Society of Behavioral Medicine (SBM) position statement: SBM supports retaining healthy school lunch policies

Joanna Buscemi, Ph.D.,¹ Angela Odoms-Young, Ph.D.,¹ Amy L. Yaroch, Ph.D.,²
Laura L. Hayman, Ph.D., RN, FAAN, FAHA,³ Trina P. Robertson, M.S., R.D.N.,⁴ Marian L. Fitzgibbon, Ph.D.¹

¹The University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA

²Gretchen Swanson Center for Nutrition, Omaha, NE, USA

³University of Massachusetts Boston, Boston, MA, USA

⁴Dairy Council of California, Sacramento, CA, USA

Correspondence to: J Buscemi
jbuscemi@uic.edu

Cite this as: *TBM* 2015;5:357–359
doi: 10.1007/s13142-015-0318-z

Abstract

Schools are recognized as venues for population-based health promotion and chronic disease prevention initiatives targeting children, and the school food environment is a central component. The Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 utilized research-based findings and expert recommendations to significantly improve school lunch standards in the kindergarten to twelfth grade (K-12) setting to enhance the nutritional intake and ultimately the health of children. The new guidelines include increasing the availability of whole grains, fruits, and vegetables; requiring children to select a fruit or vegetable daily; and restricting serving sizes. There is currently no evidence that the revised standards have increased school lunch plate waste. However, there is evidence that children are consuming more healthful foods. The Society of Behavioral Medicine (SBM) supports retaining current school lunch standards set by the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010. SBM also supports increasing the evidence-based by evaluating the implementation and impact of the school lunch revisions.

Keywords

School lunches, Childhood obesity, Health policy, Prevention

INTRODUCTION

The National School Lunch Program (NSLP) provides nutritionally balanced, low-cost or free meals to millions of school children across the USA [1]. This program is particularly important for children who are at risk for nutritional deficits, such as those living in food-insecure households. In 2013, the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) reported that approximately 14 % of households in the USA were “food insecure” at least some time during the past year, with insufficient access to enough food [2]. Studies show that children in marginally secure and food-insecure households are more likely to eat school meals and receive a greater amount of their food from school meals than more affluent children. Consequently, these meals can play a significant role in helping children meet their dietary requirements [4]. Moreover, these balanced meals may shape food preferences and patterns of kindergarten to twelfth grade (K-12) children

Implications

Practice: Schools should provide lunches to children in compliance with the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 and should incorporate nutrition education, promote consumption of more healthful foods, and create cafeteria environments that facilitate healthful eating.

Policy: SBM recommends retaining current school lunch standards and opposes weakening these standards given the potential impact on the population-level health of American children.

Research: Further research will require evaluating the implementation and longer-term impact of the 2010 school lunch revisions.

for those at high risk for adverse health outcomes, including obesity.

In 2010, the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act (HHFKA) was passed [3] to revise the national school meal standards to be consistent with the 2010 Dietary Guidelines for Americans [4] and Institute of Medicine (IOM) recommendations [5]. The HHFKA of 2010 made significant improvements to school meal standards including (1) increasing the availability of whole grains, fruits, and vegetables; (2) requiring children to select a fruit or vegetable daily; and (3) restricting serving sizes by limiting total calorie consumption by child age and grade level.

These revised standards went into effect at the beginning of the 2012–2013 school year [6]. Preliminary research suggests that the changes have resulted in increased fruit and vegetable intake at school [7]. Although data are limited due to the recent implementation of these changes, these initial findings are promising. For example, in a sample of 1030 children attending four schools in an urban, low-income district, fruit selection increased by 23 % and vegetable consumption increased by 16.2 % from pre- to post-implementation of the revised standards [7]. Therefore, these enhanced guidelines have the potential to improve population-level health of American children.

INITIAL REACTIONS

Despite the potential public health impact of the HHFKA, there has been some initial pushback on the changes in the school lunch standards from various stakeholders including policymakers, school food service directors, teachers, parents, and students [8]. The two main concerns are (1) the children do not like the taste of the fruits and vegetables and (2) the changes have increased plate waste.

Child food preferences—Research has found that children are more willing to try new foods after nutrition is taught in the classroom [9–11]. Nutrition education has also been linked to improved academic achievement [12]. Most importantly, repeated exposures are necessary for children to “like” new foods, and children find fruits and vegetables more acceptable after repeated exposures [13].

In addition to educational and behavioral considerations, environment also plays a role in promoting more healthful eating. At the Cornell Center for Behavioral Economics in Child Nutrition Program, Wansink and colleagues have developed the Smarter Lunchroom Movement, an evidence-based lunchroom focused on principles that include small and simple environmental changes that nudge students to make more healthful foods such as fruits and vegetables accessible, attractive, and normative resulting in increased consumption [14, 15]. Examples of these changes include (1) giving healthy foods fun names, (2) placing healthy items in front of the food line, and (3) displaying fresh fruit in attractive bowls.

Wansink and colleagues also found that making the selection of more healthful foods normative by having cafeteria staff verbally prompt the selection of a fruit or vegetable can increase intake. Therefore, during this transition period, children may benefit from repeated exposure to foods, in addition to small environmental lunchroom modifications that can make these more healthful foods accessible, attractive, and normative.

Plate waste—Many who have opposed the school lunch changes argue that plate waste has increased. Although this concern received widespread media attention, this claim is anecdotal. Cohen and colleagues measured food waste changes from pre- to post-implementation of the revised standards and found no increases in waste for entrees, fruits, or vegetables [7]. A recent study followed a cohort of 680 fifth graders and measured changes in plate waste and fruit and vegetable consumption from 2012–2014. Results showed a decrease in plate waste from pre- to post-implementation, and on average, students increased both vegetable and fruit consumption [16]. Therefore, the current available data indicates that the HHFKA changes have resulted in more healthful eating in the school setting without creating additional waste.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Schools are recognized as venues for population-based health promotion and chronic disease prevention

initiatives targeting children, and the school food environment is a central component. The Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 utilized research-based findings and expert recommendations to significantly improve school lunch standards in the K-12 setting to enhance the nutritional intake and ultimately the health of children. Despite initial concerns, there is currently no evidence that the revised standards have increased school lunch plate waste. However, there is evidence that children are consuming more healthful foods.

The Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 is set to expire September 30, 2015, and will be up for reauthorization. Based on current data, the Society of Behavioral Medicine (SBM) recommends the following:

1. Retain current school lunch standards set by the HHFKA of 2010 and implemented by the USDA in 2012. SBM joins the American Public Health Association, the American Medical Association, the American Heart Association, the Preventive Cardiovascular Nurses Association, and other individuals, groups, and organizations in opposing the weakening of these standards [17].
2. Given concerns about child food preferences, we suggest that schools
 - Provide standard-based, sequential nutrition education from pre-kindergarten through high school.
 - Promote innovative nutrition education formats (e.g., farm tours, urban farming, demonstration kitchens) for children of all ages.
 - Repeatedly encourage the consumption of more healthful foods, such as fruits and vegetables.
3. Given concerns about plate waste, we encourage school administrators to consider making small environmental changes in their lunchrooms to make more healthful eating accessible, attractive, and normative.
4. SBM strongly supports increasing the evidence-based by evaluating the implementation and impact of the school lunch revisions.

Acknowledgments: This manuscript was supported by the National Cancer Institute under award number R25CA057699. JB was supported by the National Cancer Institute. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health. The authors wish to gratefully acknowledge the expert review provided by the Society of Behavioral Medicine's Health Policy Committee, Health Policy Council, and the Obesity and Eating Disorders Special Interest Group.

Compliance with ethical standards: All procedures were conducted in accordance with ethical standards.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

1. United States Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. Fact sheet: National School Lunch Program. Available at www.fns.

- usda.gov/sites/default/files/NSLPFactSheet.pdf; 2013; Last accessed January 9, 2015.
2. Coleman-Jensen A, Gregory C, Singh A. Household food security in the United States in 2013. <http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err173.aspx>; 2014; Last accessed February 4, 2015.
 3. United States Department of Agriculture. The Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010. Available at www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/Governance/Legislation/CNR_2010.htm; 2013; Last accessed January 9, 2015.
 4. United States Department of Agriculture and United States Department of Health and Human Services. *Dietary Guidelines for Americans 2010*. 2010th ed. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office; 2010.
 5. IOM (Institute of Medicine). *School Meals: Building Blocks for Healthy Children*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press; 2010.
 6. Nutrition standards in the national school lunch and school breakfast programs: final rule. US Department of Agriculture. <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2012-01-26/html/2012-1010.htm>. Published January 26, 2012. 77 Federal Register 17. 111th US Congress. Healthy Hunger-Free Kids Act 2010, Public Law 111–296. Accessed January 9, 2015.
 7. Cohen JFW, Richardson S, Parker E, et al. Impact of the new US Department of Agriculture school meal standards on food selection, consumption, and waste. *Am J Prev Med*. 2014; 46: 388–394.
 8. Confessore N. How school lunch became the latest political battleground. New York Times: http://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/12/magazine/how-school-lunch-became-the-latest-political-battleground.html?_r=0; 2014; Last accessed February 4, 2015.
 9. Gordon AR, Crepinsek MK, Briefel RR, Clark MA, Fox MK. The third School Nutrition Dietary Assessment Study: summary and implications. *J Am Diet Assoc*. 2009; 109(suppl 2): S129–S135.
 10. Johnner NM. Evaluation's vital role in healthier school meals. *J Am Diet Assoc*. 2009; 109(suppl 2): S18–S19.
 11. Story M, Nannery MS, Schwartz MB. Schools and obesity prevention: creating school environments and policies to promote healthy eating and physical activity. *Milbank Q*. 2009; 87(1): 71–100.
 12. Daniels D. Examining attendance, academic performance, and behavior in obese adolescents. *J Sch Nurs*. 2008; 24: 379–387.
 13. Forestell CA, Mennella JA. Early determinants of fruit and vegetable acceptance. *Pediatrics*. 2009; 120: 1247–1254.
 14. Wansink B, Just DR, Payne CR, Klinger MZ. Attractive names sustain increase vegetable intake in schools. *Prev Med*. 2012; 55: 330–332.
 15. Hanks AS, Just DR, Wansink B. Smarter lunchrooms can address new school lunchroom guidelines and childhood obesity. *J Pediatr*. 2013; 162: 867–869.
 16. Schwartz MB, Henderson KE, Read M, Danna N, Ickovics JR. New school meal regulations increase fruit consumption and do not increase total plate waste. *Child Obes*. 2015. doi:10.1089/chi.2015.0019.
 17. Woo Baidal JA. Protecting progress against childhood obesity—the National School Lunch Program. *N Engl J Med*. 2014; 371: 1862–1865.