**Script for the video lesson “EIP project “Added values of Social Farming for agricultural production””**

1. Welcome to the second video lesson for unit three! In this presentation I will introduce you to the EIP project "Added values of Social Farming for agricultural production".
2. This is me, Lena Franke, you already know me from the first presentation of unit three.
3. After studying this resource, you will be able to know about the tasks, implementation and results of a European EIP project, using the example of the EIP project “Added values of Social Farming for agricultural production”. Furthermore, you will able to assess what contents of advice for Social Farming are needed, to explain the possibilities to create added values for all actors involved on a social farm and to find aspects for further development of existing farms and preparing ideas for own concepts of Social Farming.
4. The aim of this presentation is to consider the EIP project “Added values of Social Farming for agricultural production” as an example for an European EIP project. Therefore the presentation presents the goals and results of this project. As part of this, there is an overview of the development status of Farming in Hesse and insights into the “starter course” developed in the project for project development of Social Farming. In addition, advisory content for Social Farming is highlighted and recommendations for practice, that have emerged from the results of the EIP project, are shown.
5. Here you can see the contents of this presentation. First of all, there will be an introduction in the EIP-project. The next point will be a short presentation of the half of the partner farms involved in the project. After this tasks and aims of the project will be presented. That contents the results of the online survey, once more a presentation about the other partner farms of the project. Furthermore, about the task package “Education and further education”, about the contents of advice and about the knowledge transfer in the project. At the end, there will be recommendations for practice considered.
6. The EIP project “Added values of Social Farming for agricultural production” started in 2018 and ended up in 2020. The project was promoted in the context of The agricultural European Innovation Partnership (EIP-AGRI). An interdisciplinary operational group made up of producers, consultants and scientists examined the potential of Social Farming for the development of farms in Hesse. They researched and supported the potential of social and pedagogical work for development of farms.
7. The participating project members were:

The Department Or­ga­nic Far­ming and Crop­ping Sys­tems of the University of Kassel/ Witzenhausen, (Prof. Dr. Jürgen Heß) with Dr. Thomas van Elsen, the European Academy for Landscape Culture PETRARCA e.V., the network Social Farming of Hesse and the service unit of Agriculture of Hesse so called “Landesbetrieb Landwirtschaft Hessen (LLH)”.

1. Here you can see a part of the partner farms of the projects. These are the farms that already have an existing social agriculture. In addition to these farms, there are four other farms belonging to the partner farms. They want to start up a social branch at the farm or want to improve and increase their offers in the context of Social Farming. These four farms will be presented in more detail later in the presentation. For data protection reasons, the names of these farms and the farmers are coded. All farms are organic farms.
2. To start with the first farm, which already has a social branch. The Antoiushof is a large farm that offers jobs to people with disabilities. The farm belongs to a larger network called "Antonius Mensch", a social organization in Fulda. On an area of 385 hectares, agricultural crops are grown in eight crop rotation segments and with a high degree of biodiversity. Animal husbandry includes looking after dairy cows, sows and laying hens. It is a demonstration farm for Social and Organic Farming. There is also a nursery, a large kitchen, a bakery, a farm shop and a farm café. People with disabilities work in all areas of the farm. A total of 75 people work on the farm, some of whom are completing simple vocational training with a lot of practical experience. They are all employed under almost real conditions.
3. The Hofgut Richerode is also a Social Farm with people with intellectual and/ or emotional disabilities. You heard already in the first presentation of unit three about this farm. The Hofgut Richerode belongs to the Hessian Reformation Church Hephata (Deaconry) and has a long tradition as an agricultural enterprise supplying the facilities with food. Hofgut Richerode has been operating as a certified organic farm under the organic farming association Bioland. 155 hectares of arable land and 78 hectares of permanent grassland are cultivated since 1991. One of the main sources of income is growing potatoes. The estate's potato harvest is 250 tons a year. In addition, 180 fattening pigs, 460 laying hens and around 100 fattening cattle and bulls are kept. There is also a garden where herbs are grown, as well as a mixing and packaging facility for a regional organic tea brand. There are own peeling, packaging and storage installations facilitate marketing to wholesalers and create many secure jobs for the round about 50 people with disabilities and 14 employees of the farm.
4. „Hof Buchwald“ is a pedagogical farm which opens its doors for kindergarten groups, school classes or other team from different organizations. The aim with this pedagogical and educational branch of the farm to generate a place for encounter with nature and knowledge transfer of agricultural topics.

The agriculture concludes cultivation of feed like clover-grass, silage maize, grassland, grains, legumes and straw for livestock at the farm. Except from this there are 30 hectares of crops like wheat and corn maize. Livestock contains beef cattle, pig fattening and chickens in mobile stables. Moreover, sheep, donkeys and about 30 bee colonies are living at the farm.

1. The fourth of the already Social Farms is the "Hof Fleckenbühl". It's a farm where addicts work and live without drugs, alcohol or tobacco. Anyone can come at any time. A great principle is self-help in the community. The farm is biodynamic and comprises 80 hectares of grassland and 170 hectares of arable land. They have dairy cows and goats whose milk is used to make cheese on the farm. There is also a restaurant, a farm shop, a youth welfare service and a moving company.
2. The main questions, what are considered in the project were:

How has the inclusion of social work to be designed to create an added value for the farm and its agricultural production?

Which preconditions have to be fulfilled, which frame is needed and which advisory needs are there?

Which target groups of Social Farming are suitable for which agricultural branches of the farm and what positive impacts for production are there?

Which further potentials can farms generate by Social Farming – for production and diversification of the farm but also for rural areas like conservation and care of the cultural landscape?

1. According to the previous questions the following task packages were edited in the project:

The first task was the online survey in 2018 with the title „Evaluation of Social Farming in Hesse“. The second task was about considering of the project partner farms, especially those, which want to build up a social branch at the farm. The third task package was education and further education, where the „Starter course Social Farming in Witzenhausen“ was implemented. Fourth task was about the contents of advice for Social Farming and the last task was the knowledge transfer of the project.

1. As you already heard was the first task to evaluate the status quo of Social Farming in Hesse. Perspectives of development and funding opportunities of Social Farming in Hesse were considered. At least 23 active farms, 30 interested farms, 22 active organizations and 2 interested organizations participate at the online survey.
2. The main investigation areas of the online survey are questions about the offers of Social Farming and the different target groups in Hesse, about which providers there are so far and what the current needs are. Furthermore, which institutions and social organizations currently are active in the field of Social Farming, which central actors will be relevant for the development of Social Farming in the future and what the experience of the effects on primary production is by including different target groups.
3. One of the first questions of the online survey was about the agricultural branches at the asked farms. In this diagram you can see, that the diversity of branches is huge.

The different colours stand for the three categories of surveyed farms and organizations. The distribution of the branches at social organizations, look at the red lines, is nearly consistent. On the contrary mentioned the farms animal husbandry, cropland and fodder crops above average often. Followed by direct marketing and vegetable gardening.

1. The next question evaluated the agricultural branches with Social Farming at the farms and organizations. Here you can see, in contrary to the previous slide, that in the branches cropland, fodder crops, meat processing and direct marketing there are a reduction of the values with about 50%. It seems, that it is more difficult to include people with need for assistance in these branches/ this work. Perhaps the reason is the high level of mechanism and technic in cropland and fodder crop work. The most frequent mentioned branch with Social Farming is animal husbandry and the most frequent mentioned type of animals are diary cows and chickens. In the processing sectors there are in general less people included than in the production sectors. One of the obstacles could be the high hygiene regulations by meat processing and in the bakery. The low numbers at “direct marketing” maybe result from the needed ability handling with money. And not every person with need for assistance is able to do that. On the other hand, the direct contact to customers could have be a positive impact on motivation level and means real inclusion, but it is not often realized.

In comparison less agricultural branches with social work than branches at the hole farms are special crops, vegetable gardening, housekeeping and tree nursery. In this question about the branches with Social Farming, horticulture is mentioned more often than in the previous question. That is why, some gardens, which are not for the agricultural production but for personal need are include in Social Farming. The high need of manual work facilitate the inclusion of people with need for assistance.

Other agricultural branches were meadow orchard, landscape conservation, handcraft, cultivation of ornamental plants, vegetable peeling, package and seasonal gardens.

1. The second part of the online survey is about implemented and planed offers of Social Farming. It is interesting, that offers of social organizations developed in average in 1992 what is earlier than farms. There the average is in 2004. 60 percent of the social organizations practice Social Farming since more than 20 years. On the contrary, 40 percent of the offers at farms are developed in the last ten years. Nearly 75 percent of the farms work together with a social organization as a cooperation. And a few have extra offers independet from those cooperation. Cooperation partners are schools, associations and big organizations of youth welfare, old people's welfare and welfare of people with disabilities. On the opposite only 25 percent of the surveyed organizations with Social Farming are working together with one farm or a number of farms. Their offers are more located within the own organization. It is striking that more than the half of the asked farms can imagine a cooperation with a social organization, but only a few concrete cooperations exist until now. In relation to this, a lot of interested farms are looking for advisory for cooperation.
2. This diagram shows target groups what already are or should be involved in agricultural production. The offers of Social Farming are constructed for various target groups, but a big part for social organizations and also for farms are people with intellectual and/or mental/psychic disabilities. Furthermore, four farms and one social organization employ people with physical disabilities, but in all these Social Farms are people with intellectual disabilities employed as well. And in three farms and one organization people with mental/ psychic disabilities. Farms which work with people with disabilities primary offer outsourced workplaces from workshops for people with disabilities and internships. There is one farm with three workplaces of workshops for people with disabilities and in two farms are so called “integration workplaces”. The main focus at the social organizations is also at workplaces of workshops for people with disabilities and internships. But six organizations offer outsourced workplaces from workshops for people with disabilities. Moreover, six social organizations employ people with regular employment relationships for rehabilitation and integration. None of the questioned farms do that. At the point “other” are especially mentioned Education for Sustainable Development for adults and training for educators. It is striking that in this illustration all target groups are choosed more often from interested farms. The reason for this, first of all, is that in this question was asked with what target groups can interested farms imagine to work. But active farms and organizations was asked for the number of employed or integrated people. Remarkable is the fact that also the interest in target groups, which are only a little projects with until now, is really big. Those target groups are for example: teenager, migrants, long-term unemployed persons, seniors or addicted people.
3. Another question was, if Social Farming is practicable without public funds. Most of the time social organizations receive more public funds like money fore care and services according to the german social law. That is why their offers depend more on public funds than offers from farms. 30 percent of farm offers would be possible without public funds, but only six percent of offers by social organization could be realised without public money. Furthermore, it is interesting that about 20 percent of the questioned persons choose the option “is not calculated/ I don’t know”. This is a sign that financial aspects of Social Farming not always are separately considered and calculated. In relation to the farms it is necessary to think about those offers, which don’t generate income ore economic advantages. Voluntary activities obviously are not depending on public funds, but on they are also the other hand not able to provide so much.
4. This diagram shows the answers of the question for special obstacles which influence the economic efficiency of Social Farming. This question was asked with the possibility for an open answer. It was possible for every farm or organization to mention until to three obstacles. Here you can see the categories, which were built for the evaluation of this question.

There are financial obstacles especially related to the little ability of payment, or better the willingness of payment of payers or clientele. It is mentioned that in relation to offers of education the awareness for costs is very low. Moreover, one farm marked that social offers are not considered in context of economic issues. The high need of time for care is seen critical, because of the high level of volunteering of some of the farms. A second problematic category are structural obstacles. By considering of this category it is good to distinguish between farms and social organizations. For farms especially insufficient planning security is challenging. For example, because it is difficult to estimate how big the expense for care would be at a certain point of time while the conclusion of contract, or because of uncertainties at questions of liability. On the other hand, social organizations see the not fitting staffing conditions, the high bureaucratic expense and the inflexible curriculum for pedagogical offers. Furthermore, general challenges of agricultural production, which do not have a direct relation to social activities are mentioned, like drought, insufficient regional demand and high depreciations of machines and buildings. Some answers relate to social framework and see engagement for public recognition of Social Farming in policy, management and media as an important point. Apart from that, is was brought up the difficult search for qualified personal and from two farms also the restricted suitability of personality of employees with disabilities because of unreliability for economic relevance.

1. To conclude, there is a big diversity of target groups, which work current at social farms. Furthermore, there is a big interest in inclusion and cooperation between farms and social payers. The fields of activity for included people are in many operating ranges of farms. Most frequent in livestock farming, fewer in highly technical operating ranges like crop cultivation and fodder crops as in cultivation of vegetable, orcharding and gardening and landscaping. Social Farming makes diversification possible and expands product range. Furthermore, it is to mention, that there is a great interest of the farms in cooperating with social organizations. And the main obstacles to development of Social Farming are financial and structural obstacles.
2. The socio-empiric assessment was the second task package of the EIP-project. It was edited by the University of Kassel and Petrarca e.V.. It bases of involvement of the project partner farms in relation to optimization and development of Social Farming. Development obstacles and approaches for optimizing or setting up social farming and the added value for agricultural production were examined. There was the principle of “maximum contrast” between the farms, because of that, partner farms were selected with very different approaches of Social Farming. The four partner farms, which want to build up or develop a social branch at the farm were surveyed. The four farm are presented on the next slides, The farms have been anonymized for data protection reasons.
3. At the first farm there live 12 suckler cows and several hundred chickens in two chicken mobile stables. This "Naturland" farm sells its products from the farm and in smaller shops in the area. There are always changing interns on the farm. The farm manager works together with a local association. As part of the youth welfare service, he arranges tenancy agreements on the farm as well as interns. So, the farm manager already integrates and trains young people with special needs and would like to expand Social Farming on his farm.
4. Farm B is a Demeter dairy farm with 35 dairy cows. The products grain, feed, milk and fiber linen are marketed by a supra-regional company. Besides that, there is a potato sale from the farm. The farm does not yet have a social branch. The farm manager wants the farm to open up to society, is looking for ideas for a more social life on the farm, and has also considered the idea of Social Farming One goal could be to create an workspace for a person with special needs.
5. Farm C is a "Naturland" certified farm with walnut cultivation, walnut refinement and walnut processing. So not only are walnut trees grown, but a tree nursery with appropriate walnut tree grafting is also operated. Seeds and young plants are marketed on the farm and on the Internet.

Some time ago the farm manager hired a Syrian refugee as an employee because he wanted to help in this area. However, after the initial start-up support, this cooperation is no longer to be seen under the aspect of Social Farming, because the employee does not need any support in his daily work. The farm manager is now looking for a suitable model of Social Farming for his farm. The question arises as to which target group and which further partnerships with social organizations will be considered in the future.

1. On the fourth farm there are 90 dairy goats plus offspring, 40 suckler cows plus offspring and 230 chickens, which are kept in chicken mobile stables. The "Bioland" certified farm produces goat cheese, beef and eggs. Goat cheese and beef are marketed from the farm. The goat cheese is also sold in various organic and supermarkets in the region. A total of ten different markets are currently being supplied. The farm is already inclusive and currently employs three people with disabilities. An agricultural employee with an additional educational qualification is employed in the care to look after the employees who need support. The farm cooperates with a workshop for people with disabilities.
2. I already talked about added values of Social Farming in the previous presentation. This slide is like a little repetition of some of the aspects, it is about potentials of Social Farming seen by the project partner farms. The positive effects are divided in the four categories “potentials for agriculture”, “potentials for farmer”, “potentials for farm” and “potentials for people with need for support”. To start with the “potentials for agriculture”, Social Farming is seen by the project partner farms as an option for a promising agriculture, because it makes an expansion without an increase of land possible. Other aspects are the approach of agriculture to society and the possibility to increase public awareness of agriculture with a social branch at a farm. One statement from a farm is, that by including people in a farm, the “human part” of agriculture is generated. Accept from that, generates Social Farming an added value of society.   
   Potentials for “the farmer” are personal development and more joy in the work by cooperation.   
   Social Farming enables a higher economic efficiency of “the farm” and can help finding a suitable employee for the farm. Another potential for the farm can be a creation of more liveliness at the farm. The farmers from the project partner farms mentioned useful activity, encouraging autonomous being and self-esteem as potentials of Social Farming for people with need for support.
3. This table shows development obstacles of Social Farming of the project partner farms. The development obstacles were divided in five categories: cooperation, everyday life, personal, structures and development. In the context of cooperation, the obstacle of compliance of contracts and agreements was found. Furthermore, is the missing financial support and the distance to social organizations. There can be accrue costs by no regular cooperation with social organizations or problems with the persons with special needs. There has to be an assessment of potentials between cooperation partners, to evaluate the question of “What is possible?”. The last aspect in the category “cooperation” is about finding appropriate employees with need for support for the farm, what not always is easy. The second category of obstacles is “everyday life”. There are summarized challenges for the farmers in everyday work. The first point is about the work management and preparation, what can be an additional burden for the farmer next to the normal farm work. According to that, also the personal attitude is an important fact including competences of leading and of guidance. Personal obstacles of development of a social branch at the farm can be the fear of more work and the fear of more bureaucracy. Moreover, the question of time is a big one. For example, in the harvest season, when there is a lot to do at the fields, the care of the included people at the farm has also to be secured. What can be difficult in such a time. The next category is about structural obstacles, what is divided in operational structures and policy structures. One challenge related to operational structures is about finding a workplace for a person in the technical agriculture. Another obstacle at a farm are physically separated operating ranges. At the level of policy, insufficient communication between decision-makers and unclear responsibilities are challenging. The last category are “obstacles” in the process of development, what means that finding a basis of decision according to social branches at the farm is not easy. Moreover, are researches very time-consuming. One reason of those obstacles is the low level of public awareness of Social Farming and missing possibilities for advisory, mentioned the partner farms of the project.
4. Of course the main question of this process was about the approaches of Social Farming for the partner farms. Here you can see the visions and the related arrangements, which have to be realized, of the four farms. The first farm (“A”) strives to a development like “the big social institutions” of Social Farming. For this three options are seen. The first option is to continue case-related work. The second option is a cooperation with a social organization and option three is a takeover of the farm by a social organization, to continue as a social institution with agricultural production. Farm “B” wants to build up a social and alive agriculture with a connection between Community Supported Agriculture and Social Farming. This should be realized by an expansion of the farm through Community Supported Agriculture. Steps for this are building greenhouses, start-up of the field and create social rooms. The farmer wants to be a provider of workplaces for people who wants to do senseful work. As a first step is seen a coaching, for creating a concrete plan for development. The vison of farm “C” is to produce an added value for society and to use agricultural work in a therapeutical concept. The arrangement could be, that the employment of until two persons from September until February would be possible. If machines for walnut harvesting are at the farm, there is a lot of potential for manual work. The first step should be creating a concept. The last of the four farms (“D”) wants an improvement of the existing Social Farming at the farm. This includes a development of accommodation at the farm, to create a unity of living and working. The strategy is to find more easy tasks for employees, like a mobile chicken stable or the reactivation of gardening for herbs. Furthermore to build accommodations at the farm for six to eight persons and maybe to expand the cultivation of vegetables and the farm shop.
5. As the third task package of the EIP-project “education and further education” a starter course on Social Farming was developed. The concept of the course was developed by Thomas van Elsen with help from the members of the operational project group. Since 2007 there is a basic course for Social Farming at the University of Kassel/ Witzenhausen, taught also by Thomas van Elsen. The main idea of the “Starter course Social Farming” in the project is, a teamwork between students from the University of Kassel/ Witzenhausen of Organic Agriculture and farmers, who want to start a Social Farm or other persons with a project idea for Social Farming. The initiators of the projects apply for the course with their idea of Social Farming and develop together with students, who already completed the basic course Social Farming, a concrete concept for their initiative. An aspect for developing that course was as well as a content for advice on Social Farming for agricultural advisory services.
6. The work process takes about three months. In the first two runs of the course there were usually one student matched together with one project. In the current course there are up to four students per project. The course starts with a presence weekend, were all members come together for the first time. It is for the presentations of the students and the initiators with their project and for the matching for the teams. Based on the applications of the projects with the reason for participation and description of the project, an exposé is written in the following three weeks after the first meeting. It contents a detailed description of the project and the aims of cooperation. Until to the second presence weekend there is time for cooperation between students and project owners. Furthermore, there is a coaching for every single project with Thomas van Elsen and Martina Rasch, who is a social worker. The coaching contains a review and a commenting of the exposé and also a comprehensive conference call or a zoom meeting. While those conferences it was possible for the project teams to ask about challenges and get tips for further procedure, At the second meeting all teams present their results and the group can discuss about it. After that the concepts have to be finished, which are the proof of performance for the students in the course. There is an online platform with a file for every project to depose and save documents of the work. The files are available for all course members with the goal for exchange, networking and advisory within the projects.
7. The course differentiates from other courses, because, that the aim is not a fundamental information and knowledge transfer. The students get basic knowledge in the basic course Social Farming and the project owners through their activities within their project. There are a lot of material for self-study. Furthermore, specific inputs are given at the presence weekends to fill knowledge gaps. The exchange and cooperation between the project teams creates Interdisciplinarity and supports learning in a process. Another aspect of the course is, that the aim no certificates are, for what memorized knowledge must be learned and asked. Moreover, the course can serve the project ideas of the practitioners in a very individual and free way. The previous applications of the projects enable an assessment according to a suitability of the project ideas for the concept of the course.
8. In the fourth task package of the project strategies and contents of advisory for Social Farming with an advisory team from the service unit of Agriculture of Hesse “Landesbetrieb Landwirtschaft Hessen (LLH)” were created. Those strategies and contents were developed and tested with the project group, especially with the partner farms of the project, which want to build up a social branch at their farms. As a support for advisory services, tables with models of target groups were developed, There is a table for “i.e. people with disabilities”, “older people” and “children and young people”. Accept from that there is one table for all those target groups, with so far only a few information and possibilities of promotion. For each model there is a short description, references to financing and promotion possibilities, links for more information and contacts. The tables shall help consultants for advisory to get a quick overview about possibilities that are worth considering.
9. At this slide some contents of advice for Social Farming are seen. At first, there is a great need for advice on "funding opportunities and financing" and "professional advice, e.g. on legal issues". For farms that are interested in setting up Social Farming, "advice on cooperation" also plays an important role. There is also a need for advice on “further training opportunities” and “support in developing a concept for Social Farming”. In addition, other topics include support with public relations, marketing and support, for example in the context of a vacation replacement.
10. The last task package was about the knowledge transfer of the tasks and results of the EIP-project. Measures for knowledge transfer and network building were carried out. In relation to that, two well attended conferences in Witzenhausen took place with the topic “Added values of Social Farming”. The project reports was written and uploaded at the website of the “German Working Group on Social Farming” [www.soziale-landwirtschaft.de](http://www.soziale-landwirtschaft.de/), published in the newsletter of Social Farming and at the conferences. At the end of the project there was a meeting in Wiesbaden with the Ministries of Agriculture, Social Affairs and Education. At the meeting was a discussion about needs for action for promotion and development of Social Farming in Hesse.
11. To conclude the results of the project there were developed recommendation for practice:

Social Farming is a possibility to let participate more people at agriculture and to develop a multifunctional agriculture by inclusion. Inclusion of non-agriculture people can produce added values for the farm, for included people, for social organizations, for social and health sector, for rural areas, for nature and for society. The start of Social Farming needs good advisory and concepts, cooperation partners, knowledge about suitability of the farm for different target groups and necessary qualifications. A cooperation with a social organization makes it possible to create for people with need for assistance in agriculture.

And that brings us to the end of this presentation.

1. Sources
2. Thank you for your attention. And again, if you have any questions during the presentation, please contact me, you can find my email address on this slide.