Marketing Crops to Schools and Institutions

Introduction
Schools and institutions have long been identified as a potential market for producers of food crops. Many institutional procurement systems, however, evolved throughout the later 1900s in a manner that may have created barriers for local product entry. During the last 20 years, there have been many efforts to retool school and institutional purchasing in ways that can feature local farm products as part of healthy meal options.

Large institutional buyers, from government entities to wholesale food brokers, are more commonly initiating local purchasing programs. This fact sheet will provide producers with key areas of consideration when selling to institutions. Links to programs in Kentucky, as well as references for additional reading and information, are also listed.

Key Considerations for Producers
Product Quantity and Quality
One of the historic barriers for marketing to institutional markets, especially for small producers, has been supplying adequate quantities of a particular product at satisfactory quality levels. A frequent barrier cited by institutions interested in purchasing local produce is the failure of producers to supply reliable quantities of product.

Producers will need to communicate with potential institutional buyers to understand their quantity and quality (volume) requirements. Producers should identify their farm’s production strengths and approach institutional markets out of their production strength and experience. It is difficult for newer and less-experienced producers to automatically supply continuous product quantity and quality for institutional buyers when they are unfamiliar with continuous plantings and other seasonality concerns.

One way that producers can overcome the barrier of supplying institutions with adequate quantity and quality is to begin by marketing products that are easier to produce, store, and ship. In Kentucky, for example, the state park restaurant system made changes to purchasing requirements in the early 2000s to enable chefs to purchase local products. State park restaurants were also more easily able to purchase kale (for buffet decorations and garnish) and fall ornamentals (for restaurant decoration). Some producers found they could...
start selling these decorative crops, which tend to be relatively easier to produce, and then move into selling other fresh produce crops.

Another way that producers can seek to overcome the barrier of supplying continuous volume is to create formal or informal partnerships with other producers. Strategies utilized have included partnerships, CSA-type agreements, formation of storage and distribution networks, and formal and informal cooperative networks. In Southeast Kentucky, for example, producers formed a network to supply local consumers with fresh sweetpotatoes and used this experience to identify potential institutional customers.

Concern over some of the risks associated with institutional contracts may also be a stumbling block for producers. For example, what if crop failure or other catastrophe prevents the grower from fulfilling his/her contract? In the case of the Kentucky Farm to School Program, food service directors are still permitted to order from their regular vendors should the producer be unable to deliver product due to an unforeseen crisis. The Kentucky Department of Agriculture (KDA) reports that it is a common misconception that the local producer must supply the school(s) completely once the grower is awarded the bid. Other institutional markets may handle this scenario differently, so it is important that such issues be addressed prior to entering into a contract.

The key to nearly all efforts to place products into institutional markets is communication. Producers will need to understand the institution’s product requirements. This may include detailed handling or storage stipulations, often stemming from food safety concerns. Successful farm marketers to institutional markets will also need to establish multiple channels of communication with those responsible for purchasing. This may mean getting to know the person receiving the product at the back door as well as the accounting personnel responsible for product payment. Sound recordkeeping and invoicing systems are essential for tracking product deliveries and ensuring that the producer receives timely payment.

**Liability and Food Safety Concerns**

Managing institutional liability and food safety concerns is a major barrier often cited by crop producers attempting to enter institutional markets. While product liability insurance is now commonplace and relatively easy to obtain, levels required by institutions may exceed the common level of $1 million liability insurance expected by restaurants or smaller foodservice providers.

Kentucky producers have utilized two strategies for supplying higher levels of product liability insurance. The more obvious strategy, usually more feasible as farm cash flow increases, is to carry a larger amount of product liability insurance for an individual farm. One dairy farm, for example, found it worthwhile to increase their farm’s product liability coverage to exceed the $2.5 million required by a key institutional customer.

Another strategy, which is becoming more common, is for wholesalers or distributors to purchase the product directly from local farms and then resell it to the institutional client. In this case, the wholesaler basically assumes the risk of product liability and is able to meet the institutional client’s demand for local product. This does not release the producer, however, from the responsibility to ensure safe and secure
local food. Wholesalers may require on-farm inspections, refuse substandard products, or conduct supply chain audits to determine if farm products are being handled according to best practices.

Producers should plan how they will meet food safety and product liability requirements before approaching potential institutional customers. A producer that has already done his or her homework and established a plan for meeting a client’s food safety requirements will have a better opportunity for landing their crops in the institution’s supply chain.

Delivery
A third frequent barrier for supplying farm crops to institutions, as well as other local foodservice clients, is delivery. Producers desiring to enter this market need to understand that institutions are accustomed to receiving regularly timed deliveries from their existing product vendors. Additionally, few schools have significant processing or storage capacity. In some cases, wholesalers or other intermediaries have been used to assist with the aggregation and even light processing. A producer who is unwilling to meet an institution’s reasonable requirements for timing and manner of delivery creates a barrier to entering the market.

Fortunately, many institutional foodservice purchasers have realized that sourcing products direct from producers can meet institutional values and/or create popularity and value in the eyes of their patrons. As a result, some institutional purchasers in Kentucky and other states have become more flexible with local producers in terms of delivery and storage. Creating some additional space for local product storage in walk-in coolers (if possible) and giving chefs more flexibility in menu preparation to feature fresh local product are two ways that Kentucky institutions have increased the amounts of local product they are able to procure. However, producers should never expect that institutions will bend over backward just to source local product; for a number of institutional buyers, ease of preparation and budget constraints still govern many product purchasing decisions.

Kentucky Programs
Farm to School Program
Kentucky’s Farm to School Program is administered by the Kentucky Department of Agriculture. In 2003, the KDA modeled a purchasing program using the Department of Defense procurement structure to facilitate the entry of local products into public schools. Several successful pilot projects with local farms and farmer-owned cooperatives placed local produce into public schools. More recently, federal programs pushing for healthier meal options offered in schools have placed renewed emphasis on local sourcing of fresh products, including in-school merchandising and education of local food.

While Kentucky schools have rapidly expanded their use of local products, they still operate within a bid system. Typically three bids must be collected by the school before an offer can be made. Some Kentucky schools have been willing to make available historic purchase prices. Producers interested in supplying crop products to public schools will find it useful to work through the management supplied by the KDA. This government entity can help producers navigate supply, invoicing, delivery, and contacts with potential local school system clients. The KDA has a designated coordinator for farm-to-school purchasing in Kentucky. Producers can obtain contact information for this person via the KDA’s Farm to School Web page.
The KDA has declared October 9-15, 2011, as Farm to School Week in Kentucky. This ties in with the National Farm to School Network’s designation of October as National Farm to School Month. Producers of fall fruit and vegetable crops could seek to tie initial marketing efforts with monthly promotions during October.

**Kentucky Restaurant Rewards**
The Restaurant Rewards program that has been in place through the Kentucky Department of Agriculture for a number of years may, in some cases, apply to schools and other institutional buyers. Applicability, terms, and conditions should be explored through the KDA.

**MarketReady Training**
The MarketReady Training Program is conducted through the University of Kentucky’s Food Systems Innovation Center. MarketReady addresses the market development risks and relationships small farmers and ranchers must manage as they seek to develop supplier relationships with restaurants, grocery, wholesale, and foodservice buyers. For more information about this program, as well as training locations and dates, visit MarketReady on the Web.

**Selected Resources**

**Kentucky**
- Kentucky Farm to School Program (Kentucky Department of Agriculture)
- Kentucky Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) Program (Kentucky Department of Agriculture)
  [http://www.kyagr.com/marketing/GAP.htm](http://www.kyagr.com/marketing/GAP.htm)
- MarketReady (University of Kentucky)
- Restaurant Rewards Program (Kentucky Department of Agriculture)

**National**
- Bearing Fruit: Farm to School Program Evaluation Resources and Recommendations (Occidental College, 2009)
- Bringing Local Food to Local Institutions — A Resource Guide for Farm-to-school and Farm-to-Institution Programs (ATTRA, 2003)
- Delivering More: Scaling Up Farm to School Programs (Community Food Security Coalition, 2010) 1.4 MB file
- Farm to Preschool Program (National Farm to School Network)
- Farm to School (National Farm to School Network)
- Farm to School (USDA)
- New Markets for Your Crops (ATTRA, 2008)
- Student Gardens and Food Service (Bon Appétit Management Company)
- Tips for Selling to Institutional Markets (ATTRA, 2012)
Other states
• Farm to School Toolkits (University of Wisconsin)
  http://www.cias.wisc.edu/toolkits/
• Marketing Michigan Products to Schools: A Step-By-Step Guide (Michigan State University)
  http://www.mifarmtoschool.msu.edu/assets/farmToSchool/docs/MIFTS_Marketing_Guide.pdf
• Ohio’s Specialty Crops: A Boost to Food Service Menus (Ohio State University, 2012)
  http://www.oardc.ohio-state.edu/amp/pageview1.asp?id=2976
• Oklahoma Farm to School: Tips, Tools and Guidelines for Food Distribution and Safety (Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, 2010)
• What Producers Should Know About Selling to Local Foodservice Markets (Iowa State University, 2010)
  http://www.extension.iastate.edu/Publications/PM2045.pdf
• What Retail Foodservices Should Know When Purchasing Local Produce Directly from Local Farmers (Iowa State University, 2010)
  http://www.extension.iastate.edu/Publications/PM2046.pdf
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