

A Descriptive Survey of the University of California
Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education Program

March 2008

Prepared by Kate Clancy

I Introduction and Methods

When Tom Tomich was chosen as WK Kellogg Endowed Chair in Sustainable Food Systems at the University of California at Davis, monies were provided to him through the Foundation to bring together the Directors of all the sustainable agriculture centers around the country. One of his interests in meeting with the group was to encourage each of them to have a descriptive survey of his/her center done, so that he, as a newcomer, could learn more about his colleagues and their centers, and for all of them to compare the similarities and differences of their programs. Although the other centers have delayed a decision about doing such a survey, the UC Division of Agricultural and Natural Resources is just starting a statewide five year review of SAREP. Dr. Tomich is the director of SAREP at this point and interested in knowing more about the program and its history. Kate Clancy has developed and executed the survey at UCD that includes questions on SAREP's history, objectives, activities, funding sources, and other elements.

Professor Tomich requested the cooperation of nine present and former SAREP staff and several others who have a history with the program. Each was interviewed in February and March 2008 by phone for about an hour (See Appendix 1 for list of respondents). All the respondents were asked to give a response only to questions with which they had adequate familiarity, and to not include information about SAREP since 2004, the date of SAREP's last Biennial Report and the time when efforts were begun to develop what has become the Agricultural Sustainability Institute (of which Dr. Tomich is also the Director). The present report is a compilation of the interviewee's responses and a number of progress reports and other material from the SAREP archives (see list of these materials in Appendix 2). Although the survey is not intended to be a full evaluation of the program, one question was asked about the overall impact of the SAREP program since its initiation in 1986.

II History

The earliest effort to get the University of California to address specifically the issues of sustainable agriculture appears to have been a request from Bill Friedland and Isao Fujimoto in the early 1970s to James Kendrick, who at that time was the Vice President of Agricultural Sciences for the UC system, to allocate 10% of the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources' budget to alternative agricultural research and development. At about the same time several faculty members at UC Davis, including Professor Fujimoto, had determined that much of the research behind the mechanization of harvesting several major crops in California had been done at the University of California at Davis. The United Farm Workers had been very concerned about the loss of jobs of their members because of this research, and as more of the evidence for the University's role accumulated, and other issues surfaced, the California Agrarian Action Project (CAAP) was formed. The Project, along with California Rural Legal Assistance, sued the University saying it had not fulfilled its original contract with the California public. As a result of the lawsuit several things occurred: one was the development of the Small Farms Center, another was a growing concern throughout the state about the effects of pesticides on farm workers and rural residents. The latter issue brought attention to the fact that the University did not have an organic program. The CAAP approached State Senator Nicholas Petris, the Chair of the Education Committee's budget subcommittee, to request that he initiate a sustainable agriculture program at UC. He was enthusiastic

about doing so, and when many members of the University community told him that everything that was being done in agriculture by UC was "sustainable", the subcommittee held hearings around the state which showed that, to the contrary, few resources were being allotted to organic or sustainable agriculture research, and that there were many important research questions identified by farmers and others. Led by this strong public input, and with the University now supporting the bill that Petris had proposed, SB872 was passed in 1986.

The legislation, titled the "Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education Act of 1986" directed the Regents of the University of California to establish a Program, a Program Advisory Committee and a Technical Advisory Committee, and report biennially to the Legislature. SAREP, the first program of its kind at a land grant university in the nation, was established and placed within the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (DANR). Bill Liebhardt was hired in 1987 as the first director, and between then and 1990 he and a small staff set up the basic structures of the program, established program priorities, and executed two rounds of competitive grant distribution.

SB 872 stated that SAREP should be established from existing resources of the University, and was accompanied by an authorization of \$300,000 per year appropriated by the legislature, and \$300,000 per year by the UC Davis President's Office. For two years there was also \$175,000 of redirected University funds going to SAREP for competitive grants, but that ended because of a state budget crisis, and between 1991 and 1993 the Program's budget declined 40%. Until 1998 internal funding amounted to about \$650,000 per year -- and the amount fluctuated from then on to 2004, when the SAREP internal budget was cut again by about 33%. In the meantime, while there had always been some extramural funding in 1995 large pass-through grants doubled the previous year's total budget. In the 2002/2003 budget external funds were received from 14 sources -- the largest number ever (see more discussion of budget below on page 4).

III Internal Structures

Although physically housed at UC Davis, SAREP exists as a statewide program within the office of the Vice President-Agriculture and Natural Resources (DANR) under the office of the Associate Vice President -Programs. Cooperative Extension (CE) also reports to the Vice President, as do several other statewide programs. SAREP was perceived to be an extension program -- although it is not structured like CE, and was not totally successful in creating a structure in which SAREP had advisers in the field, like the Small Farms Program.

SAREP had two Directors between 1987 and 2004. The Technical Advisory Committee directed the program in its first year until Bill Liebhardt was hired. Liebhardt stepped down in 1998, and then Sean Swezey served from 1999 to 2004 as 80% Director and 20% extension specialist. Professor Liebhardt was criticized by an external review panel in 1995 for instituting "a flat hierarchy", saying that the activities and programs engaged in by the staff "are largely self generated, issue oriented, and often not necessarily related to issues important to constituents". However, all respondents to my survey who were connected to the program at the time felt that the organization and management were quite effective and productive in accomplishing the objectives.

Between 1987 and 1990 the staff of SAREP grew from two to nine people including three systems analysts: in 2003 there were 11 staff members, five of them were part-time. The employees also came in for criticism in the 1995 external review -- which took the program to task for hiring staff that were not academics, suggested that the grants process lacked scientific rigor, and said that there might be a conflict of interest because the staff was assisting grantees in the preparation of proposals. SAREP's rebuttal was that all the analysts (half of the staff) had PhDs, that DANR had made the hiring process difficult, that there was little understanding on any land grant university campus of how to conduct participatory research in communities and on farms, that the scientific review of all proposals was quite rigorous, and that collaboration and coordination were the hallmarks of the program so that it was fulfilling its goals in helping researchers prepare better proposals. Another criticism was that the Director did not decrease the staff in 1993 when funding decreased. The Director and the Advisory Committee had specifically chosen to keep all the employees, and to apply for more external funding, so that more outreach and assistance could be given across the state, albeit through smaller competitive grants.

Advisory Boards. The Program Advisory Committee (PAC), (the name was changed to *Public* Advisory Committee by the first advisory Board), recommended goals and priorities for SAREP, advised whether or not research proposals addressed program goals, and assisted in the development of the annual plan and a five-year strategic plan. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) made recommendations about the scientific merit of grant applications. Each had about 20 members. The 1995 review committee criticized this arrangement saying that the program had not adhered to the legislative mandate, and that the PAC had not been able to deal with programmatic issues. Rebuttals from both the Program and the PAC itself stated that both criticisms were inaccurate. At the time of their formation both committees included several DANR and public members who had been involved in the legislative discussions. SAREP was also criticized by this committee for having joined the two committees together. The Program responded that this had been done because there was so much disagreement between the two bodies, one made up of farmers and nonacademic supporters of sustainable agriculture, the other, the TAC, composed of university researchers, many of whom had not done the kind of research themselves that SAREP was soliciting. Survey respondents have mixed reactions as to the success of the joint Advisory Board.

The respondents to the present survey were uniformly complimentary to the Advisory Committees, although there was quite a lot of variability over time and the PAC has not been a viable entity for some years. They pointed out that there were advisory committees across all UC campuses at the time, but SAREP's PAC was the only one with a say in grant making. The TAC along with the PAC gave a lot of direction to grants review and planning. When budgets were threatened, the PAC was critical to restoring funding and lobbying for the program: they were the outside/constituent voice, and were exemplary in transparency and stakeholder engagement. As one interviewee put it, the PAC was "what made SAREP function well".

A final criticism from the five-year external review was that it appeared that SAREP had not done much strategic planning. The SAREP response pointed out all the ways in which they had engaged in strategic planning almost yearly -- one respondent suggested that one of the reasons it may not have been as visible as it might have been was that SAREP "had its back to the wall" so much of the time that it was hard to see past the criticisms to the day-to-day work.

Internal SAREP Connections

Connections with the University

In the early years DANR administrators were supportive of the program and provided useful guidance, although they seemed to be new to the idea sustainable agriculture. The administrators who followed them were open in their lack of interest in sustainable agriculture practices and programs (SAREP was told to not talk about organic agriculture), and "in many respects harassed us". Respondents said that for many years the SAREP program was seen as a threat to research because so much of what it was doing was community-based and participatory, or in collaboration with farmers. The connections to Cooperative Extension were stronger in the early years but lessened over time. Requests were made to the Experiment Station Director that extension agents and other faculty receive full or part time appointments in SAREP, but this never occurred. Many interviewees said that over most of the history of the Program the staff has had to justify their existence to people in the University.

College connections

Several unfortunate situations followed from the fact that SAREP was not in the College of Agriculture. The first is that according to the respondents SAREP staff were not considered peers by most of the faculty on campus, especially those whose research was not related to production. The second is that SAREP felt that only about 15% of the faculty embraced the ideas and the research that the Program was carrying out, although many were "on the fence". An incident that people remember well is the Dean of Agriculture being put under a good deal of pressure by animal science faculty when SAREP published its book on BGH and rotational grazing in 1993.

Connections with other Centers

SAREP is one of 22 statewide programs in the UC system (the Small Farm Center and the IPM program are considered by the respondents the initiatives most related to SAREP). The Director of SAREP met twice a year with the Vice President of Agriculture and Natural Resources, and interacted in a number of other ways. Most of the staff worked at the same time with people connected with DANR -- and often worked collaboratively on research projects, and on competitive and external grants, for example LTRAS, BIOS, BIFS, etc.(these are discussed in more detail below). There was also quite a bit of interaction with the program in Agroecology at UC Santa Cruz over time.

Departmental connections

SAREP had no formal ties to departments except for Bill Liebhardt's appointment in the Department of Agronomy. Having staff that did not have academic appointments was limiting in how SAREP could interact with other faculty and programs. All respondents agree that most of the interaction with faculty and CE farm advisors occurred around the competitive grants. Academic staff also gave input to many of the publications, and were engaged with the LTRAS project. It was believed that there would be more

attention from campus faculty when SAREP started its competitive grants in economics and public policy. To the surprise of the staff almost no UCD faculty applied for those grants, although it was recognized that the grants were small and required intense work in the community, which many agriculture faculty around the country and at UCD were unwilling to take up.

Budgets

Except for a small amount, the income in the first several years of SAREP operations was all from internal sources including dollars appropriated by the Legislature and University funds. From 1989 to '92 the total budget was about \$1 million per year. That dropped approximately 20% in 92/93 as some State and University funding was stopped. In 1993/94 income was at its lowest point (\$707,000), and the Director made the decision to keep staff and core activities intact, to look for external grants to make up the difference, and to bring the competitive grants funding levels back to their original level. As mentioned SAREP was criticized for maintaining its staff size and for decreasing the size of competitive grants as income dropped, but the staff and the PAC supported the decision and recognized that substantial external funds had been tapped "increasing the resources available to both DANR and the public for research and education relating to sustainable agriculture" (PAC letter to Henry Vaux 1995).

Income from internal sources stayed at about \$650,000 until 2003/04, and external funds made a significant difference in total income. The largest proportion of funds (\$2.7 million in 98/99) was pass-through grants for BIFS, Western SARE, and the Alternatives to Methyl Bromide program (described below under SAREP Activities). In 01/02 and 02/03 the program received several foundation grants and funding for the Buy California Initiative totaling almost \$1 million. In 2003/04 the program experienced a 33% cut in university funds; about that time the decision to examine a new structure was implemented.

Facilities

Securing office space at the beginning was difficult because SAREP was not a College program. But space was found and was home to the program until 1994 when a new DANR building opened up in the far west section of the UC Davis campus. The move brought all of the SAREP staff together, but isolated SAREP from many of the Agriculture College faculty. It did increase interaction between SAREP and other DNR programs including the Small Farm Center and the IPM program.

None of the survey respondents that I interviewed felt that any significant changes in structure had occurred over time. Several mentioned that things worked somewhat differently when Sean Swezey was appointed to the directorship in 1998, with the organizational structure becoming more hierarchical, and Swezey dividing his time between the Davis campus and his home campus of UC Santa Cruz.

Mission, Goals, and Objectives

In its first eight years SAREP took its mission and goals from the legislation. Its three main responsibilities were: 1) the administration of competitive research grants, 2) the development and distribution of information, and 3) the establishment of long-term farmland research sites.

One of the first recommendations of the external review committee in 1995 was to provide clear program goals and to make them visible to people outside of the University. In 1993 the program had already provided to the Advisory Committees a proposed mission and a goals statement that were to be used internally, along with objectives. These goals, which appeared in the 1995 SAREP response to the external review committee, were somewhat more like objectives: to stimulate research and education projects through a competitive grant program and other projects, to develop and disseminate information to many audiences, to facilitate communication and interaction within and among UC personnel, farmers and others, and to provide educational programs and opportunities for target audiences in cooperation with other groups.

Changes were made in these drafts, and the goal and mission statements appeared in the 1997 Biennial Report. By then they read more like goals, to wit: California farmers and ranchers are more able to manage their land and businesses in ways that are economically viable and that protect and enhance both human and natural resources and biodiversity; consumers have a closer connection to agriculture and California's rural and urban communities are strengthened through participation in sustainable food systems; and government programs and policies encourage and support the development of sustainable farms, ranches and communities in California.

DANR's own 1997 Strategic Plan explicitly focused on agriculture, natural and human resource management, and SAREP acknowledged there were overlapping priorities. Of note however, is that the DANR priority areas are identified through a conventional lens and SAREP's through a sustainability lens, for example DANR's priority area is animal waste management and confined feeding operations, and the SAREP priority is Sustainable Livestock Production Systems.

The only complete list of SAREP's objectives is found in its Strategic Plan of 2001. There are six strategies in the plan (in shortened form): (1) assess research information needs; (2) fund research and education; (3) promote the adoption of sustainable food and agriculture systems; (4) evaluate the impact of SAREP program and funded projects; (5) create and implement a development plan; and (6) further develop an effective statewide organizational structure. Each strategy is accompanied by three to seven objectives including activities such as: survey a broad cross-section of UC clientele every five years regarding their critical needs, allocate approximately two-thirds of grant funds to sustainable production and marketing, and one-third to assisting communities in... creating a demand for sustainable food and agricultural systems, leverage resources and programs aimed at developing more sustainable food and agricultural systems, enhance... the SAREP website, document that funded projects fulfill their education and outreach objectives, and develop a long-term fundraising strategy.

In part because these took a while to get on paper, there were no significant changes in the goals and mission over time or as one respondent put it "no change at the heart of them". There were changes over time in the objectives. At first the attention was 100% on plant production. The first work on animals was done in 1993 -- starting with the book on BGH. Because of its origins, SAREP initially put a significant emphasis on decreasing pesticide use in production. During Sean Swezey's directorship there was a very strong emphasis on organic, but over the last several years that emphasis has diminished. Around 1990 the PAC/TAC, after getting requests from around the state, expanded the work of SAREP to include economics and public policy. David Campbell was hired in 1991 and a good deal more work was done on community development. The shift by David and Gail Feenstra to a strong research and outreach agenda in community food systems was viewed as a natural progression.

Accountability

The early intent of the program, according to many of the respondents, was just survival. The staff's plan was to spend dollars on good projects that met the public's and the University's definition of sustainability. There was also an effort from the beginning to be transparent to the public about what was being done. SAREP reported biennially to the State Legislature in a document reviewed by DANR and the Office of the President and they reported annually to USDA in a document reviewed by DANR. They also reported periodically to DANR directly, including annual reports initiated by Associate Vice President Vaux in 1994.

Vaux's vision appears to have been that SAREP would be only a competitive grants program -- but the legislation was clear that they were to go beyond that, particularly in the area of communication. There was no specific accountability to UC Davis itself, except to adhere to the rules and regulations of the campus. When the BIFS program started there was more demand for actual evaluations of programs. Then as more external grants were secured more evaluation was mandated by funders. An effort was made in 1994 to develop and fund a baseline survey of California farmers' use of sustainable agriculture practices --but the survey was considered too costly and DANR did not fund it.

SAREP Activities

These mainly fall into the four categories described below, with some overlap among each. Unlike some other sustainable agriculture centers in the US, SAREP has no formal graduate or undergraduate educational function. Nor, as a state-funded program, has it engaged directly in policy development, although its research and education efforts have supported the "development of policies that enable a transition to sustainable farming and food systems" (1993 to 95 PR). These have included food policy councils, stakeholder processes and science information, and voluntary approaches to decrease the use of agricultural chemicals.

Grant making (four types)

1. Competitive grants

As soon as SAREP was set up it started to award competitive grants. As of 2003, the Project database lists 177 research grants (most but not all competitive) -- 56% of them were in production and 32% in food systems. They cover multiple fruit and vegetable crops, livestock, and row crops; and a myriad of topics including direct marketing, grazing, water projects, forestry management, community food system development, and many others. The amount of dollars spent on competitive grants is approximately \$8 million.

2. Long-term research in agricultural systems (LTRAS)

To accord with the Legislature's directive, SAREP wrote an RFP in 1989 to fund the establishment of one permanent site to study long-term sustainable agricultural practices. It awarded \$150,000 to a team at UC Davis to help establish this ongoing research. Support comes to this project through the college and a number of extramural grantors.

The sustainable agriculture and food systems project (SAFS) was established in 1988 to study the transition from conventional to low input and organic practices. For 11 years SAREP put between \$37, 000 and \$50,000 per year into long-term research on a 28 acre site at the UCD Agronomy fields. SARE funded this project as well. A large group of investigators has compared four cropping systems typical of the Southern Sacramento Valley.

3. Administrative and pass- through grants

These include four different production-oriented programs: one is the BIOS (Biologically Integrated Orchard Systems) project which began as a joint effort with CAFF in 1988 to help almond growers enhance their sustainable growing practices. This project was so successful that in 1994 new California legislation was passed to develop a Biologically Integrated Farming Systems program (BIFS). With funding from the California Department of Pesticide Regulation (CDPR) and US EPA SAREP administered this program and awarded grants for pilot projects in row crops and wine grapes, and later 10 more large-scale multiyear projects on rice, walnuts and other crops. In 1998 new legislation extended the program, and SAREP again administered and awarded these funds. Both of these programs continue under SAREP today.

A third grant program was developed for finding alternatives for methyl bromide, an ozone-depleting fumigant. Funding was provided by the CDPR in 1999 to SAREP, which awarded five grants.

The fourth program began in 2003 when SAREP received funding from the California Department of Food and Agriculture's Buy California Initiative to develop short courses and production manuals for selected organic crops.

4. Graduate student awards

In 1992 SAREP began to award monies to graduate students for research projects. The \$1000 to \$2000 awards were made to encourage the next generation of sustainable agriculture researchers.

Research

It was not originally intended that SAREP conduct its own research -- but circumstances and declining resources led the program to change. Bob Bugg on the SAREP staff co-founded the BIOS project, and was the first administrator of BIFS. He has been very effective in bringing substantial dollars to SAREP to administer both BIOS and BIFS over the years.

In 1993 Bill Liebhardt, with contributions from several other SAREP staff, edited the publication *The Dairy Debate: Consequences of Bovine Growth Hormone and Rotational Grazing Technologies* that examined the research findings to date of the two different technologies.

As more extramural funds were needed to fulfill the programs' goals the staff conducted its own research, and contributed to the peer-reviewed literature. This put them on a more equal footing with their faculty peers at the University of California and across the country. For 10 years Gail Feenstra was a member of a national USDA regional research team on local food systems research.

Facilitation and networking

One of SAREP's early goals was to "facilitate communication and interaction with researchers, farmers, consumers and others." Over the years this has taken multiple forms starting with educational conferences. From 1986 to 1990 SAREP put on five of these per year, and smaller but significant numbers since then. They have taken place at the national and state level and engaged many cosponsors. Along with hundreds of farmer oriented production conferences, SAREP has assisted many California communities in improving their planning abilities and collaborations, and has offered tactical assistance on food policy councils. Networking has also taken the form of service on a number of boards and advisory committees at the state and national level. The Program has also had a strong connection to the national SARE program. The Associate Director of SARE was chosen to direct the PDP component of the Western SARE, and the Western SARE Communications Director was housed with the SAREP staff in California for several years.

Education and outreach

One of the original objectives of the legislation was "the giving of instructions and practical demonstrations in agriculture and imparting information through demonstrations, publications, and otherwise, and for printing and distribution of information in connection with the sustainable agriculture research and education program." (SB 872 553 (a) (2)) SAREP took this charge seriously. From early in its

history it had an information systems manager; later an education /outreach coordinator. Among the types of activities undertaken under this heading are the following:

1. A quarterly newsletter started in 1998, sent to farmers, farm advisors, researchers, and extension personnel, and consumers across the country
2. An award-winning website
3. Conference and workshop proceedings on multiple topics
4. Hundreds of grants for educational events, often given to Cooperative Extension advisors
5. Competitive grants summaries
6. Information guides
7. Organic cost studies
8. Media coverage and public outreach including news articles, national local news coverage, and thousands of presentations at public gatherings
9. The Western SARE PDP program
10. Community food system profiles
11. Case studies of farms/enterprises
12. A speaker series on Sustainable Agriculture in 1993

VI External Links

Most of the respondents mentioned in the interviews that SAREP had not found a lot of interest across the campus in the work it was doing. Staff members worked quite a bit with the Small Farm Center, the IPM program, the Agricultural Issues Center, and various Cooperative Extension farm advisors. As mentioned earlier some faculty on campus applied for the competitive grants that SAREP was giving out. No one could think of faculty from a discipline outside of agriculture having been involved with the program. The Bioregional Group was the only other sustainability program mentioned as having engaged SAREP's attention.

In contrast, the interest shown by the NGO community in California in SAREP's work and the support it gave to the Program at both the State and University level was very strong. At some point or another SAREP probably worked with every agricultural and food systems nonprofit in the state (and a number out of state). The former included CAFF, OFRF, the Center for Land Based Learning, NRDC, the California SAWG, the Ecological Farming Association, and others; the latter includes the Community Food Security Coalition and others. Members of these organizations served as members of the PAC, as cosponsors of conferences, as grantees, and as learning partners with SAREP staff members.

SAREP interacted with a number of other organizations including RC&Ds, the California Department of Food and Agriculture, the Department of Conservation, the California Department of Pest Regulation, the Department of Water Resources, the Energy Commission, the LA Basin project that worked on erosion, and the Department of Fisheries. Many of these were funders of SAREP programs.

When asked if there had been interaction with any other sustainability organizations around the state outside of food and agriculture one person mentioned work with some of the water boards in the counties -- but that was the extent of this link.

VII Perception of SAREP Impacts

Many possible impacts were not measured, yet all but one of the respondents felt that there had been significant outcomes over time. The production research percolated to many farmers, and "planted a lot of seeds that took time to germinate", especially with conventional producers. Although the portfolio of research and extension projects is not huge in terms of dollars, the impact at the local level over time has been great in terms of support for County-based programs in production and marketing. SAREP helped establish long-term research into sustainable systems at UC Davis. Some projects had lasting effects like those with the almond growers and farmers markets; and all of SAREP's programs catalyzed a large amount of work that is still ongoing. Through its newsletter, publications, and website, SAREP is a key resource for information on sustainable agriculture in California. Many of the respondents said that the publications made a difference to many groups throughout the state and the nation, and that the public education effort was and is quite significant.

The effect of SAREP on the University of California is perhaps the strongest of its impacts. SAREP played a key role in legitimizing the terms sustainable and organic agriculture within UC. Respondents point out that SAREP introduced interdisciplinary research on a broad scale to the University, and brought a large number of external stakeholders onto the campus and into collaboration with a very insulated University. SAREP helped foster linkages between UC and growers and nonprofits; it helped provide an access point for a large segment of growers in California, who otherwise felt they didn't have the connection to the University, and who felt that the University wasn't responsive to their needs. Over time as SAREP established a beachhead and worked tirelessly to get the University to pay attention to sustainable agriculture it became more accepted. The Program also charted new territory in facilitating more direct grower involvement in establishing research and extension priorities, and it pioneered techniques for growers to be involved in the planning and conducting of research and extension projects and programs. Finally, on the research side, SAREP was a trailblazer in public scholarship related to food and agriculture. Campbell and Feenstra's connection with the PlacerGROWN project joined campus-based academics and the Placer County community in a long-term research project embedded as community-based praxis.

At the national level SAREP's very existence enhanced the credibility of the state of California to outsiders -- suggesting that there was attention being paid to organic and

sustainable production and food systems. As a land grant sustainable ag program, SAREP showed that it could be done. Other states have followed different models in how things were set up, but SAREP's creation gave the other states something to point to and work toward. SAREP was a model in its competitive grants program, and in its role in developing local food systems. Finally SAREP has helped strengthen connections between agriculture and consumers in targeted areas through support of local marketing programs, farmer's market research, and farm to institution opportunities that are critical to ongoing work in the state. It was a disappointment to SAREP staff that they did not have a greater effect on Cooperative Extension, although there were some very productive collaborations.

VIII Comments on the New Organizational Structure

All respondents had positive comments as well as caveats about the new organization. People think that tying programs together is a good idea: that it creates a new base for more synergy, new energy, new faculty, and new projects. They believe it's important to capitalize on the growing public support for sustainable agriculture, sustainable food systems, and for ecological accountability. They believe the reorganization finally says to the external world that the University of California is taking sustainability seriously, and should open the University to more stakeholder and political input into what it does. People see it as an opportunity to build better bridges between communities and the University, and hope that it will move SAREP to a new level with more campus involvement in its activities.

The down sides expressed are concern that SAREP might be getting lost in the shuffle; its present role is not clear to a lot of people. Although people like the new Director very much there is concern that having an outsider take over who doesn't know the history of how UC Davis has consistently undermined SAREP will affect SAREP's work. Another concern is that now that SAREP is totally under the auspices of the College the center of gravity will shift to the campus and away from Extension because there is more prestige there. SAREP has always been cutting edge in its activities, and this move may transfer the cutting edge to science and away from farmers and communities, and break the strong bonds that SAREP has had with people outside the University. Several people feel that SAREP needs a separate identification from the Agricultural Sustainability Institute.

People feel it is a big challenge to get to the right place, and caution that ASI should not create an overload of expectations of what the new Institute will do. It will definitely need foci, and clarity about what the relationship between UC Davis and DANR will be in the future.

Appendix 1

Interviewees

Jill Auburn, former associate director of SAREP

David Campbell, former public policy analyst SAREP

David Chaney, education/information coordinator of SAREP

Gail Feenstra, food systems analyst SAREP

Isao Fujimoto, senior lecturer emeritus in Community Development

Bill Liebhardt, first director of SAREP

Maxwell Norton, present program leader, DANR

Rich Rominger, former PAC member

Mark Van Horn, director of the UC Davis student farm

Appendix 2

Reference Materials

BIFS Program Overview -- SAREP website

David Campbell and Gail Feenstra. 2005. Community Food Systems and the Work of Public Scholarship, chapter 2 in *Engaging Campus and Community: the Practice of Public Scholarship in the State and Land Grant University System*. Scott J. Peters et al., editors. The Kettering Foundation.

Emmett Fiske 2004. *The Politics of Sustainability: Genesis and Evolution of the Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education Program at the University of California*. Transcript of the panel presentation and discussion -- Annual Meeting of The Rural Sociological Society. Sacramento, California

Five Year Ad Hoc Review August 1995

Five Year Ad Hoc Review Response October 1995

PAC letter to Dr. Henry Vaux January 1996

SAREP Biennial Reports -- 1995 to 1997, 1997 to 1999, 1999 to 2001, 2001 to 2003

SAREP Progress Reports -- 1986 to 1990, 1990 to 1993, 1993 to 1995

SAREP Mission and Goals 2003 website

SAREP Strategic Plan 2001

SAREP Projects Database

Senate Bill 872