Published in final edited form as:

Health Behav Policy Rev. 2015 September ; 2(5): 362–371. doi:10.14485/HBPR.2.5.4.

Food Service Perspectives on National School Lunch Program Implementation

Rachel G. Tabak, PhD, RD [Research Assistant Professor] and
Prevention Research Center in St. Louis, Washington University in St. Louis

Sarah Moreland-Russell, PhD, MPH [Assistant Research Professor]
Brown School of Social Work, Washington University in St. Louis

Abstract

Objectives—Explore barriers and facilitators to implementation of the new National School Lunch Program (NSLP) policy guidelines.

Methods—Interviews with eight food service directors using an interview guide informed by the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research.

Results—Food service personnel; parents, teachers, school staff; and students were important stakeholders. Characteristics of the new NSLP policy guidelines were reported to create increased demands; resources alleviated some barriers. Directors reported increased food and labor costs, food sourcing challenges, decreased student participation, and organizational constraints as barriers to implementation. Creativity in menu planning facilitated success.

Conclusions—Factors within the food service department, characteristics of implementing individuals and the new NSLP policy guidelines, and stakeholder involvement in the implementation process relate to successful implementation.

Keywords

Nutrition; School Food Service; Policy

The prevalence of youth obesity and overweight in the United States has nearly doubled in the past 20 years.^{1,2} Healthy eating helps prevent obesity, high cholesterol, high blood pressure, and other conditions, and is associated with reduced risk for many diseases, including several of the leading causes of death (i.e., heart disease, cancer, stroke, and diabetes).^{3–5} Healthy eating in childhood and adolescence can also prevent future health problems such as obesity, dental caries, iron deficiency, and osteoporosis that can be present later in life.⁵ Unfortunately, most youth in the United States do not meet the recommended servings of foods that provide for proper nutrition, optimal growth and development (specifically fruits, vegetables, and whole grains), and consume too many of the foods that lead to poor health outcomes (those high in sodium, solid fat, and sugar).^{6,7}

Correspondence Dr Tabak; rtabak@wustl.edu.

Conflict of Interest Declaration

All authors of this article declare they have no conflicts of interest.

Diet can be shaped by policies that change the environment (eg, those focused on urban planning, marketing to children, school food, etc.). In children and adolescents, school nutrition policies, such as the National School Lunch Program (NSLP), may promote healthy dietary behaviors.⁸ More than 95% of youth (aged 5–17) in the United States are enrolled in schools, and no other institution has as much continuous and intensive contact with youth during this critical time of development and growth.^{8–11} While attending school, youth can consume up to two meals, sometimes even three, plus snacks. Therefore, the practices and policies implemented in schools can affect children's diets and weight,^{12,13} making schools a key setting for promoting health.^{14–16}

In 2012, in an effort to improve school meal standards and combat childhood obesity, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) released the Final Rule for Nutrition Standards for the NSLP. The policy's final rule updated the meal patterns and nutrition standards for the NSLP and the School Breakfast Program to align them with the Dietary Guidelines for Americans.¹⁷ The new regulations went into effect in the 2012/2013 school year; it will be phased in by 2023. The goal of these changes is to improve the dietary intakes of children participating in the programs by offering healthier options including increased availability of fruits, vegetables, whole grains, and fat-free milk and reducing the levels of sodium, saturated fat and trans fat in school meals, to meet the nutrition needs of school children within their calorie requirements.¹⁷ More specifically, this policy requires schools to serve vegetables of varying colors (eg, red/orange, dark green) throughout the week and that at least half the grains served be whole grain; these specific components of the guidelines are now fully implemented. The sodium restrictions on meals served become progressively stricter through 2023. These have required many menu changes and reformulations to recipes and products. Also fully implemented at this time, the new NSLP policy guidelines further specify that for a meal to qualify for reimbursement, students must select at least one serving of fruits or vegetables, which have led to concerns about food waste.^{18,19} Despite initial success in improvement of selection and dietary intakes among NSLP participants,²⁰ difficulties with implementation have been apparent, and the policy has been revised repeatedly.^{21–23} For instance, according Government Accountability Office report to Congress student participation in the NSLP has decreased during initial implementation of the new guidelines following several years of increased participation.²⁴

There are many levels at which this national policy must be effectively implemented in order to affect child behavior, including the school level and the level of the individual food service staff member. At the school level, this new policy means changes to the foods available for purchase in the school and how they are prepared. For example, favorite menu items might need to be removed or reformulated and to accommodate this, changes may be necessary to the physical environment including the preparation and serving spaces. This impacts food service director and staff behavior. Directors might need to change their purchasing behaviors to find alternate products, and food service staff may find changes to their responsibilities such as increased processing for fresh fruits and vegetables. The manner in which these changes are implemented determines the impact of the policy on student behavior.¹⁷

Focused efforts are needed to determine if these new policies are effectively implemented and whether they encourage intake of nutritious food. It is essential to evaluate the implementation, effectiveness, and unintended consequences as the new NSLP policies are being rolled out. The purpose of this paper is to provide insight from the perspective of food service personnel regarding the supports and barriers for implementation of the new NSLP guidelines.

METHODS

Participants

Using purposive sampling, eight food service directors from eight school districts in a single region in Missouri were selected to participate in semi-structured interviews. School districts were selected such that there would be a representative sample of schools (i.e., diverse in size, variation in free/reduced price lunch participation, and level of success in maintaining participation after the implementation of the new guidelines (as indicated by the regional manager)). Directors from selected districts were approached by email, and those who were interested were recruited to participate. All respondents provided informed consent prior to beginning the interview.

Procedure

Participants were interviewed either by phone or in their office between January and March 2013 by a single interviewer. Interviews were semi-structured meaning that we addressed the process of implementation and discussed the various challenges encountered. The semi-structured interview questions were developed using the Consolidated Framework of Implementation Research (CFIR) to guide the inclusion of implementation components. The CFIR, an implementation science framework with significant previous development and use,^{25–30} was used to understand the challenges and facilitators to implementation of the new NSLP guidelines. Table 1 describes the relevant domains and constructs and provides examples for their application to the school food service environment. Though the CFIR has five domains, only four domains are relevant to the current research: *Inner Setting*, *Characteristics of Individuals*, *Intervention Characteristics*, and *Implementation Process*. The *Inner Setting* for the proposed study is the food service environment. Included in this domain are constructs such as *structural characteristics, networks and communication, implementation climate*, and *culture*. *Characteristics of individuals* include *knowledge and beliefs about the intervention, self-efficacy*, and *individual identification with the organization*. The third domain, *Intervention Characteristics*, includes the NSLP guidelines and relevant constructs such as *evidence strength & quality, complexity*, and *cost*. These CFIR constructs are particularly important, as food service staff members are the front line of delivering the school meal to children. The new NSLP guidelines impact food preparation, meal qualification at checkout (i.e., ensuring the student has the correct meal components), record keeping, and many other staff responsibilities. Adequate knowledge, skill, and buy-in from these personnel is critical to ensuring that the guidelines are implemented as planned and provide appealing, healthy options to children. Finally, the *Implementation Process* domain includes constructs focused on *planning, engaging influential stakeholders, executing*, and *reflecting and evaluating*. The semi-structured

interview guide was reviewed with several food service directors and their feedback was incorporated prior to use in the current study. With the respondent's permission, all interviews were recorded.

Data Analysis

Interview recordings were transcribed. An initial codebook was developed based on the interview guide and the CFIR, and was refined iteratively as new codes emerged from the data. The transcripts were double coded using Nvivo 10 software, and disagreements were resolved by consensus. Themes and sub-themes were summarized from each code.

RESULTS

Enrollment at the districts served by the participants ranged from 1,500 to 6,367 students (mean: 3,892 students) and free and reduced price lunch participation ranged from 15% to 65% (mean: 38%). There was a range in how long the food service directors had been with their district from six months to 33 years; there was little variability in responses based on how long the respondents had been with their districts. Several themes and subthemes related to challenges with implementation were reported. These themes are summarized below and outlined in Table 2.

Stakeholders

Several relevant stakeholders had important influence on the success of implementation of the new NSLP guidelines including food service staff and directors; parents, teachers, and school staff; and students.

Food service staff and director—Food service staff are the front line in delivering the new NSLP guidelines to students and are involved in menu planning, food preparation, and food service. Some directors reported that staff tasked with food preparation and service initially expressed low self-efficacy for the new food preparation requirements. There were mixed perspectives from the food service directors about the new NSLP guidelines with varying levels of buy-in. In some districts, food service directors reported that staff expressed doubt about the new NSLP guidelines, and questioned whether the students would eat the food and whether the new requirements provided the students enough food. In other districts, however, directors reported that staff had strong identification with the district and were enthusiastic to support implementation; these were often districts where the director described selecting staff whose work ethic and philosophy fit well with the department and districts where the staff had children enrolled in the district. Directors also mentioned additional training was helpful in relieving anxiety and improving perceptions of the new NSLP guidelines among the staff. Additionally, directors felt that his/her leadership, positive attitude, and ability to be flexible were particularly important as s/he was seen to set the tone for the department. Directors also recognized the benefits of their relationships with and support from staff. Directors acknowledged the complexity of the new NSLP guidelines, and therefore the importance of staff education and buy in.

Parents, teachers, and school staff—A common concern among directors was lack of understanding about the new NSLP guidelines, its goals, and its need for participation/support at multiple levels on the part of parents, teachers, and school staff. The level of support for the new NSLP guidelines was inconsistent across districts, as there were many directors who reported significant support from these stakeholders (eg, administration, parents). Districts that had more support, tended to be districts reporting greater success (and less negative impact on participation) with implementation of the new NSLP guidelines. Of particular importance was the support from district leadership; in districts where leadership was passionate about child nutrition, directors perceived more support, and reported more success.

Directors who reported successful implementation also developed key partnerships (eg, with classroom teachers, student/parent groups, and afterschool programs), which improved the overall perception of and support for the program. These relationships also contributed to more effective communication throughout the process with administrators, principals, school boards, teachers, and parents. Directors described points where these partnerships fell-through as challenges to successful implementation. For example, if a partnership with teachers weakened, promotion of new healthy items was not well supported. However, where this worked well, directors considered this process a facilitator for implementation success.

Students—In some districts, student engagement opportunities (eg, taste testing, nutrition education) were already in place. Whether this was added to address implementation issues or was already in place, student engagement was perceived as helpful in minimizing impacts on participation. Through these interactions, directors aimed to enhance student willingness to try new, healthy foods and to enhance participation through nutrition education and greater understanding of new NSLP guidelines and food served. Engagement included classroom lessons from food service directors and involvement with student/parent groups. Often, this type of interaction was aimed at improving students' dietary behaviors within and outside school.

Policy Characteristics

Several characteristics of the new NSLP guidelines were believed to create increased demands; however, resources were described as an important asset to help directors overcome barriers.

Increased demands—The new NSLP guidelines were perceived as difficult to implement and to require extra food service director and staff time. Food service staff perceived menu planning and food preparation require more time and effort as does additional paperwork and the extra responsibility required for cashiers, as described above.

Costs and Resources

Some of the directors reported challenges to implementation in the context of food and labor costs, issues with physical space, and food sourcing challenges.

Food and labor costs—While many directors felt they had adequate resources for implementation of the new NSLP guidelines, directors in other districts reported a gap. Directors reported increased food cost and labor as a result of implementing the new NSLP guidelines. Much of the labor was related to increased time required to prepare more food items from scratch and/or to serve food that was less processed as well as increasing preparation time for fruits and vegetables. While few directors reported strategies for overcoming the increased cost, ideas included more efficient and creative use of commodities and seeking out grants to help defray the cost of extra fruit and vegetable service.

Physical-space for service, storage, and preparation—Directors reported needing more space for food preparation and storage because of efforts to serve more fresh foods. While directors reported understanding the importance of presenting foods in ways that made them appealing to students, many reported significant limitations, particularly with regard to cafeteria space for display. Directors tried to address this by altering their menu planning. In the long term, many directors worked with their districts to introduce bond issues, which included renovations to kitchen/food service spaces, and/or planning for these spaces in new building/renovation projects. Additionally, some directors received financial support from their district; these districts were willing to invest additional resources in improvements to food service such as enhancements to the cafeteria or kitchen spaces.

Food sourcing—Nearly every director interviewed described difficulty finding bread items that met the new standards for whole grains in the appropriate sizes. However, they did report that, in general, vendors and producers made other product adjustments necessary to create items to meet the new NSLP guidelines (eg, lowering sodium content, foods portioned into required number of ounces, etc.).

Decreases in participation because of the food choices and amounts of food—Some directors reported decreases in student participation in the lunch program following the implementation of the new NSLP guidelines. This was often attributed to constraints on the menu items they were able to serve. Many directors felt they could no longer offer the students' favorite items, so students stopped participating. Further, there was a common perception that the meals were too small, and would leave students hungry. To address this, several directors reported using creativity in menu planning as a key facilitator to program success. This creativity allowed them to incorporate student preferences into the menu. Directors learned about these student preferences from a number of sources including: production and sales records (i.e., looking at what has sold well in the past), involvement with student and parent groups, and engaging with students through classroom education.

Organizational costs—The food service directors interviewed reported organizational constraints that contributed to implementation challenges. Some of the constraints described included limited time for formal training and physical distance from the schools, which prevented desired face-face communication within the food service department. Directors expressed the importance of getting out to the schools to communicate with the staff and provide informal training, but that this often came into conflict with other, required duties.

Most directors, however, described frequent (at least weekly) trips to each school, which afforded them the opportunity to engage in one-on-one training.

Resources—In response to many of these cost/resource challenges, participants saw resources from their networks as keys to their success. Resources mentioned included assistance with menu planning, access to experts (eg, dietitians, chefs) and other directors, support software, and central purchasing.

DISCUSSION

Food service directors identified a number of challenges regarding the implementation of the new NSLP guidelines. They also articulated many ways in which these challenges were mitigated and overcome and components of implementation in their districts that facilitated implementation success.

The barriers and facilitators described by food service directors align with many of the constructs described in the CFIR. Key domains of the CFIR, which related to the findings of the current study, were *intervention characteristics*, the *inner setting*, *characteristics of individuals*, and the *implementation process*. By tying the findings for this particular policy implementation effort to a broader implementation framework, it is possible to understand the barriers and facilitators in a larger context.

A number of lessons can be learned from these findings. While the *intervention characteristics* of the new NSLP guidelines are indeed complex and pose a variety of challenges to food service directors (eg, *evidence strength & quality*, *complexity*, and *cost*), several steps can be taken related to the schools *inner setting*, the *characteristics of individuals*, and the *implementation process* to improve policy implementation. The attitude of the director and the relationship, training, and buy in from his/her staff are important *inner setting* characteristics. Food service directors felt that maintaining a positive attitude could spread throughout the department, changing the departmental *culture*. Directors also felt that by building strong relationships with their staff they could overcome some of the skepticism the staff felt (*characteristics of individuals*) around the added work load to implement the new NSLP guidelines. Thus the many directors felt it was within their power to positively impact the *characteristics of individuals* involved in implementation through positive attitude and education, building *self-efficacy*, enhancing their *identification with the organization*, and improving their *knowledge and beliefs about the intervention*. These are all important constructs related to the *characteristics of individuals*. Other reports on implementation of the new NSLP guidelines have found similar challenges related to *complexity* and *cost of the policy components*, and have also highlighted the benefits of staff training.³¹ Further, district administrators and school boards, and parents and students are groups important to the *implementation process*. The CFIR recognizes the importance of these different groups of stakeholders in a successful implementation process. *Engagement of influential stakeholders* in the policy implementation process, such as presenting to the administration and school board as new changes are being mandated, was seen as an effective way to help smooth the transition.

While the *characteristics of the policy intervention* were often noted as complex and rigid and leading to a drop in participation, many directors addressed these challenges by being more creative with the menus. Similar recommendations for increased creativity on the part of directors as a way to maintain participation has appeared elsewhere.³¹ Directors also reported using this skill to continue to offer items their students like, an important predictor of satisfaction.³² Initial reports of student perceptions have indicated students complained about the new offerings initially, but that these complaints have decreased over time.³³ This flexibility by the directors ties back into the *inner setting* and implementation and learning climate, as the organization's willingness to try new things is valuable. Directors also reported success with engaging students to make sure their preferences were incorporated in the new menus and to provide education to promote buy-in.

A study looking at the implementation of a weight management program in a healthcare setting also found several CFIR constructs were related to whether a setting showed high- or low-implementation.³⁴ As with the current study, these investigators identified the *intervention characteristics evidence strength and quality, complexity, and cost* to be important. Other similarities were seen in the *inner setting*, where both investigations found *networks and communications, culture, and implementation climate* to be important, and *process* domain, where *engaging influential stakeholders* was important in both implementation efforts. One main difference is that the study identified *adaptability, trialability, and design quality and packaging*, as intervention characteristics that affected implementation and which did not emerge in our current work. Differences between the two studies may be related to the type of intervention (i.e., NSLP is a policy intervention and the other is a programmatic intervention) being investigated, the setting in which the intervention under study was being implemented, and/or the method of investigation. However, the similarities indicate that several CFIR constructs are important to implementation, and should be considered in interventions to improve implementation of other programs, policies, and or guidelines.

Many directors recognized the importance of presentation of the new food items to provide nutrition education to the students and to enhance participation by making the new menus more appealing. These factors have also been shown to be important influences on satisfaction with school food service in the past.³⁵ However, the *characteristics of the policy intervention* made this difficult, as directors reported a number of constraints on presentation and with preparation because of food item restrictions in the new NSLP guidelines. In general, many of these challenges were related to limited space and equipment for food storage and preparation in the kitchen and presentation in the cafeteria. This challenge has been echoed elsewhere. Recent research by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF) and the Pew Charitable Trusts indicated that many school food authorities faced challenges with implementation relating to equipment.³⁶ In our study, directors aimed to address this by working with their district to make changes as funding opportunities (eg, bond issues) or additional resources were made available, but found the interim to hurt program participation.

The RWJF/Pew survey also found widely reported issues with training.³⁶ The directors in our study found that opportunities for formal training of their staff were somewhat limited,

but they addressed this by regularly visiting the schools and conducting informal one-on-one training as they identified training needs. Other *intervention characteristics* such as issues with food availability (particularly bread) and *cost* (especially the extra fresh produce and extra labor) were mentioned by many directors. Some directors aimed to better use commodity products to address this, and others commented on how many parents in their district prioritized nutrition quality over cost, leaving the food service department in a difficult position of trying to break even given the demand for higher cost foods.

Limitations

This study has limitations. First, this research was conducted in only one region of the country and with a very small sample. While there was some diversity in the schools with regard to location and percent of students receiving free/reduced meals, the generalizability of the findings are limited. Additionally, all of the data used in this study are self-reported by food service directors; we are unable to verify the reliability or validity of the findings. This method also means that information about parental and student factors are a proxy of their perceptions through the Directors' report. This may not be a true representation of their perspectives and might be biased. Finally, though a lack of consistent training (registered dietician, chef) across food service directors and staff may underscore the challenges reported in the current study, particularly regarding meal planning we did not have additional information regarding the type of training or length of experience of the directors interviewed.

Several areas for future research emerge from this current work. To fully identify the factors related to implementation of the new NSLP policy guidelines and develop effective interventions, data from a wider sample of food service directors representing districts with varying types of food service management are needed. Further, report from food service staff beyond the food service director and from other important stakeholders is necessary. Finally, if such data could be collected on a wide scale, other characteristics could be collected (eg, program participation, student dietary intake), allowing for comparison between implementation and student health and behavior outcomes.

Conclusions

There are important factors within the food service department, characteristics of individuals implementing the NSLP, characteristics of the new NSLP policy itself, and stakeholder involvement in the implementation process that relate to successful implementation.

Acknowledgements

This publication was made possible by Grant Number 1P30DK092950 from the NIDDK, and its contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the NIDDK.

Human Subjects Approval Statement

This study was approved by the Human Subjects Protection Office at Washington University in St. Louis (IRB ID #: 201312070).

REFERENCES

1. Ogden CL, Carroll MD, Curtin LR, Lamb MM, Flegal KM. Prevalence of high body mass index in US children and adolescents, 2007–2008. *JAMA*. 2010 Jan 20; 303(3):242–249. [PubMed: 20071470]
2. Ogden CL, Carroll MD, Kit BK, Flegal KM. Prevalence of obesity and trends in body mass index among US children and adolescents, 1999–2010. *JAMA*. 2012 Feb 1; 307(5):483–490. [PubMed: 22253364]
3. Kushi LH, Byers T, Doyle C, et al. American Cancer Society guidelines on nutrition and physical activity for cancer prevention: reducing the risk of cancer with healthy food choices and physical activity. *CA Cancer J Clin*. 2006 Sep-Oct;56(5):254–281. quiz 313–254. [PubMed: 17005596]
4. Kaiser LL, Townsend MS. Food insecurity among US children: implications for nutrition and health. *Top Clin Nutr*. 2005; 20(4):313–320.
5. Dietary Guidelines Advisory Committee. Report of the Dietary Guidelines Advisory Committee on the Dietary Guidelines for Americans, 2010, to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health and Human Services. Washington, DC: Department of Agriculture; 2010.
6. Reedy J, Krebs-Smith SM. Dietary sources of energy, solid fats, and added sugars among children and adolescents in the United States. *J Am Diet Assoc*. 2010 Oct; 110(10):1477–1484. [PubMed: 20869486]
7. Forshee RA, Anderson PA, Storey ML. Changes in calcium intake and association with beverage consumption and demographics: comparing data from CSFII 1994–1996, 1998 and NHANES 1999–2002. *J Am Coll Nutr*. 2006 Apr; 25(2):108–116. [PubMed: 16582026]
8. 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 Mar; 87(1):71–100. [PubMed: 19298416]
9. Story, M.; Kaphingst, KM.; French, S. *Future Child*. Vol. 16. Spring; 2006. The role of schools in obesity prevention; p. 109–142.
10. Li J, Hooker NH. Childhood obesity and schools: evidence from the national survey of children's health. *J Sch Health*. 2010 Feb; 80(2):96–103. [PubMed: 20236408]
11. Mirtcheva DM, Powell LM. Participation in the national school lunch program: importance of school-level and neighborhood contextual factors. *J Sch Health*. 2009 Oct; 79(10):485–494. [PubMed: 19751310]
12. French SA, Story M, Fulkerson JA, Hannan P. An environmental intervention to promote lower-fat food choices in secondary schools: outcomes of the TACOS Study. *Am J Public Health*. 2004 Sep; 94(9):1507–1512. [PubMed: 15333303]
13. Perry CL, Bishop DB, Taylor GL, et al. A randomized school trial of environmental strategies to encourage fruit and vegetable consumption among children. *Health Educ Behav*. 2004 Feb; 31(1):65–76. [PubMed: 14768658]
14. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. School health guidelines to promote healthy eating and physical activity. *MMWR Recomm Rep*. 2011 Sep 16; 60(RR-5):1–76.
15. Kubik MY, Lytle LA, Story M. Schoolwide food practices are associated with body mass index in middle school students. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. 2005 Dec; 159(12):1111–1114. [PubMed: 16330732]
16. Committee on Prevention of Obesity in Children and Youth. *Preventing Childhood Obesity: Health in the Balance*. Washington, DC: Institute of Medicine of the National Academies; 2005.
17. Nutrition Standards in the National School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs; Final Rule: Part II. Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) U, ed. 7 CFR Parts 210 and 220. Vol [FNS–2007–0038] RIN 0584–AD592012.
18. Hellmich N. Students push back on new school lunches. *USA Today*. 2012 Sep 28.2012
19. Byker CJ, Farris AR, Marcenelle M, Davis GC, Serrano EL. Food waste in a school nutrition program after implementation of new lunch program guidelines. *J Nutr Educ Behav*. 2014 Sep-Oct;46(5):406–411. [PubMed: 24857599]

20. Cohen JFW, Richardson S, Parker E, Catalano PJ, Rimm EB. Impact of the New U.S Department of Agriculture School Meal Standards on Food Selection, Consumption, and Waste. *Am J Prev Med.* 2014; 46(4):388–394. [PubMed: 24650841]
21. USDA Office of Communications. Press Release: USDA Makes Permanent Meat and Grain Serving Flexibilities in National School Lunch Program. Washington DC: USDA; 2014 Jan 2.
22. USDA Office of Communications. Press Release: USDA Awards Grants for New School Food Service Equipment to Help Schools Improve the Quality of Meals. Washington DC: USDA; 2013 Dec 18.
23. USDA Office of Communications. Press Release: USDA Announces School Meal Flexibility for Upcoming School Year. Washington DC: USDA; 2014 May 20.
24. United States Government Accountability Office. School Lunch: Implementing Nutrition Changes Was Challenging and Clarification of Oversight Requirements Is Needed. 2014 Jan.2014
25. Manuel JK, Hagedorn HJ, Finney JW. Implementing evidence-based psychosocial treatment in specialty substance use disorder care. *Psychol Addict Behav.* 2011; 25(2):225. [PubMed: 21668085]
26. Gordon AJ, Kavanagh G, Krumm M, et al. Facilitators and barriers in implementing buprenorphine in the Veterans Health Administration. *Psychol Addict Behav.* 2011; 25(2):215. [PubMed: 21480679]
27. Midboe AM, Cucciare MA, Trafton JA, Ketroser N, Chardos JF. Implementing motivational interviewing in primary care: the role of provider characteristics. *Transl Behav Med.* 2011; 1(4): 588–594. [PubMed: 24073081]
28. Sorensen JL, Kosten T. Developing the tools of implementation science in substance use disorders treatment: applications of the consolidated framework for implementation research. *Psychol Addict Behav.* 2011; 25(2):262. [PubMed: 21668086]
29. Damschroder, L. [Accessed September 20, 2014] Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR) Wiki. 2014. <http://wiki.cfirwiki.net>
30. Damschroder LJ, Aron DC, Keith RE, Kirsh SR, Alexander JA, Lowery JC. Fostering implementation of health services research findings into practice: a consolidated framework for advancing implementation science. 2009; 4:50.
31. Byker CJ, Pinard CA, Yaroch AL, Serrano EL. New NSLP guidelines: challenges and opportunities for nutrition education practitioners and researchers. *J Nutr Educ Behav.* 2013 Nov-Dec;45(6):683–689. [PubMed: 23886776]
32. Meyer MK. Top predictors of middle/junior high school students' satisfaction with school foodservice and nutrition programs. *J Am Diet Assoc.* 2000 Jan; 100(1):100–103. [PubMed: 10646013]
33. Turner L, Chaloupka FJ. Perceived reactions of elementary school students to changes in school lunches after implementation of the United States Department of Agriculture's new meals standards: minimal backlash, but rural and socioeconomic disparities exist. *Child Obes.* 2014 Aug; 10(4):349–356. [PubMed: 25045934]
34. Damschroder LJ, Lowery JC. Evaluation of a large-scale weight management program using the consolidated framework for implementation research (CFIR). *Implement Sci.* 2013; 8:51. [PubMed: 23663819]
35. Meyer MK, Conklin MT. Variables affecting high school students' perceptions of school foodservice. *J Am Diet Assoc.* 1998 Dec; 98(12):1424–1431. [PubMed: 9850111]
36. The Pew Charitable Trusts and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. Serving Healthy School Meals Despite challenges, schools meet USDA meal requirements: a report from The Pew Charitable Trusts and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. 2013 Sep.2013
37. WELCOME to the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR) Wiki. http://www.wiki.cf-ir.net/index.php?title=Main_Page. Accessed March 25, 2014, 2014
38. Klein KJ, Sorra JS. The challenge of innovation implementation. *Acad Manage Rev.* 1996 Oct; 21(4):1055–1080.
39. Martin, J.; Culture, O. Mapping the terrain. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications; 2002.
40. Gershon RR, Stone PW, Bakken S, Larson E. Measurement of organizational culture and climate in healthcare. *J Nurs Adm.* 2004; 34(1):33–40. [PubMed: 14737033]

41. Pronovost P, Berenholtz S, Needham D. Translating evidence into practice: a model for large scale knowledge translation. *BMJ*. 2008; 337(7676):963–965.

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

IMPLICATIONS FOR HEALTH BEHAVIOR OR POLICY

These findings highlight a number of barriers to implementation of the new NSLP policy guidelines, but identified several strategies to overcome these barriers such as a flexible, adaptive, and creative attitude on the part of the director; communication and education for food service staff (in formal and informal settings); engagement of important stakeholders such as administrators, which might offer opportunities for district involvement; partnership with parents and students (particularly through educational outreach); and communication with other directors with varying areas of expertise.

Table 1

Description of CFIR Domains and Constructs with Examples for the School Food Service Environment

Domain	Constructs	Definition ³⁷	School Food Service Example
Inner Setting	Networks & Communications	Nature and quality of social networks, formal/informal communications between these networks and within an organization	The amount of formal and/or informal communication and training about the new NSLP guidelines a director is able to provide to his/her staff.
	Implementation Climate	Perception of the extent to which use of an innovation is rewarded, supported, and expected within an organization ³⁸	The extent to which learning to develop and prepare menu items is rewarded by the food service director.
	Culture	Norms, values, and basic assumptions of a given organization, relatively stable, socially constructed, subconscious. ^{30,39,40}	The value placed on creativity with menu items.
Intervention Characteristics	Evidence strength & quality	Perceptions strength or quality of evidence for intervention	The extent to which food service staff believe that the new NSLP guidelines require them to serve meals that are too small for the students.
	Complexity	Perceived difficulty of implementation	The perception that the requirement to serve fresh fruits and vegetables requires extensive staff time and effort.
	Cost	Cost of intervention and implementation	The perception that the foods required to meet the new NSLP guidelines will cost more than the foods previously served.
Characteristics of individuals	Self-efficacy	Individual belief in their capacity for Implementation	The extent to which staff understand and feel comfortable with their new responsibilities in preparing meals that meet the new NSLP guidelines.
	Individual identification with organization	Perception of the organization and relationship and degree of commitment to it	The staff perceptions about the district in which they work values their services and is committed to providing good nutrition.
	Knowledge and beliefs about the intervention	Attitudes toward and value placed on the intervention, familiarity with facts about it	The amount the staff know about the details of the new NSLP guidelines and why these are necessary to improve the health of the students they serve
Implementation Process	Planning	Scheme of behavior and tasks for implementation developed in advance	The degree to which director and district administrators worked together to plan for implementation before the new NSLP guidelines became mandatory.
	Engaging	Attracting and involving appropriate individuals in the implementation ⁴¹	The extent to which important stakeholders, such as parents and students, have been involved in implementation.
	Executing	Carrying implementation according to plan.	The director's perception regarding the accuracy with which the new NSLP guidelines have been implemented as planned.
	Reflecting & Evaluating	Feedback about the progress and quality of implementation	The responses food service directors receive regarding the success or failure of implementation of the new NSLP guidelines.

Table 2

Main Themes Related to Challenges and Facilitators to National School Lunch Program Implementation Reported by Food Service Directors

Barriers				Facilitators	
Theme	Sub-Theme	Quote	Theme	Sub-Theme	Quote
Stakeholder	FS staff and directors	"I have a principal that still thinks the amount of protein that students are allowed to have ... because you have to fall within those calorie guidelines, and when we just ... when we ... before we did this, we were a nutrient based and not a food base, and I still have complaints."	Director characteristics	Flexible and adaptive	"But I think that we've been successful because we have a lot of experience here and a very caring team."
	Teachers			Regular communication with all stakeholders	
	Parents			Positive attitude	
	Students			Support from FSP	
Costs and Resources	Money	"Most of the training is informal. ... there's not a lot of time in the day and then there's just not a lot of money in the budget that will allow us to have the full staff work outside of work hours, so that's where most of the training happens, it happens during work hours." "So, yeah, space, storage space, cooler space, that's a problem because we have a lot more fruits and veggies we offer now and we just have to try to make it work because a lot of the schools are older and their facilities just are not big enough to handle the number of students."	District Resources	Problem understood by stakeholders (parents and school)	"My philosophy with this whole thing is make the food appealing or appetizing enough that they're making the choices for themselves and you're not forcing them to make the choices. I think once you do that your job becomes much easier as far as implementing the programs and everything like that."
	Time			Supportive leadership who care about kids nutrition	
	Equipment			Funding for programs	
	Physical-space for service, storage, and preparation			Space and equipment Presentation	
Decreases in participation because of the food choices and amounts of food		"Yeah, and it lowered the participation because you're taking away their favorite." "It was really the bread because nobody prepared us to prepare the students that, oh, by the way, this big fancy focaccia bread that you're used to getting, you're not going to get."	General Supports	Buy in from all stakeholders	"Think out of the box. Even though you still have all your requirements you've still got to keep offering your favorite entrées. It's still going to be a reimbursable meal as long as they take that half cup fruit or vegetables. Don't take away their favorite entrées. Keep their favorite things out there, even if the recipe for it's going to change a little bit."
				Designing menus based on student feedback/student preferences Providing education to students/board/teachers/admin	
Policy characteristics	Complicated	"I know bringing in new people, there's a lot to explain. And you don't realize how complex the program is until you sit down with the new manager, whether it's elementary, middle or high, and you start	Resources	Software	"Plus my district manager is very supportive. If I need her all I have to do is call her. And we have a really good group of directors in this area so we call each other all the time if
	Takes too much time (paperwork, menu planning, food prep)			Access to experts (eg dietitian, chef, other directors, leadership) Access	

Facilitators			Barriers		
Theme	Sub-Theme	Quote	Theme	Sub-Theme	Quote
		we have questions, need help. Like one of the directors called me earlier and said, Hey, come out to my school on Friday. I want you to see my new lunch line she had at her high school. And just that kind of stuff, just that kind of support is good, because I can go to any of the schools and check on them and see what they're doing, or they can come here."			telling them all of the expectations and the guidelines, it's a lot." "Yes, there's a lot more prep time. There's, with the fresh fruits and vegetables ... and we have to offer the legumes once a week or twice a week, whatever it is ... and typically there's more ... it's a more intense process than just opening a can of beans or anything like that. So the prep time is significantly more."
Organizational	Communication	"Yeah. I feel like hey're so busy that I don't like to take their time unless ... like often I want them to see that I'm in their schools and that I care about their program. But often it's just a wave or a smile or some kind of acknowledgement and not take them away from what they're doing."			
	Leadership				
	Support				