



Co-design of Adaptable Learning Outcomes for Sustainable Food Systems Undergraduate Education

Roland Ebel¹, Selena Ahmed^{1*}, Will Valley², Nicholas Jordan³, Julie Grossman⁴, Carmen Byker Shanks¹, Mary Stein⁵, Mary Rogers⁴ and Colin Dring²

¹ Food and Health Lab, Department of Health and Human Development, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT, United States, ² Centre for Sustainable Food Systems, Faculty of Land and Food Systems, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada, ³ Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics, University of Minnesota, Saint Paul, MN, United States, ⁴ Department of Horticultural Science, University of Minnesota, Saint Paul, MN, United States, ⁵ Department of Health and Human Development, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT, United States

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:

Molly D. Anderson,
Middlebury College, United States

Reviewed by:

Damian Michael Parr,
University of California, Santa Cruz,
United States
Kristen Lowitt,
Queen's University, Canada
Lori Stahlbrand,
George Brown College, Canada

*Correspondence:

Selena Ahmed
selena.ahmed@montana.edu

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to
Social Movements, Institutions and
Governance,
a section of the journal
Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems

Received: 02 June 2020

Accepted: 26 August 2020

Published: 29 September 2020

Citation:

Ebel R, Ahmed S, Valley W, Jordan N,
Grossman J, Byker Shanks C,
Stein M, Rogers M and Dring C (2020)
Co-design of Adaptable Learning
Outcomes for Sustainable Food
Systems Undergraduate Education.
Front. Sustain. Food Syst. 4:568743.
doi: 10.3389/fsufs.2020.568743

Higher education institutions are increasingly offering Sustainable Food Systems (SFS) degree programs in response to societal demand for training a professional food systems workforce. As a relatively young field, there is a need for clearly articulated learning outcomes (LOs) for SFS education to define student learning through degree programs, design new programs, and evaluate and modify existing programs. New and established SFS programs are often fragmented over multiple academic departments which impedes the development of a coherent and holistic curriculum for approaching the complexity of food topics. Here, we address these needs through the co-creation of adaptable LOs for Baccalaureate degree-level SFS programs which are aligned to a SFS Signature Pedagogy and based on outcomes-based education toward contributing to a solid conceptual basis for SFS education. The SFS Signature Pedagogy is a framework that can be applied to develop students' systemic capacities, including holistic, and pluralistic ways of understanding sustainability challenges, multi-, inter- and trans-disciplinarity, experiential learning, and collective action projects. Our co-design of LOs was based on qualitative content analysis of existing LOs of established SFS programs, a cross-sectional survey with SFS educators and refinement of LOs from feedback in an expert panel. This process resulted in the eight adaptable LOs: (1) systems thinking, (2) critical reflection, (3) diverse ways of knowing, (4) practical application, (5) multi-context communication, (6) teamwork, (7) collective action, and, (8) advocacy for SFS. We anticipate the adaptable LOs proposed here to be applicable for diverse student communities and geographic respectively cultural contexts as well as to provide insight for sustainability-related academic programs toward developing professionals equipped with skills and capacities to address complex challenges.

Keywords: sustainable food systems professionals, curriculum development (education), curriculum assessment, collective action, systems thinking and application, co-design, outcome-based education (OBE), sustainable food systems education

INTRODUCTION

Overview of Sustainable Food Systems (SFS) Education

One of the greatest societal challenges of our times is to nourish a growing population with healthy food procured in ways that support environmental and human well-being (Tilman and Clark, 2014; Mason and Lang, 2017). While food nourishes us, food systems are a leading driver of environmental degradation (Meybeck and Gitz, 2017) and global change (Willett et al., 2019). Diet-related health conditions present one of the greatest global burdens of disease (Swinburn et al., 2019) and inequities persist from farm to table (Breggin and Myers, 2013). Several planetary boundaries of environmental thresholds recognized as safe operating spaces for humanity have already been crossed including a dramatic rate of biodiversity loss and notable changes to the global nitrogen cycle (Steffen et al., 2015). The environmental challenges associated with food systems are depleting the natural resource base upon which food and well-being depend (Foley et al., 2005; Francis et al., 2008; Gerber et al., 2013; Steffen et al., 2015). Malnutrition including obesity, undernutrition, and their coexistence, impacts every country and is a leading cause of death globally (Afshin et al., 2019). Concurrently, interacting political, market, and population factors create inequity and other food justice issues (Breggin and Myers, 2013). Climate change exacerbates these food system challenges (Willett et al., 2019). Addressing the complexity of these interconnected challenges requires engaged professionals equipped with skills beyond conventional disciplinary training in food, nutrition, and agriculture, which often approach each issue separately (Valley et al., 2018). Additionally, food system studies take into account the unique relationship between food and the human experience from a variety of perspectives lending an interdisciplinary aspect to this field that differs from more disciplinary approaches taken by food-related areas of study (Almerico, 2014).

In response to societal demand for more interdisciplinary programs, higher education institutions, including private and public colleges, universities, and polytechnics, are increasingly offering sustainable food systems (SFS) and similar degree programs. However, despite the need for enhanced interdisciplinarity in programs and classes, many courses of interdisciplinary programs remain housed in traditionally defined disciplinary departments (Cargill, 2005). In addition, there is often an expectation of faculty to develop new courses and programs that are interdisciplinary with little institutional resources or support. This lack of resource support for the design of interdisciplinary programs and courses contributes to structural and economic “siloeing” of SFS and similar programs, which precludes the creation of programs that facilitate education across disciplines (Hamada et al., 2015). To overcome resource limitations as well as to strengthen the field of SFS education based on a solid conceptual basis, collaborations across SFS programs to develop curriculum is critical.

While differing in their curriculum, SFS programs are characterized by an underlying conceptual framework to build students’ systemic capacities that complement disciplinary

training in food and agriculture topics (Jordan et al., 2014). These systemic capacities include deep reflection, rich observation and model-making, future visioning and design, and responsible participation (Jordan et al., 2014). More recently, a SFS Education Signature Pedagogy (SFSESP) has been identified to advance SFS education by providing a guiding framework to develop and evaluate curriculum of SFS programs (Valley et al., 2018).

To transform frameworks such as the SFSESP into curricula that meet societal and professional needs, outcome-based education (OBE) has been advanced over the past five decades (Harden, 2001, 2002). The establishment of clearly articulated program learning outcomes (LOs) is an essential requirement for OBE (Spady, 1994). While LOs presently exist in numerous SFS programs, they differ in number, approach, emphasis, and style (see **Appendix 1** for examples). It is also unclear to what extent these LOs align with the SFSESP, especially since most programs evolved independently from this framework. Thus, we identified the need for LOs aligned to the SFSESP as building blocks for the development and assessment of SFS curricula. The purpose of this paper is to draw from an OBE model to co-design and propose a set of LOs for Baccalaureate degree-level SFS programs aligned to the SFSESP that can be adopted and modified in diverse educational and institutional contexts. The LOs presented here are intended to be adaptable to diverse geographic and cultural contexts and for akin programs including Food Networks, Urban Food Systems, Ocean Food Systems, Food Studies, Sustainable Food and Farming, Agricultural and Food Systems, certain Agroecology programs, Community Food Systems, Sustainable Community Development, Indigenous Food-Energy-Water Systems, Eco-Gastronomy, certain Nutrition, Gastronomy, and Food Culture programs, Food Systems Management, Food Security, Food Sovereignty, Hunger Studies, as well as several Environmental, and Sustainability Studies programs.

The co-design of adaptable LOs for SFS undergraduate curricula was led by faculty ($n = 6$) and staff ($n = 3$) of three SFS programs in North America (Montana State University, University of Minnesota, and University of British Columbia). It proceeded in the following steps: a qualitative content analysis of the LOs of selected SFS programs; a survey on SFS LOs with SFS educators; and an internal review panel ($n = 8$) for the final refinement of the LOs aligned to the SFSESP.

Sustainable Food Systems Signature Pedagogy

A signature pedagogy serves as a framework in which future practitioners of a specific field are educated for their profession (Shulman, 2005; Gurung et al., 2009). It is applied across higher education institutions to align programs based on philosophies of education such as experiential and social constructivist learning (Kolb, 1984; Palincsar, 1998), and more specifically Lieblein et al. (2007) dual learning ladder toward responsible action and transformative food systems education (Galt et al., 2013), teaching practices, and LOs. Educators and students can benefit from a clearly articulated signature pedagogy of a specific field by understanding its pedagogical foundations

as well as accepted methodological approaches for developing professional capacities (Valley et al., 2018). A leading framework for organizing a signature pedagogy is based on three structural levels: (1) surface structure of visible operational acts of teaching and learning; (2) deep structure of the essential theories, concepts, and capacities for professional practice in a field, and (3) the implicit structure, comprising the set of professional attitudes, values, and dispositions of a field (Shulman, 2005).

The SFS Signature Pedagogy was developed by SFS educators from four different institutions in the US and Canada and first presented to the public in 2017 in the journal article “An emerging signature pedagogy for sustainable food systems education” (Valley et al., 2018). The article has been cited 33 times between March 2017 and July 2020. The framework was also presented at five scholarly conferences since 2017. Each component of the SFSESP exists at one of the three structural levels of a signature pedagogy (Shulman, 2005) and interacts with each other. The surface level of learning contexts and activities of the SFS Signature Pedagogy caters to multiple learning styles essential for designing inclusive curriculum which accounts for students’ educational, cultural, and social background and experience (Smith, 2002). This includes contexts from classrooms to laboratory and community settings, and from individual assignments to co-producing solutions. This range of context and activities provides opportunities for students to adapt to different settings.

The deep structure of the SFS Signature Pedagogy proposed by Valley et al. (2018) consists of four principal elements:

1. Pedagogy of systemic thinking: to develop the ability to understand food systems through holistic and pluralistic approaches. Systemic thinking requires the capacity to identify the boundaries, components, and interactions within a system, as well as how different stakeholders value, define, and experience systems.
2. Pedagogy of experiential learning: to build a particular form of professionalism, here defined as capacities for thought, performance, and action with integrity (Shulman, 2005). This pedagogy is primarily based on experiential learning that features integrated engagement of “heart, head, and hands”; this 3-fold integration of engagement is considered essential to building capacity for thought and action with integrity in ethical and moral terms.
3. Pedagogy of multi-, inter-, and trans-disciplinary learning: to develop capacities to participate in the process of understanding complex situations with diverse academic stakeholders and other social actors in the food system.
4. Pedagogy of open-ended case inquiry: to develop the capacity for dealing with the uncertainty and dynamism that are characteristic of complex issues and opportunities in SFS. In particular, such inquiry aims to develop one of the most crucial aspects of SFS professionalism, namely, the ability to make judgments under uncertainty.

The implicit structure of the SFS Signature Pedagogy consists of three elements:

1. Collective Action: acknowledging the limitations of singular, uncoordinated efforts to instigate systemic change in a complex system.
2. Critical Reflection: requiring a habit of mind that recognizes historical and current power differentials within society and their resulting uneven distribution of benefits and harms related to food systems.
3. Seeking Balance: recognizing the tensions and trade-offs inherent to any intervention in a complex system, and being mindful of the potential negative consequences associated with maximizing for any one outcome in food systems (Valley et al., 2018).

Outcome-Based Education

Outcome-based Education (OBE) develops a curriculum around an explicit set of program learning outcomes (LOs) identified as critical for all students to achieve by the end of their experiences in a program (Spady, 1994; Harden, 2002). Prior to the emergence of OBE, statements regarding students’ learning expectations were generally not included in program documents. Early proponents of OBE in higher education were in the medical field and argued that language clarifying student learning expectations is a catalyst to keep up with changing societal needs (Jessup, 2002). As a learning-centered curriculum approach, OBE focuses on what students know and can do, as compared to a teacher-centered model emphasizing what is presented (Tam, 2014). By aligning courses with clearly stated measurable LOs, OBE improves curriculum consistency and strengthens curriculum accountability (Spady, 1994).

Program LOs are fundamental for OBE. Some authors define them as what students know, are able to do, or are like after college education as a result of specific teaching and learning experiences (Killen, 2000; Tam, 2014). Contemporary definitions emphasize that LOs should be precise and measurable and achievable for all students during college (Spady, 1994; Hartel and Foegeding, 2004). The most frequently used definition is Spady (1994), who defines LOs as “the ability to demonstrate learning that matters.” Accordingly, LOs (framed using action verbs) are not values, beliefs, or states of mind, neither approaches, means, strategies, or processes but skills, knowledge and professional attitudes. Educators can apply LOs to guide curriculum mapping, curriculum design, instruction, and assessment (Spady, 1994; Harden, 2002; Hartel and Foegeding, 2004; Frank and Danoff, 2007). Proponents of OBE highlight that the use of LOs provides students and the professional sector transparent and clear expectations about a program (Harden, 2002; Tam, 2014).

There is sometimes confusion between the term LO and the partially overlapping (depending on the school of thought and authors of each framework) concepts of learning objectives and student competencies. Hartel and Foegeding (2004) clarify that learning objectives are general statements about the larger goals of a course or program, while LOs describe specific student skills. Competencies are statements that broadly indicate the desired skills of students after graduating. Different from PLOs, competencies are acquired by students or graduates, rather than by the program and its instructors (Morcke et al., 2013).

Although there are underlying differences between outcome- and competency-based education frameworks, when referring to the point of graduation, similar descriptors can be used for LOs and competencies (Cumming et al., 2007), although achieving a single competency may require a graduate to meet several LOs. The organic incorporation of the SFSESP in SFS curricula we expect from the use of LOs would also be accomplishable using a competency-based education framework. We opted for OBE as a vehicle to implement the SFSESP because it is currently more common in higher education curriculum design and assessment than competency-based approaches.

While various SFS programs have developed LOs (Appendix 1), implementable LOs are needed to provide foundational building blocks for the improvement of existing SFS programs and for allowing new programs to have a foundation from which to draw. A set of shared and adaptable LOs contributes to strengthening the way SFS curriculum is developed and assessed. Clearly defined LOs also allow employers and food system stakeholders to better understand the attitudes, skills, and knowledge of a growing professional workforce with a SFS degree.

METHODS

We developed the adaptable LOs for sustainable food systems (SFS) undergraduate curricula in three steps: (1) qualitative content analysis of the LOs of selected SFS programs, (2) cross-sectional online surveying of SFS education experts (faculty and graduate students), and (3) final framing of adaptable LOs based on an expert panel and iteration.

Content Analysis of SFS Program Learning Outcomes

We analyzed the LOs of undergraduate SFS programs in the U.S. and Canada which were selected on the basis of the following criteria: (1) the program name includes the term “food systems”; (2) SFS is available as a major or minor at undergraduate (BSc or equivalent) level; (3) the program has explicit LOs framed in the context of outcomes-based education (Spady, 1994), (4) the LOs are published by the respective institution. A total of 43 undergraduate SFS programs were evaluated for the aforementioned criteria and the following five programs were selected as they best met this existence of published LOs in OBE style.

- Sustainable Food and Bioenergy Systems, Montana State University
- Food Systems, University of Minnesota Twin Cities
- Land and Food Systems, University of British Columbia
- Sustainable Agriculture and Food Systems, University of California Davis
- Sustainable Agriculture and Food Systems, University of Rhode Island

For the five selected SFS undergraduate programs, we carried out a content analysis of the published LOs to identify the skills, knowledge, and attitudes that students are expected to acquire

and develop during their degree programs (Kuckartz, 2014). While we used a qualitative approach to content analysis, we quantified the results of this analysis including the prevalence of specific themes. Our content analysis was led by the following research question: *What are common and overlapping student skills, attitudes, and knowledge determination relevant to the students' ability to examine and address complex food systems challenges in undergraduate sustainable food systems program Learning Outcomes?* The coding process was facilitated by the qualitative software NVivo 12 and conducted in two steps: (1) An initial directed content analysis based on predetermined key variables as preliminary coding categories, and (2) a refined analysis using coding themes that emerged during the first step (Leech and Onwuegbuzie, 2011; Saldaña, 2015). In both steps, we split the LOs into meaning units (Kuckartz, 2014) and coded each unit. Occasionally, one meaning unit was coded to multiple themes.

The coding scheme for the initial process consisted of the four deep and three implicit components of the SFSESP (see Introduction). Any content that could not be categorized with the initial scheme was categorized as “Other.” We calculated the frequency of meaning units as a percentage of total meaning units to identify extensive or underrepresented codes (Appendix 2).

In the second step, we grouped meaning units into categories and coded them along these categories. “Collective action” and “Critical reflection” were identified as extensive categories, and we established subcategories. “Self-reflection” was considered underrepresented and became a subcategory of “Critical reflection.” The category “Open-ended case inquiry” was renamed to “Food system assessment.” The same occurred with “Experiential learning” which was renamed to “Practical skills.” We merged the categories “Food system assessment” and “Collective action” under the title “Civic engagement” since they shared over 30% of meaning units. The remaining uncategorized meaning units were coded to determine whether they represented a new category or subcategory of one already existing code. They were divided into “Communication skills” (two subcategories), “Attitudes,” and “Knowledge.” After coding, we identified 46 condensed meaning units grouped into eight categories, three of which were divided into subcategories. Six categories were related to skills, one to knowledge, and one to attitudes (Appendix 3).

Surveys to Identify Priority Adaptable SFS Program Learning Outcomes

We conducted surveys with SFS educators in Canada and the United States to identify priority LOs for SFS undergraduate programs. The surveyed educators have disciplinary and interdisciplinary expertise in various aspects of SFS and in interacting with stakeholders. A cross-sectional online survey was administered in two steps. First, educators associated with a SFS education project led by members of this paper were surveyed ($n = 31$; 25 faculty, 1 post-doc, and 5 graduate students; 28 responses). Second, we reached out to experienced SFS instructors outside the project-scope, teaching at 14 different institutes of higher education in North America ($n = 37$; all faculty; 17 responses). The survey responses were voluntary and

anonymous. Upon completion, a \$15 gift card was provided as an incentive for participation in the survey that was provided to educators outside of the project team.

For the questionnaire, all 46 meaning units obtained in the content analysis were framed as LOs. Their style was aligned to the recommendation of Hartel and Foegeding (2004), meeting the criteria of being specific, measurable, achievable for all students, realistic, and time-bound. In our understanding, specific and measurable mean that LOs are assessable and provide a guideline for the development of assignments to objectively measure the students' mastering of these LOs. Consequently, our LOs involve skills expressed by an action verb such as "demonstrates" or "analyzes." We avoid verbs like "understands" or "appreciates," which could not be objectively assessed. We intended to be as specific as possible with the framing of our LOs given the interdisciplinary nature of SFSE. "Achievable for all students" means for us that meeting a certain LO does not privilege a specific group of students or discriminate against another one. Finally, "realistic" and "time-bound" LOs are, in our understanding, achievable based on what a SFS curriculum offers to students and the regular duration of the respective program. Thus, mastering a LO refers to what can be expected from an undergraduate student after graduation. It does not mean perfection.

All LO suggestions in our surveys began with "Upon graduating, students will be able to," followed by an action verb. For example, the meaning unit "Systems approach" was framed "Analyze complex problems using a systems approach." On three occasions, one meaning unit was presented in optional versions differing in terms of style and emphasis. The questionnaire involved multiple-choice questions and a Likert-scale ranking. In the latter section, participants were asked to rate the significance of each LO on a scale from 0 (not relevant for SFS curricula) to 10 (indispensable). The multiple-choice questions served to select one prevailing theme per LO. Therefore, the categories and subcategories from the qualitative analysis were converted into survey questions and the corresponding meaning units were the choice options. Example:

Question: "Please select the most appropriate framing of a learning outcome about systems thinking!"

- Answer (Option 1): "The student analyzes complex problems using a systems approach."
- Answer (Option 2): "Using a systems approach, the student compares and assesses alternative models for food system change."

Final Framing of Adaptable Program Learning Outcomes

In this step, an internal project panel comprised of eight instructors in the fields of SFS, education, agriculture, food, and nutrition, all authors of this article, interpreted the survey results, selecting those options with the highest approval rate and synthesizing certain content where the approval for different options was equal. The panel framed the final set of LOs as building blocks for the substantial systemic capacities that we hope our graduates will develop. This occurred through

a focus-group workshop followed by a series of iteration through correspondence and conference calls. In this context, we integrated the LOs "Food system assessment" into "Collective action," "Self-reflection" into "Critical reflection." We renamed "Research skills" to "Diverse ways of knowing," "Communication skills" to "Multi-context communication," and "Professional attitude" to "Advocacy." Due to our emphasis on developing student skills such as collective action (Valley et al., 2018), we decided to process "Knowledge" as a requirement for achieving our LOs but to exclude it as an independent LO. We restructured the sequence of the LOs and shared a draft set of LOs with all project team members. After integrating their feedback, we determined the final set of adaptable LOs for SFS education. We assigned a short name to each LO and aligned the LOs to the deep and in implicit components of the SFSESP (Table 1).

RESULTS

Overview of Adaptable SFS Program Learning Outcomes

The final set of adaptable Sustainable Food System Program LOs derived from the study process involving content analysis, surveys of SFS education experts (see results in Appendix 4), and the final framing of adaptable LOs, is presented in Figure 1. In section Description of Individual Adaptable SFS Program Learning Outcomes, the eight LOs are described in detail focusing on their relevance for SFS programs along with teaching approaches and techniques for supporting these LOs (resumed in Table 1). For a detailed description of recommended pedagogical techniques and strategies for supporting our LOs, please see Appendix 5.

Description of Individual Adaptable SFS Program Learning Outcomes

LO 1 Analyze Food Systems Using a Transdisciplinary Approach Guided by Sustainability Principles

Analyzing and addressing the food challenges of our times requires systems thinking that takes into consideration all the parts, relationships, and interactions from food production to consumption and waste. Systems thinking is grounded in the principles of holism and pluralism (Valley et al., 2018) and draws from socio-ecological theory. Holism refers to a focus on the relationships and interactions between the components of a system to understand the whole as well as to consider the contextual factors that surround an issue or desired outcome. Pluralism refers to explicit engagement and valuing of multiple perspectives when characterizing a system (Reynolds and Holwell, 2010; Williams and Hummelbrunner, 2010). Food systems thinking further draws from a socio-ecological approach that examines the ecological, socio-economic, cultural, and human health dynamics pertaining to food (Ahmed et al., 2017, 2019; Mason and Lang, 2017; Ahmed and Byker Shanks, 2019). Food systems thinking is, therefore, transdisciplinary, involving what is between different disciplines, across, and beyond them. Its goal is the understanding of the present


TABLE 1 | Adaptable Program Learning Outcomes for Sustainable Food Systems Education, their alignment with the SFSESP Framework, and teaching activities for supporting these LOs.

Learning outcome #	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Short name	Systems thinking	Critical reflection	Diverse ways of knowing	Practical skills	Multi-context communication	Team skills	Collective action	Advocacy
Alignment with SFSESP level	Deep structure	Implicit structure	Deep structure	Deep structure	Deep structure	Deep structure	Implicit structure	Implicit structure
Closest alignment with SFSESP components	Systems thinking; Multi-, inter-, and trans-disciplinarity	Critical reflection; Seek balance	Multi-, inter-, and trans-disciplinarity; Open-ended case inquiry	Experiential learning	Multi-, inter-, and trans-disciplinarity; Experiential learning	Multi-, inter-, and trans-disciplinarity; Experiential learning	Collective action; Seek balance	Collective action
Suggested teaching activities (see Appendix 5 for details).	Case Studies; Concept Mapping; In-depth Multi-day Field Courses; Power Mapping; Rich Pictures	Case Studies; Concept Mapping; Critical Reading; Debates; Deep-learning Classroom Activities; In-depth Multi-day Field Courses; Interactive Group Techniques; Power Mapping; Rich Pictures; Student-centered Guest Lecturing	Case Studies; Conversational Method of Gathering Indigenou Knowledge; Debates; Farm-based Authentic Research Modules in Sustainability Sciences	Case Studies; Experiential Learning; Internships; Roleplays; Service Learning	Critical Reading; DEAL (Describe, Examine, Articulate Learning); Deep-learning Classroom Activities; Electronic Media Communication and Literacy Training; One-to-one Relational Meetings; Participatory Writing	Capstone Projects; Experiential Learning; Farm-based Authentic Research Modules in Sustainability Interactive Group Techniques; Internships; Public Narrative; Service-learning	Capstone Projects; Case Studies; Community-based participatory action research; Deep-learning Classroom Activities; Public Narrative; Service-learning	Capstone Projects; Community-based participatory action research; Community Arts Projects; Community-engaged Teaching and Learning; Power Mapping; Service-learning

world (Nicolescu, 2014). Also, systems thinking is not limited to Western scientific methods but informed by insights from the multiple perspectives and sensibilities of those affected by a food system (Klein, 2013). When analysis is guided by systems thinking, it reflects the multiple values and conceptions of sustainability, particularly its complex social dimensions related to equity, sovereignty, and justice (Bacon et al., 2012). We define such an analysis as a qualitative account of a food system (Moragues-Faus and Marceau, 2019), that portrays key elements, events, relationships, forces, ideas, and values in the food system in question.

Systems thinking is a means to understand a food-system situation broadly including its complexity and divergent perspectives of participants and their histories. Given the complex and “wicked” nature of food system problems, well-considered initiatives for food systems change must take a holistic view grounded in systems thinking as their point of departure or run risks of failure. “Wicked” problems are characterized by heterogeneity, non-linearity, interdependence, and self-organization (Finegood, 2011). As such, systems thinking considers how to collectively address complex food problems where the environment interacts with socio-economic, cultural, and human health factors in infinite permutations.

Although many analytical methods can be applied to investigate food systems in the classroom, few of these are explicitly transdisciplinary or reflective of the multiple dimensions of sustainability. Images and symbols, rather than verbal accounts, are often effective tools to depict the qualitative essence of a food system (Cadieux et al., 2016). In such a model, the account should describe the activities and agencies of both human and non-human actors and their interplay, and the essential dynamics and tensions that animate the food system situation, particularly as relating to sustainability challenges. The account should also be a “tale told in many voices,” to capture the divergent views of people that have different understandings and stakes in a situation. We advocate that by the end of their programs, students will be able to articulate transdisciplinarity via the use of visual representations of complex systems. For example, “rich pictures” (See Glossary in **Appendix 5** for further information) is a mechanism for learning about complex problems by drawing detailed representations of them (Avison et al., 1992). Inventories such as concept or power maps (Glossary) also enhance systems thinking. Socio-environmental case studies (Glossary) are an excellent way to apply systems thinking in real scenarios.



LO 2 Critically Reflect on Interactions Between Worldviews and Power Relations in Food Systems, Recognizing One's Positionality, and Learning Processes

While LO 1 is about how information is processed in SFSE, LO 2 deals with the nature and the use of this information. We consider critical reflection as a skill that allows students to develop reasoned solutions to complex problems when the needed information and evidence are unavailable, or when there is no one single resolution, a characteristic of most food systems issues (Perry et al., 2018). Further, critical reflection requires developing a habit of mind that continuously questioning one's taken-for-granted assumptions and beliefs, one's positionality, and their cumulative impact on what one values and how one acts. Further, critical reflection requires an outward orientation toward recognizing and questioning external power relations in food systems and their influence on distribution, representation, and recognition. We draw upon Mezirow (2000, 2003) transformative learning theory as an essential building block for developing an understanding of the nature of reason and associated methods, logic. Considering the social dimension of learning, we agree with Kreber (2006) that reflection must be responsive to broad social and cultural imperatives to allow critical reflection leading to action. Furthermore, we underpin our understanding of critical reflection on Andreotti et al. (2018) framing of problematic and harmful patterns of hegemony, ethnocentrism, ahistoricism, depoliticization, salvationism, uncomplicated solutions, and

paternalism that permeate the food system and society broadly (Allen et al., 2003; Born and Purcell, 2006; Levkoe et al., 2016).

Critical reflection is related to the process of learning and embodies the ability not only to know content, but also to understand that knowledge is both socially constructed (and consequently strongly influenced by power relations in- and outside the food systems), and based on one's own experiences and assumptions (Lieblein et al., 2004; Roy et al., 2019). When students understand how their socioeconomic status, experiences, and (cultural, religious, and family) backgrounds shape their learning, they are better equipped to think critically and arrive at thoughtful solutions to sustainability issues.

The capacity of students to bring about positive food systems change is hinged on the depth of their ability to apply critical reflection skills following, and during, their education. Historically, most SFS academic and degree programs in the U.S. have arisen out of production-based programs such as agronomy, horticulture, or plant science. Yet the food systems issues addressed in these programs are larger in their scope, context, and stakeholder base, requiring students to learn across multiple disciplines. Most importantly, for students to be engaged in effective collective action, they must have the right tools in their toolbox and know how to select or modify these heuristics. When faced with a new issue or problem, the exploration of multiple perspectives, ways of knowing, and their assumptions, will result in more effective outcomes. Critical reflection skills help students sort through multiple perspectives and arrive at reasoned solutions that bring voices of all actors to the table. It encourages students to question how knowing occurs, where

knowledge and power reside as well as how knowledge is constructed and evaluated (Valley et al., 2018). Eventually, critical reflection is a requirement for shifting unequal power relations in the food system and the students' lives.

By the end of their programs, students should be able to validate their attainment of this LO via writing pieces that demonstrate reasoned and supported arguments for often divergent perspectives on an issue. In SFS education, rather than instructors conveying information through traditional lectures, readings, and discussions, it is common for them to instead serve as guides to help students understand the complexity of issues via structured interpretation and reflection on experiences and their learning process (Lieblein et al., 2004). Courses that involve action and participatory learning and that move beyond a lecture-in-the-field allow for the development of critical reflection skills through exposure to diverse viewpoints. Pedagogical strategies to enhance LO 2 include a wide range of community engagement activities such as in-depth multi-day field courses, service-learning, and power-mapping (See Glossary in **Appendix 5** for further information). Where community engagement is not possible, students can gain insights through case studies, debates, and student-centered guest lectures, diverse types of deep-learning classroom activities, interactive group techniques, and the subsequent integration of learned information in a "rich picture" or concept map (Glossary). Tools such as the DEAL model (Glossary) guide students through the process of critical reflection via writing. The "Iceberg Exercise," where students are encouraged to distinguish between the visual part of a complex problem, and its underlying roots (Crosby and Bryson, 2014) is an example of practicing and assessing both, LO 1 and LO 2.

LO 3 Apply Appropriate Methodologies Considering Diverse Ways of Knowing

Examining and making decisions with regards to the food system requires an evidence-based approach that considers diverse perspectives and synthesizes the totality of available knowledge sets. LO 3 is therefore, essential for SFS programs. It implies that students select an appropriate methodology for analyzing a determined problem, that this selection considers diverse ways of knowing (including those not based on Western science), and that the student is able to conduct this analysis based on the selected methodology. Specifically, diverse ways of knowing include academic, humanistic, and non-academic notions of "evidence" applied across the ecological, socio-economic, cultural, and human health dimensions of food systems. This approach requires the inclusion of perspectives at all levels of the food system from those involved in production, distribution, processing, packaging, consumption, and waste to those involved in associated education, healthcare, and policy (Valley et al., 2018). Conventional research is strongly underpinned by the epistemology of positivism. In conventional research, the application of appropriate methodologies encompasses the processes of inquiry, data collection, analysis, synthesis, and dissemination that facilitate problem-solving and critical thinking (Ritchie and Rigano, 1996). However, SFS programs facilitate research approaches tailored to the needs and interests of stakeholders of a food system that include, but

go beyond, classical academic methods. For example, drawing from indigenous paradigms, appropriate methodologies further relate to the set of beliefs and ethics, that guide action and relationships including the way knowledge is acquired and information is presented (Wilson, 2001). Methodologies that consider diverse ways of knowing can be qualitative, quantitative, participatory, or mixed methods, and include, but are not limited to, experiments and trials, surveys and questionnaires, interviews, case studies, participant observation, conversation, ceremony, and storytelling (Wilson, 2009; Kovach, 2010; Creswell and Creswell, 2017). Activities that directly teach students research methodologies have been shown to foster intellectual and professional development including scientific literacy skills, career interest, and self-confidence (Hunter et al., 2007; Derting and Ebert-May, 2010; Brownell et al., 2015; Staub et al., 2016).

Independent from the diverse knowledge sets available and appropriate for analyzing a specific food system, we encourage students to apply an evidence-based approach to decide about possible interventions. By taking into account the totality of available evidence from diverse sources and types of information, food system leaders can more effectively design solutions that support sustainability while considering trade-offs with minimal unintended consequences (Stoy et al., 2018). Also, an evidence-based approach calls for students to consider their positionality, implicit biases, and preconceived assumptions as expressed in LO 2. Activities that may increase self-awareness and positionality can arise from collective processes of learning that engage with diverse ways of knowing (Tochon, 2010; Anderson et al., 2019b). Consequently, students may be more disposed to support and work toward decolonizing the food system. Decolonizing the food system points to the contemporary food system crisis arising from a globalized, modern-industrial food system built upon the hegemony of anthropocentric, imperialist, Euro/Western-centric, capitalist, and modernist ontologies, and refers to 'commons-based alternatives often rooted in non-anthropocentric cosmologies, agroecological farming methods, less androcentric land-tenure, and generally congenial relations to non-human nature (International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development, 2009; Figueroa-Helland et al., 2018). As multiple scholars call for education to directly address its complicity with maintaining the food system (Napier, 2010; Meek and Tarlau, 2016; Anderson et al., 2019b) contends that experiences with otherness provide new paradigms for living and science.

It is expected that exposing SFS students to such new paradigms for living and science, their capacity to assess food system challenges and to develop concerted solutions increases. Curriculum activities about applying appropriate research methodologies require educators to critically analyze the ways in which they prepare students to ask questions, think across disciplines, test possible solutions, collaborate with a diverse range of stakeholders, facilitate community engagement, and synthesize evidence (Ahmed et al., 2017). The premise is a critical self-reflection of the instructors on their own positionality, which should be shared with the students. To sensitize students on the impact of epistemology on research results and the subjectivity of evidence, having students performing research using theoretical

lenses with different epistemologies (for example, positivism, political economy, and feminism) in their fieldwork can be a powerful experience (Galt et al., 2013). Primary research in the undergraduate classroom (Hunter et al., 2007; Derting and Ebert-May, 2010; Brownell et al., 2015; Linn et al., 2015; Ahmed et al., 2017) is a typical way to train students to apply appropriate methodologies. For example, Farm-based Authentic Research Modules in Sustainability Sciences or FARMS (See Glossary in **Appendix 5** for further information) incorporates primary research into course curricula based on input from diverse local agricultural stakeholders (Ahmed et al., 2017). Another curriculum activity to train the selection and application of appropriate research methodologies is to guide students to employ ethnographic techniques such as participant observation and the conversational method of gathering knowledge built upon an indigenous relational tradition (Glossary) (Kovach, 2010). Socio-environmental case studies and debates (Glossary) that facilitate students to reflect on their positionality and that of food system stakeholders are further curriculum activities to support LO 3.

LO 4 Demonstrate Practical Skills in the Food System Based on Sustainability Principles

Understanding food, from production to consumption, and the actors involved in the system requires the development of diverse practical skills, which are developed through hands-on approaches to deepen knowledge or solve problems within the food system. Students in SFS programs must be able to draw upon skills from multiple disciplines including food, agriculture, natural resources, and human sciences (Clark et al., 2013; Hilimire et al., 2014) to better understand the logistical aspects of those dimensions. Given the magnitude of practical skills required from food system professionals, SFS students cannot achieve proficiency in all potential sectors. A balanced SFS program should provide insight into diverse activities such as farming, culinary, processing, nutrition education, application of the scientific method, lab-based skills, and indigenous ways of knowing to research, policy advocacy, entrepreneurship, management, leadership, and communication. Existing SFS programs have faced challenges in structuring curricula that address such activities while offering students a feasible graduation timeframe.

Developing practical skills is essential to answer questions and solve real-world problems related to the interconnected challenges of changing environmental, social, economic, and health conditions in SFS. Students particularly need to critically engage with practical skills to know when to apply specific skills to certain issues or problems to support the economic, environmental, and social components of sustainability (Parr et al., 2007; Clark et al., 2011). For example, students can hold romantic or naïve assumptions regarding food production. Through immersion in farming activities such as planting, weeding, harvesting, and selling, students may contextualize alternative farming practices to their unique challenges and opportunities. Given that SFS require a multitude of practical skills, students need to know how to draw upon other resources to gain skills they do not already possess. Immersive experiences

allow students to move beyond forming ideals to embodied experience where they can better understand decisions in the food systems from a logistical perspective. Experiential learning (See Glossary in **Appendix 5** for further information) provides a framework for students to practice skill-building (Lieblein et al., 2004; Parr and Trexler, 2011). These experiences are typically external but can be introduced in classroom settings, for example, in the form of problem-based case studies or roleplays (Glossary). Ideally, experiential learning also means interacting with and learning from professionals in the respective areas as in the case of internships (Glossary).

LO 5 Communicate Effectively in Oral, Written, and Visual Formats Across Multiple Contexts

Oral, written, and visual communication skills are essential for most undergraduate programs. More unique to SFS programs is the ability to effectively communicate ideas clearly and concisely using multiple modalities in cross-cultural contexts to diverse, both professional and lay, audiences. It is not enough to simply have an idea to transform food systems—one must be able to effectively communicate ideas to varied audiences across contexts for knowledge dissemination, debate, and to stimulate change or action (van Ginkel et al., 2015). This means that SFS students should be able to articulate or present food system issues clearly and in a way that is appropriate for the respective target audience. Depending on what is communicated, the process of writing, speaking, and creating visual representations always fosters one or more of the other LOs (Trumbo, 1999; Prain and Hand, 2016).

Effective oral, written, and visual communication skills are critical for a SFS workforce who has the capacity to effect change including through mobilizing stakeholders in the food system (Trumbo, 1999; Chan, 2011; van Ginkel et al., 2015). The development of communication skills should be emphasized in SFS programs to demonstrate the achievement of other LOs and competencies such as systems thinking and critical analysis [5]. Effective communication is further of relevance for training a SFS workforce capable of demonstrating leadership, stimulating action, and presenting a professional identity across different sectors of the food system as well as being capable to effectively share stories, build relationships, and synthesize feedback from stakeholders (Nisbet and Scheufele, 2009; Reynolds et al., 2012). SFS curriculum should include activities designed to allow students to learn a variety of communication strategies (Menary, 2007; Reynolds et al., 2012; Prain and Hand, 2016). To obtain feedback and rework a communication product, as it happens in the professional world, these products can be integrated across multiple courses.

Curriculum activities for deepening knowledge through communication include written service-learning reflections that use tools such as DEAL, which stands for Describe, Examine, and Articulate Learning (See Glossary in **Appendix 5** for further information). Student-led presentations and discussions on critical readings and One-to-one Relational Meetings (Glossary) are other impactful communication activities. In addition to traditional improvement of multi-context communication practices such as poster presentations and deep-learning classroom activities, assignments for co-producing knowledge

(for example, participatory writing, see Glossary) are especially beneficial for SFS students to learn how to communicate effectively in multiple contexts. Finally, in an expanding age of online media, electronic media communication, and literacy training (Glossary) is essential.

LO 6 Collaborate and Demonstrate Leadership Skills and Professionalism as Inclusive Members of Diverse Teams

SFS students need to have the ability to collaborate and demonstrate leadership skills and professionalism as inclusive members of diverse teams given the collaborative nature of SFS work, combined with an increasingly team-based workplace across most sectors (Britton et al., 2017). Solutions to complex challenges in the food system necessitate a collective action approach that addresses a given problem from a variety of vantage points that include diverse perspectives drawing from different academic fields and sectors of society. Valley et al. (2018), define collective action as “a theme demonstrated when students are empowered and motivated to act together to achieve a common objective, address critical societal issues and contribute to the public good.” In a recent study, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) reported that 71% of surveyed employers identified “teamwork skills and the ability to collaborate with others in diverse group settings” as a LO that needs more attention in higher education (Hart Research Associates, 2009).

Addressing food system problems often involves team collaboration across a variety of food system sectors. Team skills involve the capacity to determine with whom to collaborate to achieve specific goals (Hurlbert and Gupta, 2015). They also include many interrelated behaviors and attitudes related to leadership, facilitation, professionalism, work ethic, clear communication, agency, and engagement. The development of effective team skills is especially important for engaging in collective action, which inherently brings together diverse groups around a common goal [7].

Students of SFS programs have the opportunity to develop and hone team skills through many curricular avenues including campus farm experiences, off-campus internships, place-based research projects such as FARMS, community engagement opportunities, different kinds of experiential learning, interactive group techniques, public narratives, and capstone projects (See Glossary in **Appendix 5** for further information). While assessing individual teamwork skills is challenging, improvement in the assessment of this LO is important so that these skills can be refined and improved throughout the undergraduate curriculum. Impactful collective action requires SFS students to show solidarity both within their team and with the stakeholders they are serving. Teamwork (LO 6) is, therefore, a premise for achieving LO 7.

LO 7 Co-design, Implement, and Assess Food System Solutions Across Scales

The complexity and uncertainty inherent to work within food systems result in professional practice that requires skills in project management and collaboration, as well as experience in

diverse processes of inquiry and the habit of critically reflecting on project outcomes. This LO relates to the collective action component of the implicit level of the SFSESP, where students are empowered and motivated to act together to achieve a common objective, address critical societal issues and contribute to the public good (Valley et al., 2018).

The LO draws upon elements of the previous six LOs but adds applied uses of these skills, namely solution (project) design, implementation, and assessment. At the outset, co-designing projects to address sustainability requires a systems approach to help identify scale and boundaries, specific components of the system under investigation and their interactions, as well as an understanding of the diverse stakeholders involved and the power dynamics that enhance or limit the achievement of equitable outcomes for all. Background in areas such as risk assessment, life-cycle assessment, benefit-cost analysis, ecosystem-services valuation, integrated assessment models, sustainable impact assessment, present and future scenario tools, food justice, and food legislation helps student deepen their food system assessment capacity. Students may apply these tools in a real-world case study. To implement a project in the food system, students will need to draw upon context-specific methodologies, communicate effectively within transdisciplinary, collaborative settings, and develop indicators to determine if their efforts reached their intended project goals. Efforts toward reaching LO 7 relates to Spiro (1988) cognitive flexibility theory, which promotes multiple representations of concepts and cases across ill-structured or complex knowledge domains while simultaneously fostering learners' ability to evaluate diverse knowledge sources. To develop cognitive flexibility to address complexity, students in SFS programs will need to practice working on projects at different scales, with different collaborators, and on different topics.

Collective action projects are inherently team-based to allow learners to practice their organizing, communication, and project development skills within the student group, between the student group and the organization or community partner, and between the student group and the broader class/teaching team. By the time a student completes their SFS program, they should be able to identify a wide range of actors and team members who they recommend should be involved in solution development. Common curricular activities that allow students to demonstrate growth and mastery in collective action are community-based participatory action research and other collaborative projects, service learning, as well as case studies and interdisciplinary capstone projects (See Glossary in **Appendix 5** for further information). In the classroom, diverse deep-learning classroom activities and practicing public narratives (Glossary) help train collective action skills.

LO 8 Advocate for Enhanced Environmental, Social, and Economic Sustainability in Food Systems

Advocacy refers here to voicing conceptions or understandings of necessary changes in food systems, based on a values-based perspective. For example, it might entail defense of interests of groups of excluded or disenfranchised people, or efforts to defend against a wide range of abuses of public power or social

exclusion beyond strictly legal problems (Fox, 2001). Advocacy encompasses a wide range of tools, tactics, and techniques to influence the setting and implementation of policies, guidelines, laws, regulations, and other decisions that affect people's lives (Brinsden and Lang, 2015). In our understanding, advocacy must be balanced with appreciation, which refers to interactions that aim to produce mutual understanding and affinity among potential allies in efforts to advance sustainability in food systems. These interactions entail intentional and skilled inquiry to build mutual understanding about the worldview (i.e., beliefs, values, behaviors) and capacities of potential partners in collective action (Cooperider and Whitney, 2005). Potential outcomes in students include the discovery of unexpected alignments of interests and underlying values, careful and sympathetic consideration of other's views and motivations, and recognition of opportunities to exert power through collective action.

This LO is aimed to prepare students to engage in values-based deliberation about sustainability in food systems, understood as a triple bottom-line conception considering social well-being, environmental protection, and economic viability (Rogers and Ryan, 2001). As noted in Valley et al. (2020), equity-related competencies such as food justice practice (Cadieux and Slocum, 2015; Meek and Tarlau, 2016) are essential, core elements in SFS required for learners to understand and enact change in food systems (Meek and Tarlau, 2016; Anderson et al., 2019a). Future food system professionals will need to address situations in which all three aspects of sustainability must be considered and advanced, e.g., transitioning from carbon-intensive agri-food systems (Marsden, 2013), working to address food system inequities (Galt, 2013; Cadieux and Slocum, 2015), and building food sovereignty (Meek et al., 2019) while dealing with power relations across relevant scales (Cadieux and Slocum, 2015).

Students will demonstrate their ability to achieve this outcome by creating objects that record and reflect advocacy and appreciation as these have operated in values-based dialogue about environmental, social, and economic sustainability in food systems. Such dialogue can occur through participation in collective action projects, in one-to-one relational meetings, civic deliberation arenas, civic arts such as community theater, community-engaged teaching and learning, or community-based research efforts in a capstone course (See Glossary in **Appendix 5** for further information). Objects that record and reflect these processes can take the form of reflective statements that both capture the essentials of a student's advocacy (i.e., what is advocated, and why and how?), and the essential viewpoints of others involved in the situation, as understood by the student. Non-verbal media could be used to express the dualistic "both/and" understanding that is inherent to this LO.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The complex and interconnected challenges of food systems require professionals capable of thinking beyond disciplinary boundaries and acting collaboratively with diverse stakeholders in ways that are impactful in positively transforming society toward advancing sustainability. Within the last 15 years, an increasing amount of higher education institutions has developed sustainable food systems (SFS) undergraduate degree programs

to create and train a professional workforce equipped with the skills and capacities to address food systems challenges. Here, SFS educators from three institutions in North America (Montana State University, the University of Minnesota, and the University of British Columbia) apply their experiences coupled with other SFS educators toward the co-design of adaptable program learning outcomes (LOs) aligned to the SFS Signature Pedagogy (Valley et al., 2018).

Our effort for co-designing adaptable LOs was driven by our joint desire to advance the field of SFS through contributing to a solid conceptual basis for SFS education toward the development of a professional food systems workforce. This effort was further driven by our concerns for the environmental, social, economic, and human health challenges of contemporary food systems and, the need to increase the societal impact of SFS education toward addressing these concerns. We contend that critical to enhancing the field of SFS is a solid conceptual basis of SFS education that overcomes the resource and institutional challenges including departmental and disciplinary silos that impede interdisciplinarity.

The eight LOs presented here comprise of the basic set of skills and attitudes that graduates of baccalaureate-level SFS degree programs are expected to have developed upon graduation. It is expected that our program LOs can be used to assess students' ability to meet these LOs. They will also serve as measurable parameters to evaluate the effectiveness of diverse programs in facilitating the students' achievement of these outcomes. Our adaptable LOs built on previous work led by the study team authors, including extensive interactions with food system stakeholders to understand the needs of a professional workforce as well as the conceptually underlying SFSESP framework (Valley et al., 2018). The framework promotes student skills including systems thinking, multi-, inter- and trans-disciplinarity, and critical reflection, and suggests pedagogical approaches to developing these skills such as experiential learning and open-ended case inquiries. The adaptable LOs represent a departure from positivist epistemology as the exclusive framework to develop curricula (still common in most institutions, including such which offer SFS programs) and offers a considerably different epistemology that values the social and cultural processes of knowing, teaching, and learning, fundamental to develop skills required from SFS professionals. All proposed LOs are skill- rather knowledge-based (**Table 1**). We understand broad SFS knowledge as a requirement for students to achieve our LOs. Thus, we did not detect the need to propose additional knowledge LOs about topics beyond what is necessary for meeting our LOs. Skill-based LOs are also stronger aligned with what is expected from SFS professionals.

The proposed LOs for SFS have resemblances to previously presented learning outcomes and objectives. For example, Ingram et al. (2020) presented a set of nine learning objectives of the Interdisciplinary Food Systems Teaching and Learning (IFSTAL) program in the United Kingdom for the development of a future workforce of food systems analysts. Common aspects of the learning objectives of the IFSTAL program with the SFS LOs presented here include a focus on systems thinking and analysis, pluralism, inter- and transdisciplinarity, and effective communication targeted at varied audiences. Likewise, especially

regarding interdisciplinarity, there is overlapping between our LOs and a Delphi survey that generated recommendations on what a Sustainable Agriculture and Food Systems major curriculum should include (Parr et al., 2007).

We believe the co-designed LOs presented here are adaptable to diverse socio-ecological contexts with diverse student communities, the various stakeholders that students will collaborate with, the range of fields of program instructors and their technical expertise, and the institutional background and geographic location in which SFS programs are implemented. Our eight LOs constitute a basic guideline to be adapted to the context-specificity of each institution rather than rigid standards. For example, while LO 4, focused on demonstrating practical skills, was found to be critical by survey respondents in some institutions, educators of other institutions may decide to not implement this LO because of its lower relevance to their program's context. Also, the LOs presented here can further be adapted in some educational contexts to be more progressive and radical to train a SFS workforce with the capacity to bring about substantive change to the food system (Holt-Giménez and Shattuck, 2011).

While our LOs refer to Baccalaureate degree-level SFS programs, they can be adapted for graduate-level SFS programs and courses. Also, while the LOs presented here were co-designed in a North American context with educators in Canada and the U.S., we believe they have applicability globally. International collaboration with educators and food system stakeholders will allow us to continue to refine the proposed LOs for diverse settings. These LOs represent a holistic ensemble of desirable student skills that interact, reinforce, and inform each other. Therefore, most of the pedagogical activities we suggest for deepening one LO simultaneously helps strengthen other LOs. For example, integrating open-ended case studies into our courses helps to strengthen systems thinking, critical reflection, diverse ways of knowing, and collective action skills within students.

We also emphasize the need to be realistic about what is to be expected from students during an undergraduate degree. Given the level of complexity required for achieving a LO such as systems thinking or collective action, the mastery or advanced proficiency of such a LO is to be seen within the context of what a student can accomplish during their time in an undergraduate degree. It is further important to recognize that the presented LOs need to remain dynamic and be revised in response to changing societal needs. We acknowledge that interactions with our students, food systems stakeholders, and other educators, along with our experiences teach us better than any conceptual paper with regards to student, workplace, and societal needs. Thus, we will continue engaging with our students, food systems stakeholders, and networks of educators to constantly improve our programs through an iterative process.

REFERENCES

Afshin, A., Sur, P. J., Fay, K. A., Cornaby, L., Ferrara, G., Salama, J. S., et al. (2019). Health effects of dietary risks in 195 countries, 1990–2017: a systematic

analysis for the Global burden of disease study 2017. *Lancet* 393, 1958–1972. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(19)30041-8

Ahmed, S., and Byker Shanks, C. (2019). "Supporting sustainable development goals through sustainable diets," in *Good Health and Well-Being*, eds W. Leal

As societal challenges, opportunities, and needs change, it is anticipated these adaptable LOs be revisited for SFS education to develop graduates best equipped to respond to current and emerging societal needs of feeding humanity in just ways that support planetary health.

SFS is such a new and complex science that teaching it can easily become an inconsistent activity which may include interesting courses but without developing a clear and precise skillset among our students. To avoid this scenario, a continuous discussion about desirable student skills in SFS is necessary. This paper serves as a basis for a long-lasting, deep, and exciting discussion about LOs for SFS education.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

All datasets generated for this study are included in the article/**Supplementary Material**.

ETHICS STATEMENT

The studies involving human participants were reviewed and approved by Montana State University Institutional Review Board. The patients/participants provided their written informed consent to participate in this study.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

SA, WV, NJ, JG, and RE led the study conception and design. RE led the acquisition of data and data analysis and developed the glossary. RE and SA led the drafting of the manuscript with contribution to writing and revising from all authors. All authors contributed to data interpretation.

FUNDING

This work was supported by the United States Department of Agriculture Higher Education Challenge (HEC) Grant, National Institute of Food and Agriculture (Award No: 2018-70003-27649).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank the students, colleagues, and food systems stakeholders who influenced our understanding of sustainable food systems education.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fsufs.2020.568743/full#supplementary-material>

- Filho, T. Wall, A. M. Azul, L. Brandli, and P. G. Özyur (Cham: Springer International Publishing), 1–13. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-69627-0_101-1
- Ahmed, S., Byker Shanks, C., Dupuis, V., and Pierre, M. (2019). “Advancing healthy and sustainable food environments: the flathead reservation case study,” in *UNSCN Nutrition 44*, eds C. Campeau, D. Costa, C. Delmuè, and S. Oenema (Rome: FAO), 38–45.
- Ahmed, S., Sclafani, A., Aquino, E., Kala, S., Barias, L., and Eeg, J. (2017). Building student capacity to lead sustainability transitions in the food system through farm-based authentic research modules in sustainability sciences (FARMS). *Elem. Sci. Anth.* 5:46. doi: 10.1525/elementa.239
- Allen, P., FitzSimmons, M., Goodman, M., and Warner, K. (2003). Shifting plates in the agrifood landscape: the tectonics of alternative agrifood initiatives in California. *J. Rural Stud.* 19, 61–75. doi: 10.1016/S0743-0167(02)0047-5
- Almerico, G. M. (2014). Food and identity: food studies, cultural, and personal identity. *J. Int. Business Cult. Stud.* 8:1. doi: 10.13140/RG.2.2.26973.05608
- Anderson, C. R., Binimelis, R., Pimbert, M., and Rivera-Ferre, M. (2019a). Introduction to the symposium on critical adult education in food movements: learning for transformation in and beyond food movements—the why, where, how and the what next? *Agric. Hum. Values* 36, 521–529. doi: 10.1007/s10460-019-09941-2
- Anderson, C. R., Maughan, C., and Pimbert, M. P. (2019b). Transformative agroecology learning in Europe: building consciousness, skills and collective capacity for food sovereignty. *Agric. Hum. Values* 36, 531–547. doi: 10.1007/s10460-018-9894-0
- Andreotti, V., Stein, S., Sutherland, A., Pashby, K., Susa, R., and Amsler, S. (2018). Mobilising different conversations about global justice in education: toward alternative futures in uncertain times. *Policy Prac. Develop. Educ. Rev.* 26, 9–41.
- Avison, D. E., Golder, P. A., and Shah, H. U. (1992). Towards an SSM toolkit: rich picture diagramming. *Eur. J. Inform. Syst.* 1, 397–408. doi: 10.1057/ejis.1992.17
- Bacon, C. M., Getz, C., Kraus, S., Montenegro, M., and Holland, K. (2012). The social dimensions of sustainability and change in diversified farming systems. *Ecol. Soc.* 17:41. doi: 10.5751/ES-05226-170441
- Born, B., and Purcell, M. (2006). Avoiding the local trap: scale and food systems in planning research. *J. Plann. Educ. Res.* 26, 195–207. doi: 10.1177/0739456X06291389
- Breggin, L., and Myers, D. (2013). Subsidies with responsibilities: placing stewardship and disclosure conditions on government payments to large-scale commodity crop operations. *Harvard Environ. Law Rev.* 37, 487–538.
- Brinsden, H., and Lang, T. (2015). *An Introduction to Public Health Advocacy: Reflections on Theory and Practice*. London: Food Research Collaboration.
- Britton, E., Simper, N., Leger, A., and Stephenson, J. (2017). Assessing teamwork in undergraduate education: a measurement tool to evaluate individual teamwork skills. *Assess. Eval. Higher Educ.* 42, 378–397. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2015.1116497
- Brownell, S. E., Hekmat-Scafe, D. S., Singla, V., Chandler Seawell, P., Conklin Imam, J. F., Eddy, S. L., et al. (2015). A high-enrollment course-based undergraduate research experience improves student conceptions of scientific thinking and ability to interpret data. *CBE Life Sci. Educ.* 14, 14–21. doi: 10.1187/cbe.14-05-0092
- Cadieux, K. V., Levkoe, C., Mount, P., and Szanto, D. (2016). *Visual Methods for Collaborative Food System Work*. Saint Paul, MI: Hamline University Press.
- Cadieux, K. V., and Slocum, R. (2015). What does it mean to do food justice? *J. Polit. Ecol.* 22, 1–26. doi: 10.2458/v22i1.21076
- Cargill, K. (2005). Food studies in the curriculum: a model for interdisciplinary pedagogy. *Food Cult. Soc.* 8, 115–123. doi: 10.2752/155280105778055371
- Chan, V. (2011). Teaching oral communication in undergraduate science: are we doing enough and doing it right? *J. Learn. Design* 4:71. doi: 10.5204/jld.v4i3.82
- Clark, S. G., Steen-Adams, M. M., Pfirman, S., and Wallace, R. L. (2011). Professional development of interdisciplinary environmental scholars. *J. Environ. Studi. Sci.* 1, 99–113. doi: 10.1007/s13412-011-0018-z
- Clark, S. G., Byker, C., Niewolny, K., and Helms, J. (2013). Framing an undergraduate minor through the civic agriculture and food systems curriculum. *NACTA J.* 57:56.
- Cooperider, D., and Whitney, D. (2005). *Appreciative Inquiry: A Positive Revolution in Change*. Virginia Beach, VI: Koehler Publishers.
- Creswell, J. W., and Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Crosby, B. C., and Bryson, J. M. (2014). “Public integrative leadership,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Leadership and Organizations*, ed D. V. Day (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 57–72. doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199755615.013.003
- Cumming, A., Cumming, A., and Ross, M. (2007). The tuning project for medicine—learning outcomes for undergraduate medical education in Europe. *Med. Teach.* 29, 636–641. doi: 10.1080/01421590701721721
- Derting, T. L., and Ebert-May, D. (2010). Learner-centered inquiry in undergraduate biology: positive relationships with long-term student achievement. *CBE Life Sci. Educ.* 9, 462–472. doi: 10.1187/cbe.10-02-0011
- Figueroa-Helland, L., Thomas, C., and Aguilera, A. P. (2018). Decolonizing food systems: food sovereignty, indigenous revitalization, and agroecology as counter-hegemonic movements. *Perspect. Glob. Dev. Technol.* 17, 173–201. doi: 10.1163/15691497-12341473
- Finewood, D. T. (2011). “The complex systems science of obesity,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Social Science of Obesity*, ed J. Cawley (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 208–236. doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199736362.013.0013
- Foley, J. A., DeFries, R., Asner, G. P., Barford, C., Bonan, G., Carpenter, S. R., et al. (2005). Global consequences of land use. *Science* 309, 570–574. doi: 10.1126/science.1111772
- Fox, J. (2001). Vertically integrated policy monitoring: a tool for civil society policy advocacy. *Nonprofit Volunt. Sector Q.* 30, 616–627. doi: 10.1177/0899764001303015
- Francis, C. A., Lieblein, G., Breland, T. A., Salomonsson, L., Geber, U., Sriskandarajah, N., et al. (2008). Transdisciplinary research for a sustainable agriculture and food sector. *Agron. J.* 100, 771–776. doi: 10.2134/agronj2007.0073
- Frank, J. R., and Danoff, D. (2007). The CanMEDS initiative: implementing an outcomes-based framework of physician competencies. *Med. Teach.* 29, 642–647. doi: 10.1080/01421590701746983
- Galt, R. E. (2013). Placing food systems in first world political ecology: a review and research agenda. *Geogr. Compass* 7, 637–658. doi: 10.1111/gec3.12070
- Galt, R. E., Parr, D., Kim, J. V. S., Beckett, J., Lickter, M., and Ballard, H. (2013). Transformative food systems education in a land-grant college of agriculture: the importance of learner-centered inquiries. *Agric. Hum. Values* 30, 129–142. doi: 10.1007/s10460-012-9384-8
- Gerber, P. J., Steinfeld, H., Henderson, B., Mottet, A., Opio, C., Dijkman, J., et al. (2013). *Tackling Climate Change Through Livestock: a Global Assessment of Emissions and Mitigation Opportunities*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).
- Gurung, R. A. R., Chick, N. L., and Haynie, A. (2009). *Exploring Signature Pedagogies: Approaches to Teaching Disciplinary Habits of Mind*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Pub.
- Hamada, S., Wilk, R., Logan, A., Minard, S., and Trubek, A. (2015). The future of food studies. *Food Cult. Soc.* 18, 167–186. doi: 10.2752/175174415X14101814953846
- Harden, R. M. (2001). AMEE Guide No. 21: curriculum mapping: a tool for transparent and authentic teaching and learning. *Med. Teach.* 23, 123–137. doi: 10.1080/01421590120036547
- Harden, R. M. (2002). Developments in outcome-based education. *Med. Teach.* 24, 117–120. doi: 10.1080/01421590220120669
- Hart Research Associates (2009). *Raising the Bar: Employers’ View on College Learning in the Wake of the Economic Downturn*. Available online at: http://www.aacu.org/leap/documents/009_EmployerSurvey.pdf (accessed May 29, 2020).
- Hartel, R., and Foegeding, E. (2004). Learning: objectives, competencies, or outcomes? *J. Food Sci. Educ.* 3, 69–70. doi: 10.1111/j.1541-4329.2004.tb00047.x
- Hilimire, K., Gillon, S., McLaughlin, B. C., Dowd-Urbe, B., and Monsen, K. L. (2014). Food for thought: developing curricula for sustainable food systems education programs. *Agroecol. Sustain. Food Syst.* 38, 722–743. doi: 10.1080/21683565.2014.881456
- Holt-Giménez, E., and Shattuck, A. (2011). Food crises, food regimes and food movements: rumblings of reform or tides of transformation? *J. Peasant Stud.* 38, 109–144. doi: 10.1080/03066150.2010.538578

- Hunter, A. B., Laursen, S. L., and Seymour, E. (2007). Becoming a scientist: the role of undergraduate research in students' cognitive, personal, and professional development. *Sci. Educ.* 91, 36–74. doi: 10.1002/sce.20173
- Hurlbert, M., and Gupta, J. (2015). The split ladder of participation: a diagnostic, strategic, and evaluation tool to assess when participation is necessary. *Environ. Sci. Policy* 50, 100–113. doi: 10.1016/j.envsci.2015.01.011
- Ingram, J., Ajates, R., Arnall, A., Blake, L., Borrelli, R., Collier, R., et al. (2020). A future workforce of food-system analysts. *Nat. Food* 1, 9–10. doi: 10.1038/s43016-019-0003-3
- International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD). (2009). *Agriculture at a Crossroads*. eds B. McIntyre, H. Herren, J. Wakhungu, and R. T. Watson (Washington, DC: Island Press).
- Jessup, G. (2002). "Outcome based qualifications and the implications for learning," in *Outcomes, Learning and the Curriculum*, ed J. Burke. (London: Falmer Press), 51–72.
- Jordan, N., Grossman, J., Lawrence, P., Harmon, A., Dyer, W., Maxwell, B., et al. (2014). New curricula for undergraduate food-systems education: a sustainable agriculture education perspective. *NACTA J.* 58, 302–310.
- Killen, R. (2000). *Outcomes-Based Education: Principles and Possibilities*. Newcastle: University of Newcastle.
- Klein, J. T. (2013). The transdisciplinary moment (um). *Integral Rev.* 9, 189–199.
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kovach, M. (2010). *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations, and Contexts*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Kreber, C. (2006). Developing the scholarship of teaching through transformative learning. *J. Scholar. Teach. Learn.* 6, 88–109.
- Kuckartz, U. (2014). "Three basic methods of qualitative text analysis," in *Qualitative Text Analysis: A Guide to Methods, Practice and Using Software*, ed U. Kuckartz (London, UK: SAGE), 65–121. doi: 10.4135/9781446288719
- Leech, N. L., and Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2011). Beyond constant comparison qualitative data analysis: using NVivo. *School Psychol. Q.* 26, 70–84. doi: 10.1037/a0022711
- Levkoe, C. Z., André, P., Bhatt, V., Brynne, A., Davison, K. M., Kneen, C., et al. (2016). Collaboration for transformation: community-campus engagement for just and sustainable food systems. *J. Higher Educ. Outreach Engage.* 20, 32–61.
- Lieblein, G., Østergaard, E., and Francis, C. (2004). Becoming an agroecologist through action education. *Int. J. Agric. Sustain.* 2, 147–153. doi: 10.1080/14735903.2004.9684574
- Lieblein, G., Breland, T. A., Østergaard, E., Salomonsson, L., and Francis, C. (2007). Educational perspectives in agroecology: steps on a dual learning ladder toward responsible action. *NACTA J.* 51, 37–44.
- Linn, M. C., Palmer, E., Baranger, A., Gerard, E., and Stone, E. (2015). Education. Undergraduate research experiences: impacts and opportunities. *Science* 347:1261757. doi: 10.1126/science.1261757
- Marsden, T. (2013). From post-productionism to reflexive governance: contested transitions in securing more sustainable food futures. *J. Rural Stud.* 29, 123–134. doi: 10.1016/j.jrurstud.2011.10.001
- Mason, P., and Lang, T. (2017). *Sustainable Diets: How Ecological Nutrition can Transform Consumption and the Food System*. New York City, NY: Routledge. doi: 10.4324/9781315802930
- Meek, D., Bradley, K., Ferguson, B., Hoey, L., Morales, H., Rosset, P., et al. (2019). Food sovereignty education across the Americas: multiple origins, converging movements. *Agric. Hum. Values* 36, 611–626. doi: 10.1007/s10460-017-9780-1
- Meek, D., and Tarlau, R. (2016). Critical food systems education and the question of race. *J. Agric. Food Syst. Commun. Dev.* 5, 1–5. doi: 10.5304/jafscd.2015.054.021
- Menary, R. (2007). Writing as thinking. *Lang. Sci.* 29, 621–632. doi: 10.1016/j.langsci.2007.01.005
- Meybeck, A., and Gitz, V. (2017). Sustainable diets within sustainable food systems. *Proc. Nutr. Soc.* 76, 1–11. doi: 10.1017/S0029665116000653
- Mezirow, J. (2000). *Learning as Transformation: Critical Perspectives on a Theory in Progress. The Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series*. San Francisco, CA: ERIC.
- Mezirow, J. (2003). Transformative learning as discourse. *J. Transform. Educ.* 1, 58–63. doi: 10.1177/1541344603252172
- Moragues-Faus, A., and Marceau, A. (2019). Measuring progress in sustainable food cities: an indicators toolbox for action. *Sustainability* 11:45. doi: 10.3390/su11010045
- Morcke, A. M., Dornan, T., and Eika, B. (2013). Outcome (competency) based education: an exploration of its origins, theoretical basis, and empirical evidence. *Adv. Health Sci. Educ.* 18, 851–863. doi: 10.1007/s10459-012-9405-9
- Napier, A. D. (2010). *The Age of Immunology: Conceiving a Future in an Alienating World*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Nicolescu, B. (2014). Methodology of Transdisciplinarity. *World Futures* 70, 186–199. doi: 10.1080/02604027.2014.934631
- Nisbet, M. C., and Scheufele, D. (2009). What's next for science communication? Promising directions and lingering distractions. *Am. J. Bot.* 96, 1767–1778. doi: 10.3732/ajb.0900041
- Palincsar, A. S. (1998). Social constructivist perspectives on teaching and learning. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 49, 345–375. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.49.1.345
- Parr, D. M., and Trexler, C. J. (2011). Students' experiential learning and use of student farms in sustainable agriculture education. *J. Natural Resour. Life Sci. Educ.* 40:172–180. doi: 10.4195/jnrise.2009.0047u
- Parr, D. M., Trexler, C. J., Khanna, N. R., and Battisti, B. T. (2007). Designing sustainable agriculture education: academics' suggestions for an undergraduate curriculum at a land grant university. *Agric. Hum. Values* 24, 523–533. doi: 10.1007/s10460-007-9084-y
- Perry, D. K., Paulsen, T. H., and Retallick, M. S. (2018). Differences in critical thinking ability according to college entry pathway. *NACTA J.* 62, 115–123.
- Prain, V., and Hand, B. (2016). Coming to know more through and from writing. *Educ. Res.* 45, 430–434. doi: 10.3102/0013189X16672642
- Reynolds, J. A., Thaiss, C., Katkin, W., and Thompson, R. J. Jr. (2012). Writing-to-Learn in undergraduate science education: a community-based, conceptually driven approach. *CBE Life Sci. Educ.* 11, 17–25. doi: 10.1187/cbe.11-08-0064
- Reynolds, M., and Holwell, S. (2010). *Systems Approaches to Managing Change: A Practical Guide*. London: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-1-84882-809-4
- Ritchie, S. M., and Rigano, D. L. (1996). Laboratory apprenticeship through a student research project. *J. Res. Sci. Teach.* 33, 799–815. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1098-2736(199609)33:7<799::AID-TEA6>3.0.CO;2-I
- Rogers, M., and Ryan, R. (2001). The triple bottom line for sustainable community development. *Local Environ.* 6, 279–289. doi: 10.1080/13549830120073275
- Roy, S. G., de Souza, S. P., McGreavy, B., Druschke, C. G., Hart, D. D., and Gardner, K. (2019). Evaluating core competencies and learning outcomes for training the next generation of sustainability researchers. *Sustain. Sci.* 15, 619–631. doi: 10.1007/s11625-019-00707-7
- Saldaña, J. (2015). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE publications.
- Shulman, L. (2005). Signature pedagogies in the professions. *Daedalus* 134, 52–59. doi: 10.1162/0011526054622015
- Smith, J. (2002). Learning styles: fashion fad or lever for change? The application of learning style theory to inclusive curriculum delivery. *Innovat. Educ. Teach. Int.* 39, 63–70. doi: 10.1080/13558000110102913
- Spady, W. G. (1994). *Outcome-Based Education: Critical Issues and Answers*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Spiro, R. J. (1988). *Cognitive Flexibility Theory Advanced Knowledge Acquisition in Ill-Structured Domains*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Staub, N. L., Poxleitner, M., Braley, A., Smith-Flores, H., Pribbenow, C. M., Jaworski, L., et al. (2016). Scaling up: adapting a phage-hunting course to increase participation of first-year students in research. *CBE Life Sci. Educ.* 15:ar13. doi: 10.1187/cbe.15-10-0211
- Steffen, W., Richardson, K., Rockström, J., Cornell, S. E., Fetzer, I., Bennett, E. M., et al. (2015). Planetary boundaries: guiding human development on a changing planet. *Science* 347:1259855. doi: 10.1126/science.1259855
- Stoy, P. C., Ahmed, S., Jarchow, M., Rashford, B., Swanson, D., Albeke, S., et al. (2018). Opportunities and trade-offs among BECCS and the food, water, energy, biodiversity, and social systems nexus at regional scales. *BioScience* 68, 100–111. doi: 10.1093/biosci/bix145
- Swinburn, B. A., Kraak, V. I., Allender, S., Atkins, V. J., Baker, P. I., Bogard, J. R., et al. (2019). The global syndemic of obesity, undernutrition, and climate change: the lancet commission report. *Lancet* 393, 791–846. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32822-8

- Tam, M. (2014). Outcomes-based approach to quality assessment and curriculum improvement in higher education. *Qual. Assur. Educ.* 22, 158–168. doi: 10.1108/QAE-09-2011-0059
- Tilman, D., and Clark, M. (2014). Global diets link environmental sustainability and human health. *Nature* 515, 518–522. doi: 10.1038/nature13959
- Tochon, F. V. (2010). Deep education. *J. Educat. Teach. Trainers* 1, 1–12.
- Trumbo, J. (1999). Visual literacy and science communication. *Sci. Commun.* 20, 409–425. doi: 10.1177/1075547099020004004
- Valley, W., Anderson, M., Tichenor-Blackstone, N., Sterling, E. B., Erin, A. S., Koch, P., et al. (2020). Towards an equity competency model for sustainable food systems education programs. *Elementa* 8:33. doi: 10.1525/elementa.428
- Valley, W., Wittman, H., Jordan, N., Ahmed, S., and Galt, R. (2018). An emerging signature pedagogy for sustainable food systems education. *Renew. Agric. Food Syst.* 33, 467–480. doi: 10.1017/S1742170517000199
- van Ginkel, S., Gulikers, J., Biemans, H., and Mulder, M. (2015). Towards a set of design principles for developing oral presentation competence: a synthesis of research in higher education. *Educ. Res. Rev.* 14, 62–80. doi: 10.1016/j.edurev.2015.02.002
- Willett, W., Rockström, J., Loken, B., Springmann, M., Lang, T., Vermeulen, S., et al. (2019). Food in the anthropocene: the EAT–lancet commission on healthy diets from sustainable food systems. *Lancet* 393, 447–492. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31788-4
- Williams, B., and Hummelbrunner, R. (2010). *Systems Concepts in Action: a Practitioner's Toolkit*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. doi: 10.1515/9780804776554
- Wilson, S. (2009). *Research is Ceremony. Indigenous Research Methods*. Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing Company.
- Wilson, S. (2001). What is an indigenous research methodology? *Can. J. Native Educ.* 25, 175–179.
- Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.
- The handling Editor declared a past co-authorship with two of the authors, WV and CD.
- Copyright © 2020 Ebel, Ahmed, Valley, Jordan, Grossman, Byker Shanks, Stein, Rogers and Dring. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.