, multi-year commitments with farmers that involve front-end planning, flexible menuing, and modified scale expectations.
- Empower small farms through innovative funding: Consider implementing models of funding that provide critically needed upfront capital, especially for small farms, to support farmers’ pre-harvest costs that include agreed-upon purchase volume and pricing.
- Strengthen procurement strategies through transparency: Apply a transparent, three-pronged strategic approach to procurement, in which the institutional buyer, the distributor, and the farmer engage in open, regular communication to build a strong relationship.
In 1920, there were nearly one million Black farmers in the United States. Today, according to the most recent U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) data, there are just over 45,000. This 95% decrease is a result of racism—past and present. The disappearance of Black farms is urgent and ongoing. All food system stakeholders have a responsibility to act now.

LAND ACKNOWLEDGMENT:
Stanford sits on the ancestral land of the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe. This land was and continues to be of great importance to the Ohlone people. Recognizing the centrality of land, history, and equity to sustainable food systems work, and consistent with our values of community and inclusion, we have a responsibility to acknowledge, honor, and make visible the University’s relationship to Native peoples.
Still, the majority of Black farm families at the time were forced to work under exploitative conditions as sharecroppers and tenant farmers. Federal programs and policies, while supposedly designed to open up farmland access, often excluded Black applicants. For example, the Homestead Act of 1862 gave U.S. citizens the opportunity to claim 160 acres of land for farming. But as a report by McKinsey & Company notes, the Act was “passed prior to passage of the Fourteenth Amendment that recognized formerly enslaved people as citizens,” as well as the Civil Rights Act of 1866. Up to 1.6 million white families received free land, compared to only up to 5,500 Black families. In spite of this challenge, Black farmers were able to accumulate almost 20 million acres by 1920.

Since 1910, even families who owned their land have been stripped of their property, due to a host of discriminatory practices enforced by the government. Over the years, for instance, the USDA has systematically denied Black farmers loans and assistance. And as recently as 2022, it granted direct loans to only 36% of Black farmers, compared to 72% of white farmers, and rejected applications from 16% of Black farmers versus just 4% of white farmers. All these factors have led to a collective land loss that has been estimated to be at least 14 million acres, and that has affected 98% of Black farmers.

After the Civil War and the abolition of slavery in the U.S., many Black Americans sought to acquire land. As explained in The New Republic: By 1890, about 20 percent of Black farm families owned their land, and by 1910 that figure had reached 35 percent. Even as white creditors cheated them, white planters worked them ragged, white politicians disfranchised them, and white mobs targeted them with arsons and lynchings, over 425,000 Black families were able to save enough to purchase almost 20 million acres in the Jim Crow South.
Facing and overcoming discrimination at every level, Black farmers have innovated alternative models for building thriving enterprises. Since the end of the Civil War and accelerating in the 1960s, civil rights leaders and Black farmers organized networks of farmer cooperatives. Dr. Monica White’s expansive history of southern Black agricultural organizations, *Freedom Farmers* [12], illuminates how initiatives such as the Freedom Farm Cooperative grew to over 600 acres by the early 1970s and supported a generation of Black farmers in the Mississippi Delta. It also explores the 1967 roots of today’s robust Federation of Southern Cooperatives, and their influence on recent initiatives founded in urban areas beyond the South, including the Detroit Black Community Food Security Network.

Black farmers have also acted collectively to reclaim land and rights through policy. In 1997, a group of 400 Black farmers sued the USDA on the grounds that the department had discriminated against them—and won [13]. The case, called Pigford v. Glickman, was settled in 1999, with $1 billion allocated to tens of thousands of farmers. However, for most of the 20,000 farmers receiving payment, this only amounted to $50,000 of farmers. In light of these complications with the Pigford and deadlines, and were eventually told they filed too late. In light of these complications with the Pigford and deadlines, and were eventually told they filed too late.

Despite signs of progress, more success on the policy front is needed to fully leverage the federal government’s role in supporting Black farmers. Historically—when the government makes promises to Black farmers—it breaks them. In the meantime, institutions need not wait, though they must understand why this history has rightfully made so many Black farmers distrustful of large institutions. But these data points, which focus on farmers as individuals, do not begin to capture the effects of systemic racism on Black communities as a whole. Farmers were the bedrock of these Black communities. Without the first- and second-generation farmers gaining access to land following the Civil War, the full degree of liberation would not have been possible. Having land was the first material needed for freedom. Following the Civil War, Black communities wanted nothing more than to be left alone to raise families; develop infrastructure of churches, schools, businesses, and entertainment; and exist within a free and safe environment. Black farmers were land owners and donated land for the development of Black towns. Because of the necessity of safe places to live, these all-Black enclaves were foundational to the development of thriving, interconnected communities—an entire social fabric of churches, schools, businesses, and civic associations. Yet, within all the development, the basic belief that Black people were undeserving of loans meant that communities dealt with all forms of discrimination, especially the loss of land they worked to acquire after the Civil War.
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It should be noted that not all Black farmers want to enter wholesale markets. Some run farms specifically dedicated to providing nutritious, affordable food to their local communities. Broadening wholesale access isn’t the sole path to equity for Black farmers. The complexity of addressing the decline of Black farms requires multiple approaches.

This project specifically targets farmers aspiring to enter wholesale markets, aiming to reduce entry barriers.

Our goals for this toolkit are to:

• Break down the barriers Black farmers have faced in entering wholesale markets.

• Outline steps that institutions, including but not limited to colleges and universities, can take to remove these barriers and change industry standards.

• Equip procurement managers and foodservice leaders in various settings to purchase from Black farmers in equitable, culturally responsive ways, thereby expanding their network of supplier relationships.

• Help Black farmers be able to build the intergenerational wealth they were denied for so long.

This history has shaped a narrative within Black communities, where farming is often linked to unfair treatment. According to one farmer interviewed, African Americans, particularly the youth, view farming as an extension of sharecropping and slavery. Consequently, engaging and inspiring younger generations to pursue agriculture as a career presents a significant challenge for Black farmers.

“It’s easy to see farming as a noble institution,” he said. “They don’t see agriculture as a space of justice and equity. They see it as one of the remnants of slavery and institutionalized racism.” Because of the USDA’s long-standing discrimination against Black farmers, it has even been called “the last plantation.”

Our goals for this toolkit are to:

• Break down the barriers Black farmers have faced in entering wholesale markets.

• Outline steps that institutions, including but not limited to colleges and universities, can take to remove these barriers and change industry standards.

• Equip procurement managers and foodservice leaders in various settings to purchase from Black farmers in equitable, culturally responsive ways, thereby expanding their network of supplier relationships.

• Help Black farmers be able to build the intergenerational wealth they were denied for so long.
Our Purpose

RAD Stanford Dining, Hospitality & Auxiliaries is a division of Residential & Dining Enterprises, a self-operated food service department, serving 25,000 meals daily in over 100 locations across three campuses, and procuring 11.4 million pounds of food each year. We aim to use our purchasing power to support racial equity and help reverse Black farmers’ disappearance.

The findings cited in this toolkit are based on our own learnings from the purchasing program and research initiative we have set up here at Stanford in partnership with Oakland-based community organization Farms to Grow, Inc. We hope that, by freely sharing these findings, other institutions—namely fellow colleges and universities, K-12 schools, hospitals, prisons, and corporate dining programs, as well as other foodservice companies (both contract and self-op) at larger institutions—will adopt the models that work at Stanford, and thus help to support Black farmers across the nation.

Ultimately, we hope for every volume foodservice purchasing department to think of purchasing from Black producers in the same way they think about local purchasing: a new norm within the foodservice industry. We hope they use the power of their institutional dollars to reduce the disenfranchisement of Black farmers.
The Voices & Stories of Black Farmers

We interviewed 10 Black farmers: five based in California, and five from elsewhere around the nation (Arkansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, and New Jersey). Nine of these farmers are male; one is female. Crucial to this purchasing program and research initiative was that we heard from the farmers directly, as a key goal of the toolkits is to center their perspectives and elevate their stories.

The interviews, based on community-based participatory research [19] principles and following an organic, conversational format, were led by Jared Klegar (Stanford B.A. ’24), accompanied by Elaine Smith (Farms to Grow Executive Director) and occasionally Diane Mavica (Stanford R&DE Associate Director of Vendor Management and Contracts). Each interview lasted about 1 to 2 hours.

The farmers shared insight on their:
1. Motivations for farming
2. Agricultural philosophies and farming practices
3. Barriers to wholesale markets
4. Experiences with racism and discrimination
5. Business goals and top priorities going forward
THE IMPORTANCE OF FAMILY:
All the farmers we interviewed cited family as a major motivating factor for both starting and continuing farming. Many learned how to farm from watching their parents or grandparents. Today, some work alongside their siblings, while others show their children the ropes, hoping the next generation will ultimately take over their operations.

With this sense of heritage—one farmer’s family has been involved with agriculture for eight generations—comes a unique connection to the land. But given the history of discrimination against Black farmers, it also sometimes means wrestling with complex familial pasts. Several farmers spoke about relatives who had been sharecroppers, working under unjust conditions. These farmers expressed how they try to honor their family’s agricultural traditions while acknowledging the inequitable social structures under which many of these traditions were born. In this way, farming can be “a process of healing ancestral trauma,” as one farmer described it.

A COMMUNITY-CENTERED EFFORT:
Many interviewees said that they first established their farms because they wanted to give back to their communities. After the local grocery store in one farmer’s town closed down, he began growing food as a way to fight food insecurity within his community. And even among farmers who are interested in selling their products in wholesale markets, many stressed the importance of keeping some of their crops within their communities.

Another farmer noted that his community has been crucial in sustaining his business. After a fire destroyed sizable portions of his property—damages totaling hundreds of thousands of dollars—he received just $2,000 from the Federal Emergency Management Agency. In the absence of substantial outside help, he relied on the support of family members, neighbors, and fellow farmers in order for his farm to survive.

HEALTH & NUTRITION:
In particular, farmers emphasized their desire to provide their families and communities with healthier food options. “I did not like the simple fact that pesticides were in our food,” one farmer said. “I just felt that it was making us unsafe, and I always thought that it was making us have some of these health conditions within our Black community.”

For reasons along these lines, it has been important to many farmers that they provide their community members with access to fresh, locally grown food—and that they do so using sustainable practices.
Agricultural Philosophies & Farming Practices

A TRADITION OF SUSTAINABILITY: One farmer’s mission, he said, is “to keep old traditions alive, old crops, African crops—keep that stuff going, like mustard greens, turnips, swiss chard, kale, seeded melons.” Many farmers spoke about the cultural significance of the crops they grow. And to grow these crops, the farmers we interviewed use methods that attend to sustainability and conservation. Some advocate for and carry out the humane treatment of animals. Many grow organic, which “may cost a little bit more,” a farmer explained, but is “worth it, because what we’re putting in our bodies is good, and it’s healthy for us, and it’s helping us to live longer and have more productive lives.”

Moreover, they use the following techniques, which prioritize healthy soil, carbon sequestration, and the preservation of biodiversity, among other sustainable practices:
- No or low-till
- Crop rotation
- Diversified farming
- Managed and rotational grazing
- Cover crops
- Compost
- No synthetic pesticides, herbicides, or insecticides
- Pollinator protection
- Precision irrigation and drought-tolerant crops
- Water-conserving and water-draining soil mixes
- Hydroponics
- Reusable containers
- Mulching
- French drain systems
- Tractor repairs in designated areas to prevent oil leaking
- No waste

As one farmer put it, “I think it’s the only way that we continue to survive: that we’re employing these techniques.”

ROOTS IN INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGE: These practices could be called “regenerative” or “climate-smart.” But as multiple farmers noted, they and their ancestors, as well as their Indigenous colleagues, had been utilizing so-called “regenerative” practices long before these buzzwords [30] caught on.

“What happens in academic institutions,” one farmer said, “is that they work very hard to codify the practices of the people on the ground. So when we talk about ‘climate-smart’ agriculture, what that word is really replacing is indigenous practices.” The term, despite appearing to encapsulate a new form of farming, in actuality describes “the way that we worked before colonization.”

Another farmer pointed to regenerative agriculture’s origins in the Global North and the movement’s frequent failures to credit the Indigenous knowledge on which it is built. He contrasted this with agroecology, another movement that recognizes agriculture as interconnected with politics, economics, and society. “You can read more on this distinction here [31].”

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER: Black farmers’ current practices also owe a huge debt to the groundbreaking work of agricultural scientist George Washington Carver.

Carver was born into slavery. Transcending mountainous societal barriers through determination, intelligence, and curiosity, he attended Iowa State University as the first Black student. While completing his bachelor’s and master’s degrees, his pioneering botanical innovations won national recognition. In 1896, the famed Black educator Booker T. Washington, then-president of the Tuskegee Institute, appointed Carver to head the school’s agriculture program. Carver shared his research findings by circulating free, accessible bulletins, which “contained invaluable advice about improving soils using fixed nitrogen crops and growing low input crops.” Carver’s bulletins—and his ingenuity at large—“are too commonly overlooked by (white) historians. But his impact on sustainable agriculture, not to mention science as a whole, has been indelible, and some of the farmers we interviewed credited his innovative practices.”

CERTIFICATIONS: Of the growers we interviewed, most do not have sustainability certifications for their farms. Farmers expressed interest in these certifications, but some did not know the requirements but were dissuaded by barriers with regard to paperwork and cost (fees for application, inspection, renewal, etc.); and others were unsure, given size requirements and the demands of the market, if their operation could reasonably run wholly organic, for instance.

One grower’s farm was certified organic, but he said he didn’t know if the certification was helping to improve his pricing.
LACK OF AVAILABLE INFORMATION:
When it comes to wholesale markets specifically, farmers spoke about a general lack of information. Many were unaware of the option to sell, for example, to colleges and universities. Those who were aware did not know where to start or whom to contact. Without any inroads to institutions or distributors, it made more sense for these farmers to continue with community farming and to sell only in local markets.

UNFAIR PRICING:
Despite this widespread inaccessibility, some of the farmers we interviewed still were able to enter wholesale markets. There, however, they faced unfair treatment, particularly with regard to pricing.
One farmer struck a deal with a food broker to sell his red onions for $12 per box. But when the broker finally sent him the check, the price had suddenly changed—without any discussion or negotiation—to $5.80 per box. Because there were no measures of accountability in place to restrict this food broker’s power, the farmer had no recourse to challenge the new price. The experience dissuaded him from wanting to stay in wholesale.

This is not an uncommon experience. Another farmer noted: “Wholesale pricing markets never seem to hold true to what was promised.” Furthermore, farmers noted a lack of transparency regarding not just selling prices, but also input costs: it has not always been clear what a fair amount of money they should be expected to invest for resources like seeds and equipment.

ISSUES WITH TRANSPARENCY:
The farmer who was not given fair prices for his red onions observed: “African American farmers no longer trust the government after the treatment they have received.” And, after the treatment Black farmers have received from institutions and distributors, that distrust extends to them as well.
Farmers emphasized that it is critical to keep them informed in all business interactions. One farmer, who is currently working with a university in the South, noticed that there were “backroom conversations that [he] is not a part of.” Farmers expressed a willingness and need to be included in these discussions, in order to build trust and stay current on buyers’ demands.

TRANSPORTATION & FOOD SAFETY REQUIREMENTS:
About 18 years ago, one farmer said he tried selling to schools in his county. The main difficulty he encountered was transportation: Without the infrastructure to transport his crops from his rural farm to the urban areas where schools were located—at a minimum, a 1.5-hour journey—he was not able to secure the purchasing relationship.

In addition, many farmers were unaware of the extensive food safety practices required by institutions and distributors. If they did know about these requirements, oftentimes they were unsure about the costs involved.

THE PROBLEM OF SCALE:
Many farmers said selling to institutions like colleges and universities appeared inaccessible to them because these institutions tend to purchase crops at a high volume. Farmers did not know if it was financially viable for them to try to scale their operations to meet this demand, nor did they want to compromise the quality of their products or the sustainability of their practices to meet the minimum amount of what institutions want.

Barriers to Wholesale Markets
The barriers farmers encountered can be classified into the following categories: lack of available information, unfair pricing, issues with transparency, and concerns relating to transportation, food safety, and scale requirements.
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OVERT RACISM:

Another farmer told the following story:

I was in my junior year of college, and I came home one summer and I learned from one of my white farm buddies that he had just got a beginning farmer loan because he was from a farm family and he wanted to farm.

So one particular day, my dad and I were at the local USDA office, and I walked in the back to talk to the county executive director about a beginning farmer loan. This gentleman proceeded to tell me that I was a smart young man, and I was in college, and I should go pursue a job and use the good head on my shoulders and not get involved in farming.

I felt a little slighted because my high school buddy had just told me he got a beginning farmer loan. I’m like, Why would you give so-and-so a farm loan and discourage me from trying to get a farm loan? That’s just not what I wanted.

I said, ‘I want a farm—it’s my family’s legacy, and I want a farm.’ So he proceeded to tell me that was a smart young man, and I was in college, and I should go pursue a job and use the good head on my shoulders and not get involved in farming.

I felt a little slighted because my high school buddy had just told me he got a beginning farmer loan. I’m like, Why would you give so-and-so a farm loan and discourage me from trying to get a farm loan? That’s just not what I wanted.

I said, ‘I want a farm—it’s my family’s legacy, and I want a farm.’ So he proceeded to tell me, ‘Well, you know the farm is expensive, and your dad right now—he’s in debt and owes the government money.’

And I said, ‘Well, or that’s not what I came in here for. I didn’t come in here to ask you for a loan on who, what, and why. I came in here to ask you for a beginning farmer loan for me. And it doesn’t seem like you are answering my questions.’

So he proceeded to get a little frustrated with me. And he set back in his chair, and he pulled his center desk drawer out. And in that desk drawer he had a pistol. He locked down at that pistol, and he looked back up at me. He said, ‘I think we’re done with this conversation, son.’

That is a scar that I still bear, and I hope and pray that no other young Black, Native American, or historically underserved kid would ever have to experience anything like that in life, because I, too, could have been a George Floyd, an Ahmaud Arbery, a Breonna Taylor, just in that local government office.

The sheer level of audacity from the USDA agencies to inflict this type of trauma upon Black farmers is unreasonable, and this experience from a couple decades ago still speaks to the violence some Black farmers encounter today.

COVERT RACISM:

Farmers also shared experiences in which the racial discrimination they faced was more subtle, disguised enough that its perpetrators could rationalize it away. ‘Racism is a very tricky thing to codify from the outside,’ one interviewee said. ‘As someone who experiences it, you can kind of see it. But then people can say, “Oh, that wasn’t racism, that was just such-and-such.”’ There’s a lot of ways that people try to justify actions.”

Taken together, these stories undeniably lay bare the pervasive culture of racism that farmers have had to navigate.

Black farmers have been denied loans even with excellent credit scores, impressive work histories, and the highest credentials. They have been shut out of farmers’ markets. They have not been able to sell their products even when they have seen white farmers, with products of a similar quality, successfully sell theirs to the same buyers. They have been expected to pay for their land upfront, in cash. Government organizations have neglected to tell them about opportunities for grants and bridge loans.

Experiences with Racism & Discrimination

The barriers to wholesale markets described above are intricately linked to farmers’ experiences with racism and discrimination. Racism creates obstacles that farmers must consistently face and overcome in order to continue farming.

Racial discrimination against Black farmers is the proverbial elephant in every room. Based on the findings of Pigford, just to name a few findings when it comes to U.S. agriculture, there is overwhelming evidence that discrimination against Black farmers is as endemic as the soil.

When asked if he had ever experienced racism in his line of work, one farmer said, “Every day. I mean, that kind of question is like, ‘Is the sun ever going to shine?’ The sun’s always shining. Even when the Earth turns, and we’re in night, the sun is shining.”

Among farmers we interviewed, the consensus was overwhelmingly clear:

1. The barriers to entry they have faced are unnecessarily high and inequitable.
2. Currently, there exist few forms of accountability and oversight to correct these barriers.
FARMING MORE LAND:
A large portion of the farmers currently farm less than one-third of the land they own. Without sufficient capital and demand, though, they said they cannot expand their operations. In the past, some had experienced difficulties getting rid of their products: they couldn’t find markets in which to sell them, and so distributed them to shelters and churches at no cost or found other ways to donate them. They didn’t see competitive prices as a viable option and simply didn’t want to let their crops go bad or to waste.

Going forward, many farmers said their goal is to sell all (or most, since some farmers noted they still wanted to donate food to their communities) of their products, and to do so at prices proportional to the quality of their food and the amount of labor they invest. Then, their farms will be able to grow.

One farmer, who recently became an approved supplier of R&DE Stanford Dining, Hospitality & Auxiliaries, was only farming about 20 percent of his acreage in 2022. Now, with Stanford lined up as a wholesale buyer in 2023, he is farming 70 percent of his land.

ONBOARDING:
The farmers in the process of onboarding at Stanford said their near-future plans are to finish complying with the university’s food safety requirements and to work out the logistics of delivery and pick-up schedules.

GETTING MORE RESOURCES:
To reach these goals, nearly every farmer stressed the importance of access to resources. Some need new equipment, others are looking to acquire crop insurance, and still, others would like to be able to hire full-time employees.

“Farmers need advocates,” as one interviewee put it. Another said, “The limit on what I can do is my resources currently.” They know how to farm; they just need the capital.

Black farmers have shown perseverance in the face of innumerable obstacles. Still, it is hard at times not to be discouraged. “Sometimes, when doors are not open,” one farmer said, “you refrain from opening the door anymore.” Another said that, in light of the legacy of discrimination against Black farmers, a certain mindset can develop: “You stay in your area in which you are able to succeed and you try to move on from there. But you wouldn’t dare venture out into something if you thought it wasn’t available to you.”

When asked if he had any questions about supplying a university like Stanford, one farmer responded with three. “Is it real?” he asked. “The opportunities—are these things real?” And finally: “Is Stanford the only school that is looking at this as an opportunity to share with people?”

Our hope is that, by widely sharing this toolkit, we will soon be able to answer this question with a resounding no, and that there will be diverse opportunities for Black farmers to enter wholesale markets across the nation.
Recommended Steps for Foodservice Providers
CONNECTING WITH THE COMMUNITY:
Where Stanford has found the most success in connecting with Black farmers is by partnering with the community organization Farms to Grow, Inc. Farms to Grow works closely with farmers: providing them with technical assistance, helping with grant writing, connecting them to distribution opportunities, and offering a multitude of other resources [24].

One farmer we interviewed mentioned that he had far less faith in politicians and government officials than he did in the directors and team of Farms to Grow. Indeed, the interviews we conducted with farmers for this toolkit were only possible because of the trust Farms to Grow had already established with those farmers.

Stanford’s relationship with Farms to Grow took time to develop and involved a number of long, deeply considered conversations. It is based on listening, open communication, and Stanford’s commitment to this initiative as a long-term, sustainable program.

Simply put, this toolkit—and this program—would not exist without Farms to Grow!

In the appendices, we have included a database, hosted on Farms to Grow’s website, of points of contact for farmers, community organizations, and foodservice operations. This database, we hope, will help to foster collaborations like the one between Stanford and Farms to Grow.

ESTABLISHING TRUST:
Any foodservice professional should be conscious of the distrust many Black farmers have of large institutions, and why there is good reason for this distrust, given the historical and present discrimination they are up against.

“If we have any issues,” said one farmer we interviewed, “it’s usually people from the outside.” It is crucial, therefore, that foodservice operators recognize this history and these sentiments, and adjust their behavior accordingly.

Building trust might mean traveling to visit growers on-site at their farms or having several preliminary conversations with them to get to know them as people first before trying to strike a deal. Foodservice operators should also have an understanding of the digital divide and note that some farmers may not be as familiar with certain forms of communication or technology (such as Zoom).
LONG-TERM, MULTI-YEAR COMMITMENTS:
Without commitments that span at least a couple of years, foodservice interviewees said, it is difficult to develop a purchasing relationship built on trust. Additionally, this amount of time allows farmers to feel a sense of stability and for institutional buyers to engage in thorough, collaborative planning with growers.

One farmer we interviewed said that he had seen programs come into his community and fold after a few years, as their programs were inadequate without a structure in place that kept supporting the communities. Finally, if or when these multi-year commitments end, it is important that farmers are in a better position than when they began. To ensure the commitment ends in this better place, the farmers still are producing.

MODELS OF FUNDING:
Stanford has developed a “forward pay” model, in which we provide much-needed cash flow to farmers during their times of peak expenses (planting, growing, harvesting, and distribution) to reduce the financial risks and pressures of waiting to be paid until they can deliver their products to campus. Specifically, Stanford has the flexibility to offer 50% advance payment. This model may not work for all farmers, some of whom may feel it resembles sharecropping. But it has worked for some Black farmers Stanford has purchased from, so it is a viable course of action for an institutional buyer, it should be provided as an option.

Other foodservice leaders have also offered capital to growers looking to begin selling wholesale. For example, the Common Market, a nonprofit regional wholesale food distributor, extends working capital loans to farmers with 0% interest and no fees. By incorporating these practices, institutions can help share risk across the supply chain more equitably.

FRONT-END PLANNING:
Setting clear expectations from the get-go is pivotal for any successful purchasing relationship. Institutional buyers must be sure that what crops are needed, the terms of rejection and acceptance for products, and their anticipated timelines for distribution. At the same time, buyers and distributors should be flexible when possible, allowing farmers to adapt to working with different types of producers. Many farmers we interviewed stated that they could not sell wholesale in the past due to rigid distribution specifications. But with enough time and commitment, buyers, distributors, and farmers can work together to help farmers meet these specifications.

Everyone at the table should be forthright about their capabilities. Foodservice operators should be careful not to overcommit or overpromise regarding what they are able to buy. In addition, one foodservice professional observed that growers, on occasion, have either under- or overestimated how much they could produce because they didn’t want to be judged. But if institutional buyers and distributors lay out contingency plans for both parties to follow in the case of crop failures and have backup products in their order guides, then that might alleviate some pressure for farmers. If foodservice operators express to farmers that they know harvest issues are possible, all parties can be on the same page.

ONBOARDING AND FOOD SAFETY:
Foodservice professionals should be aware of the extensive onboarding and food safety processes that local farms have to undergo to sell wholesale. These requirements are often difficult, expensive, and time-intensive and affect the time and capital farmers will need to enter wholesale markets. To comply with onboarding checklists, farmers may need to spend anywhere from $25,000–$50,000. (Our complimentary toolkit (link to former toolkit, designed for Black farmers, covers the requirements in more detail). It’s important to note that many institutions have unique set-ups with corporate distributors that have especially extensive requirements, sometimes exceeding federal regulations. For example, according to exemptions laid out in the Food Safety Modernization Act (21), farms that are small enough in size and revenue do not need to obtain third-party Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) certification to sell to an institution—but the distributors the institution does business with might still require it. (Furthermore, the industry standard in many regions of the U.S. is for a farmer to obtain GAP certification just once, and provide a letter upon request each year from their food safety consultant that they are still following the plan. Many corporate distributors, however, require small farms to pay for re-certification each year.)

Distributors also often request that farmers have extremely expensive liability insurance policies, usually $1–2 million of coverage, when most small farmers carry a policy of $1 million in coverage—for far more than enough for most foodservice arrangements. But not only is change possible, it has preceded. Recently, some distributors have provided food safety scholarships and technical assistance to Black farmers. All institutions should do an extensive review of their distributors’ requirements. As the customers of distributors, they have more power than they realize to advocate for farmers, provide them with resources, and push to relax these distributors’ requirements.
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The institutional buyer commits to purchasing specific products from specific farmers via the distributor.

Now, the distributor knows the products it sources will be purchased by the institutional buyer.

And the farmer knows she has an outlet for her product. She is also aware of how much the distributor will pay her, and how much the institutional buyer will pay the distributor.

Pricing is kept confidential to the three entities, among whom it is wholly transparent. Internally, the three parties are aware of each other’s businesses and prices; if one party acts in bad faith, everyone will be able to see it, ultimately creating sufficient checks and balances.

Stanford Dining, Hospitality & Auxiliaries employs a three-pronged approach which engages the institutional buyer, the distributor, and the farmer. All parties have mutual knowledge of their respective roles and are transparent about pricing. By emphasizing open, regular communication, this three-pronged approach helps to foster both 1:1 relationships and collaborative relationships across all three parties.

ACCOUNTABILITY AND THE IMPORTANCE OF MEASURING PROGRESS:
Since this initiative is a long-term commitment, Stanford plans to track several metrics to evaluate the program’s effectiveness. The most essential outcomes will be economic benefits to Black farmers—increasing financial support and stability through long-term business relationships and scaled production, as well as opportunities for new business with other institutions based on the models being developed.

We also plan to check in with farmers periodically over a three-year timeframe to get qualitative feedback on the toolkit’s impacts.
Cultural Awareness

THE E IN DEI:
Stanford Food Institute and Farms to Grow, Inc. value diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI). This toolkit focuses on equity in particular; as the Farms to Grow team has witnessed over the years, discussions of DEI can sometimes leave out this crucial component.

As the National Association of Colleges and Employers notes [27]:

The term “equity” refers to fairness and justice and is distinguished from equality: Whereas equality means providing the same to all, equity means recognizing that we do not all start from the same place and must acknowledge and make adjustments to imbalances.

That is why understanding the history of discrimination perpetrated against Black farmers is so vital—it means acknowledging that Black farmers are not starting with equal access to opportunities.

THE PERSONAL, THE INTERPERSONAL:
Equity relies on systemic changes to policies and practices, like the ones outlined in this toolkit. But the work of DEI also occurs on the personal and interpersonal levels to help create a culture of inclusion and retain diversity.

All readers of this toolkit are encouraged to consult this guide on inclusive language [28] and to consider their actions, gestures, and non-verbal body language. Some farmers we interviewed spoke about e-mails they had received that were disrespectful, intentionally or not. Others recalled instances of racial microaggressions: for instance, one farm owner and operator has been approached on multiple occasions on the property and asked, “Where’s the owner?” These situations cause undue disrespect, but they can be avoided by not making assumptions.

AN INTRODUCTION TO UNCONSCIOUS BIAS:
We all hold beliefs about various identity groups based on social stereotypes. Whether those beliefs are conscious to us or not, they influence the way we behave and treat other people. Implicit bias tests [29] are a good starting point for readers to reflect on the biases they may hold.

We should point out, as well, that this section on cultural awareness is merely an introduction to what will be an ongoing process for any individual and for any organization that individual represents. We also hope that these principles are apparent throughout the entire toolkit, and that every decision foodservice operators make—with regard to outreach, purchasing, etc.—has a foundation in diversity, equity, and inclusion.
The farmer continued: “Black farmers are an endangered species. And there are more bald eagles in the lower 48 states than there are Black row crop farmers. So if we don’t do something, if this industry doesn’t wake up and people don’t get on the same page to make something happen—we will be extinct.”

It is possible to reverse the disappearance of Black farms in the U.S. But we all have to play our part to make sure it happens.

A Closing Thought

In the 1960s, one farmer said, there were only about 400 nesting pairs of bald eagles in the lower 48 states. So the government made a multi-million dollar investment and enacted legislation to help protect these endangered birds.

Today, the bald eagle population has “climbed to an estimated 316,700 individual bald eagles in the lower 48 states.”[33] and bald eagles have been delisted from the Endangered Species Act.

The farmer continued: “Black farmers are an endangered species. And there are more bald eagles in the lower 48 states than there are Black row crop farmers.

“So if we don’t do something, if this industry doesn’t wake up and people don’t get on the same page to make something happen—we will be extinct.”

It is possible to reverse the disappearance of Black farms in the U.S. But we all have to play our part to make sure it happens.
Glossary:

Carbon sequestration: The storage of carbon in soils and vegetation. It is one of the primary methods for removing carbon from the earth's atmosphere.

Diversified farming: The practice of producing a variety of crops on one farm, in order to decrease risk.

Hydroponics: A technique in which plants are grown without soil. It uses less water than traditional soil-based systems.

Managed grazing: A method of controlling when and where livestock graze, so that recently grazed areas can recover.

Pollinator protection: Any practice that protects pollinators. For example: the opposite of monocropping.

The practice of producing a variety of crops on one farm; the opposite of monocropping.
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