



Coordinator Name

John Ruzas

Planning Team

Kim Harrison, John Ruzas, Chuck Howard, Dan Kelly, Stephanie Valleroy, Melissa Ford, Dina Strader, Paul Bauer

Description of the Program (2010-2012)

SSD Food Service provides breakfast and lunch in our seven school cafeterias: Southview, Northview, Neuwoehner, Litzsinger, Ackerman Schools plus North and South Technical Schools.

Description of How the Program’s Services are Developed and Delivered

The program is developed using guidelines from USDA and State such as the Missouri Eat Smart Guidelines and Board of Education.

Key Program Stakeholder Groups

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students | <input type="checkbox"/> Board of Education |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Parents Staff | <input type="checkbox"/> Taxpayers |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Administrators | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify.) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |

Student and/or Stakeholder Needs Addressed by the Program

This program addresses the need for nutritious healthy meals for all students in our schools

Overall Goals of the Program

Goal 1: Meet the requirements of Missouri Eat Smart Guidelines for advanced and exemplary ratings

Goal 2: Maintain a median price point in charges for meals among school districts throughout the St Louis county area.

Expected Measurable Outcomes

75% of the items on the Missouri Eat Smart assessment rubric will be either advanced or exemplary

To be within 10% of the median price point charged for meals throughout St Louis County School Districts.

Evaluation Questions

- What is the status of the program’s progress toward achieving the goals?
- What do students and other stakeholders consider to be the strengths and weaknesses of the program?
- What do staff consider to be the strengths and weaknesses of the program?
- How does the program’s actual implementation compare with the program’s design?
- How should priorities be changed to put more focus on achieving the goals?
- How should goals be changed? Any added or removed?

Data Collection Methods

- Surveys and questionnaires
- Interviews
- Document reviews
- Observations
- Focus groups
- Case studies
- Assessments
- Other (Specify)



Evaluation Results

What is the status of the programs progress toward achieving the goals? Both stated goals were met.

Goal 1: Meet the requirements of Missouri Eat Smart Guidelines for advanced and exemplary ratings.

Measurable Objective 1:	To have 75% of the items on the Missouri Eat Smart rubric be in either advanced or exemplary levels.				
Results: At the end of the school year 80% of the items in the rubric were at the advanced or exemplary level.					
	Level	Exemplary	Advanced	Intermediate	Minimum
	Items	21	3	2	4
	Percent	70.0%	10.0%	6.7%	13.3%

Goal 2: To maintain a median price point in charges for meals among school districts throughout the St Louis County area.

Measurable Objective 1:	To be within 10% of the median price point charged for meals throughout St Louis County School Districts.		
Results: The end of year survey showed that SSD is within the 10% goal of being the median price charged for breakfast and lunch. Of the 22 Districts in the area, Ten Districts are higher in price and Twelve Districts are lower in price placing SSD in the middle. SSD prices for breakfast, elementary lunch and High School lunch were within 10% of the median prices of the 22 St Louis County Districts.			
	Comparison of Median Prices		
	Breakfast	Elem Lunch	H.S. Lunch
Districts	22	22	22
Median	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50
SSD	\$1.30	\$2.05	\$2.25

Comparative Price Increase Study

COMPARATIVE DISTRICTS	2011-2012					
	Milk	Brk	Adult Brk	Elem lunch	H.S. Lunch	Adult Lunch
DISTRICT						
Special Schools	\$0.45	\$1.30	\$1.45	\$2.05	\$2.25	\$2.50
FRANCIS HOWELL	\$0.50	\$1.30	\$1.20	\$1.95	2.15/3.30	\$2.30
BAYLESS	\$0.50	\$1.40	\$1.60	\$1.95	\$2.10	\$2.40
KIRKWOOD	\$0.50	\$1.60	\$2.00	\$2.35	\$2.50	\$2.95
ROCKWOOD	\$0.60	\$1.55	\$1.80	\$2.40	\$2.55	\$3.00
PARKWAY	\$0.50	\$1.75	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$2.50	\$2.75
CLAYTON	\$0.60	\$2.00	\$2.10	\$2.90	\$3.15	\$3.40
BRENTWOOD	\$0.35	\$1.35	\$1.60	\$1.90	\$2.05	\$2.55
RITENOUR	\$0.35	\$1.50	\$1.50	\$2.00	2.25/2.50	\$2.25
VALLEY PARK	\$0.50	\$1.50	\$1.95	\$2.50	\$2.50	\$2.75
HAZELWOOD	\$0.45	\$0.75	\$1.25	\$1.50	\$1.90	\$2.50
AFFTON	\$0.35	\$0.90	\$1.40	\$1.85	\$1.75	\$2.25
HANCOCK PLACE	\$0.50	\$0.00	\$1.40	\$2.00	\$2.25	\$2.75
LADUE	\$0.55	\$1.15	\$1.35	\$2.30	2.30/2.65	\$2.95
PATTONVILLE	\$0.50	free	\$1.00	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$2.25
WEBSTER GROVES	\$0.50	\$1.25	\$1.50	\$2.50	\$2.50	\$2.60
LINDBERGH	\$0.70	.80/.85	n/a	2.30/2.40	2.45/2.55	\$2.50
MAPLEWOOD	\$0.25	\$0.00	\$1.50	\$2.50	\$2.50	\$2.75
NORMANDY	\$0.30	\$1.00	n/a	\$1.10	\$1.25	n/a
RIVERVIEW	\$0.25	\$0.75	\$1.00	\$1.25	\$1.50	\$2.00
FERGUSON-FLORISSANT	n/a	\$0.75	n/a	\$1.45	\$1.50	n/a
UNIVERSITY CITY	\$0.30	\$1.25	\$1.45	\$1.65	\$2.05	\$2.30
VALLEY PARK	\$0.50	\$1.50	\$1.95	\$2.50	\$2.50	\$2.75

HIGHER THAN SSD

LOWER THAN SSD

What do key staff and stakeholders consider to be the strengths and opportunities for improvement/weaknesses of the program?

Strengths

- *Strength 1. The Food Services program has made steady progress on the Missouri Eat Smart rubric in each of the three years that those guidelines have been in place. Food surveys were taken to establish what the students want in terms of choices*
- *Strength 2. The poster competition in the younger grades helps with educating students on healthy choices and was well received, as well as the visits from the Lift-Off character in elementary schools.*
- *Strength 3. Food service committee meetings promoted monthly communication thus allowing for a timely response to problems that were identified.*

Opportunities/Weaknesses

- *Opportunity 1. DESE and the Federal Government replaced the total Missouri Eat Smart goals with goals from USDA Healthy Hunger Free Kids Act of 2010 so the measures of compliance with state recommendations will change.*

How well aligned are the program's priorities and processes with the goals of the program?

The priorities were very well aligned and the program made great strides in the Missouri Eat Smart Guidelines. We achieved our set goal to meet 75% of the guidelines rubric in the exemplary and advanced levels.

Deployment Level of Program Services: Services are fully deployed without significant weaknesses or gaps in any areas or schools.

Should priorities be changed to put more focus on achieving the goals? Yes No

Should goals be changed, added or removed? Yes No

If Yes describe the changes to goals listed.

The goal now must be changed to align with new USDA Healthy Hunger Free Kids Act of 2010 recommendations.

Evaluation Implications

General Recommendation Resulting from the Evaluation

Select from the following possible recommendations resulting from the evaluation:

- Continue the program as is. It is meeting or exceeding all expected outcomes.
- Expand the program, replicating effective components.
- Streamline, refine, or consolidate elements of the program.
- Redesign the program.
- Reevaluate the purpose and/or goals of the program.
- Discontinue ineffective or nonessential program components.
- Discontinue the program.
- Other (Specify.)

Action Plan

- Realign the goals to follow the new Healthy Hunger Free Kids Act.
- Evaluate the SSD meal plan with guidelines of Healthy Hunger Free Kids Act.

Cost and Funding Source - The cost increase of compliance with the HHFKA act will be about \$.06 per lunch meal effective July 1, 2012. To counteract this increase the Federal reimbursement is scheduled to increase \$.06 in October 2012. The District will absorb the increased cost for August and September Lunch meals.

Status of prior Program Evaluation Recommendations

- *Food Services will maintain the Advanced level for menu planning and continue to work with Sodexo in monitoring program costs and address budgetary issues as needed. Food Services will collaborate with the Wellness Committee to explore the feasibility of meeting Exemplary status with regard to menu planning.*

As shown by the above table 70% of the rubric for Missouri Eat Smart guidelines were in the exemplary status.

- *Food Services will explore available processes and methods to solicit direct feedback regarding student satisfaction.*

This year we used the climate survey to collect quantitative data and feedback regarding student satisfaction.

- *The Food Service Committee will continue educating both staff and students on healthy choices. More emphasis will be placed on the correlation between food choices, calories, carbohydrates and physical activity.*

The Food Service Committee completed education activities through student posters, the appearance of the Lift-Off character in elementary schools and health classes.

- *Posters depicting healthy choices will again be requested from students and will be displayed in the schools.*

The Lift-Off character will continue to be a part of the program in elementary schools.

- *Food Service Committee meetings will continue as a means to promote communication and timely response to problems.*

Meetings take place once a month on a rotating schedule so no school will have to host all meetings, and to make the meetings accessible to all areas of the county.

- *The carbohydrate list is a dynamic tool and will be updated and changed as needed.*

This list came out of a request voiced at a monthly meeting by nursing staff. It was acted upon so that nursing staff can now chart out a Diabetic student's meals.