Program Description

Summary Description of Program

The Food Service program is intended to provide wholesome, nutritious, and appetizing meals to District students, thereby contributing to good nutrition, which is vital to mental and physical growth during the formative years. Through our partner vendor Sodexo, the program provides breakfast, lunch, and/or after-school snacks in seven school cafeterias: Southview, Northview, Neuwoehner, Litzsinger, Ackerman, and North Tech (as it has only half-day programs, South Tech does not provide lunch.). The program operates under the guidelines of the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) and School Breakfast Program (SBP), as amended by the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 (HHFKA). Certain eligible students are provided food services at a free or reduced cost under those programs.

Purpose or Mandate

The Food Service program exists to satisfy the hunger needs of students while at school, because physical satisfaction of this need is believed to relieve a barrier to learning. Board policy EF (revised January 26, 2010) permits but does not mandate a food service program. That policy states that the food program “will operate as an integral part of the total school program.” Similarly, Board policy EFB authorizes free or reduced-cost food services “if state and federal resources . . . are available.” The two policies provide further guidance for the program, including a requirement to provide health instruction for students and information for staff on Missouri’s Eat Smart Guidelines (which have now been supplanted by HHFKA).

Which specific CSIP/MSIP goals does this Program support?

CSIP 1.3.1: Provide a safe, equitable, supportive environment for students attending SSD schools. Process Classification Framework (PCF, SSD’s Enterprise Management Model) 4.5: Manage food service

Who are the Customers/Stakeholders?

- Students
- Parents
- Staff
- Other
- Board of Education
- Taxpayers
- Administrators
What are the Customer/Stakeholder requirements?

Stakeholders require healthy food in a safe environment. General requirements for nutrition value, portion size, and food quality are mandated by HHFKA. Specific requirements for students having special dietary needs are received from private physicians, coordinated through the Effective Practice Specialist (EPS) for Health Services.

What is this program expected to accomplish?

This program is expected to prevent students from being hungry while at school, and to do so with wholesome, nutritious, and appetizing food and drink. Fulfilling this purpose is expected to contribute to improved student outcomes such as engagement, satisfaction, behavior, and achievement.

Briefly describe how this Program works

This program is operated using guidelines from U.S. Department of Agriculture (HHFKA), DESE, and Board policies. Menu planning, food preparation, and food delivery are outsourced to Sodexo, Inc., SSD’s food service vendor. Sodexo’s role is executed by an on-site manager who coordinates Sodexo services with SSD’s purchasing, accounting, and health services departments.

Funding and budgeting for the program are managed by SSD’s accounting staff. Certification of eligibility for free-or-reduced-price meals is coordinated by SSD building staff and the Sodexo manager. Collection of student payments is coordinated by Sodexo cafeteria staff and SSD accounting staff, who maintain student accounts in the Tyler SIS student information system.

What resources (type and quantity) are required to execute this plan?

This program is managed collaboratively by several SSD staff on an ad-hoc basis, including resources from the accounting, purchasing, health services, and student information departments.

Detailed execution of the program is outsourced to Sodexo, Inc. They supply one on-site manager plus cafeteria staff in each of the SSD schools. Kitchen, serving, and seating equipment is owned by SSD. In addition, SSD provides one point-of-sale computer in each cafeteria (seven sites).
Action Plan Summary

Previous Cycle Goals and Outcomes

2011-2012 Overall Goals

Goal 1: Meet the requirements of Missouri Eat Smart Guidelines for advanced and exemplary ratings.
75% of the items on the Missouri Eat Smart assessment rubric will be either advanced or exemplary.

Goal 2: Maintain a median price point in charges for meals among school districts throughout the St Louis county area.
To be within 10% of the median price point charged for meals throughout St Louis County School Districts.

Current Cycle (2012-2015) Goals and Outcomes

2012-2015 Overall Goals

Goal 1: Transition program administration to the new Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 (HHFKA).
The program will be in compliance with HHFKA standards.

Goal 2: Maintain a median price point in charges for meals among school districts throughout the St Louis county area.
SSD’s average cafeteria prices will be within ±10% of the median price point charged throughout St Louis County School Districts.

Goal 3: Reduce the annual amount by which SSD subsidizes the Food Service program.
Reduce SSD’s annual food service subsidy by at least 5%.

Evaluation Plan Summary

Program Evaluation Authority
Evaluation of this program is required biennially by Board policy IM. The last evaluation report was approved by the Board on September 25, 2012.

Qualitative Measures - Evaluation questions to be used
- What are the major accomplishments or benefits of this program?
- How well did this program fulfill its purpose or mandate?
- What do customers and other stakeholders consider to be the strengths and opportunities for improvement/weaknesses of the program?
- How well-aligned are the program’s priorities and processes with the goals of the program?
- What is the level of deployment of this program’s services?
- How should resources be changed to put more focus on achieving the goals?
- How should goals be changed, added, or removed?
- Have SSD cafeterias earned an "A" grade from Saint Louis County Health Department?
- Have cafeteria staff completed certification as qualified food handlers?
- Do schools provide health instruction for students and information for staff, aligned with HHFKA?
Quantitative Measures - Evaluation questions to be used

- What is the status of the program’s progress toward achieving its goals?
- What are the actual costs of this program, and how do they compare to planned costs?
- What is the estimated actual benefit-cost or cost-effectiveness of this program?

Quantitative Measures - Criteria for Evaluation

1.a Measure to be used: Completion and acceptance of USDA/DESE certification application, followed by annual attestation of compliance.

1.b Rationale for establishing targets (check all that apply):
   a. ☐ Performance compared to similar organization
   b. ☐ Performance compared to benchmark organization
   c. ☐ State standard
   d. ☐ Norm-referenced standard
   e. ☒ 100% - based on core values
   f. ☐ Industry standard
   g. ☐ Incremental improvement based on historical results
   h. ☐ Growth to proficiency-Determine whether the measure is “on track” to become proficient or meet target within a certain period of time
   i. ☐ Growth targets based on employee input. Those closest to the work may be in the best position to provide insight on what represents a meaningful target (Niven, p. 244)
   j. ☐ Growth target based on feedback from customers. Ask them what is expected (Niven, p. 245)

1.c What are the target and scorecard criteria scores?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Results</th>
<th>Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.a Measure to be used: Mean of SSD’s breakfast and lunch cafeteria prices (numerator), compared to the median of mean prices of available St. Louis County school districts (denominator), expressed as a percent.

2.b Rationale for establishing targets (check all that apply):
   a. ☐ Performance compared to similar organization
   b. ☐ Performance compared to benchmark organization
   c. ☐ State standard
   d. ☐ Norm-referenced standard
   e. ☒ 100% - based on core values
   f. ☐ Industry standard
   g. ☐ Incremental improvement based on historical results
h. □ Growth to proficiency-Determine whether the measure is “on track” to become proficient or meet target within a certain period of time
i. □ Growth targets based on employee input. Those closest to the work may be in the best position to provide insight on what represents a meaningful target (Niven, p. 244)
j. □ Growth target based on feedback from customers. Ask them what is expected (Niven, p. 245)

2.c What are the target and scorecard criteria scores?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Results</th>
<th>Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>met</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>± 10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.a Measure to be used: Reduction in the year-to-year annual dollar value of SSD's food service subsidy (deficit), expressed as a percent.

3.b Rationale for establishing targets (check all that apply):
   a. □ Performance compared to similar organization
   b. □ Performance compared to benchmark organization
   c. □ State standard
   d. □ Norm-referenced standard
   e. □ 100% - based on core values
   f. □ Industry standard
   g. □ Incremental improvement based on historical results
   h. ☒ Growth to proficiency-Determine whether the measure is “on track” to become proficient or meet target within a certain period of time
   i. ☒ Growth targets based on employee input. Those closest to the work may be in the best position to provide insight on what represents a meaningful target (Niven, p. 244)
j. □ Growth target based on feedback from customers. Ask them what is expected (Niven, p. 245)

3.c What are the target and scorecard criteria scores?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Results</th>
<th>Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not used</td>
<td>≥ 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation Summary

Purpose or Mandate

The Food Service program exists to satisfy the hunger needs of students while at school, because physical satisfaction of this need is believed to relieve a barrier to learning. Board policy EF (revised January 26, 2010) permits but does not mandate a food service program. That policy states that the food program “will operate as an integral part of the total school program.” Similarly, Board policy EFB authorizes free or reduced-cost food services “if state and federal resources . . . are available.” The two policies provide further guidance for the program, including a requirement to provide health instruction for students and information for staff on Missouri’s Eat Smart Guidelines, which have now been supplanted by the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 (HHFKA).

Program Description

The Food Service program is intended to provide wholesome, nutritious, and appetizing meals to District students, thereby contributing to good nutrition, which is vital to mental and physical growth during the formative years. Through our partner vendor Sodexo, the program serves breakfast, lunch, and/or after-school snacks in seven school cafeterias and also provides meals for other locations (Table 1, right). As it has only half-day programs, South Tech does not provide lunch. The program operates under the guidelines of the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) and School Breakfast Program (SBP), as amended by HHFKA. Certain eligible students are provided food services at a free or reduced cost under those programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Cafeteria</th>
<th>Breakfast</th>
<th>Lunch</th>
<th>Snack (2:30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ackerman</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litzsinger</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuwoehner</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northview</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southview</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tech</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tech</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Locations

- Daycare at South Tech: Delivered from Southview
- Daycare at Ladue EC: Delivered from Litzsinger
- Transition students: Meals picked up at Litzsinger and Northview
What were the major accomplishments or benefits of this program?

During the 2014-2015 school year, this program served more than 274,000 meals (Table 2, right) to approximately 1,230 SSD students.

Prices charged to students for meals was consistently below the average of other Saint Louis County school districts (see Goal 2, below).

Despite having low prices, the program reduced its annual operating deficit (i.e., reduced SSD’s subsidy to this program) for all three years in this evaluation cycle (see Goal 3, below).

The program responded to new standards imposed by the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 (HHFKA) by instituting new recipes and meal plans, with mixed reaction from students (see Goal 1 and Action Plans, below). These new rules address nutrition and wellness, and are being phased in over a ten-year period.

How well did this program fulfill its purpose or mandate?

☐ Inadequate ☐ Approaching Satisfactory ☑ Satisfactory ☐ Excellent

What factors made essential contributions (+/-) to this rating?

During the current evaluation cycle, this program was challenged to conform to new rules adopted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture under the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 (HHFKA). These rules imposed new and/or heightened standards for recipe ingredients and menu planning (e.g. serve fat-free or low-fat milk, use whole-grain bread, limit sugar and sodium, etc.) and portion size (among other standards). These rules are in contradiction to the present eating habits of many school-age youth, both in SSD and throughout America. Because of the new menus, anecdotal evidence suggests widespread dissatisfaction among students (both nationally and within SSD) regarding both the taste and quantity of meals. Anecdotal evidence within SSD also suggests increasing amounts of wasted food (food served but not eaten). Available data do not yet reflect the full effect of the menu changes, so we are unable to say with certainty the extent of this dissatisfaction or waste. Action plans for the next evaluation cycle have been suggested which are designed to collect voice-of-the-customer inputs and additional measures for this program.
Evaluation Results

What is the status of the program’s progress toward achieving its goals?

**Goal 1:** Transition program to the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 (HHFKA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurable Objective 1:</th>
<th>Completion and acceptance of USDA/DESE certification application, followed by annual attestation of compliance. TARGET VALUE: 100% compliance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Results:** MET

SSD came into compliance with HHFKA provisions in October, 2012, was certified by DESE in November, 2012, and has attested to be in compliance annually since that time.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurable Objective 1:</th>
<th>Mean of SSD’s breakfast and lunch student cafeteria prices (numerator), compared to the median of mean prices of available Saint Louis County school districts (denominator), expressed as a percent. TARGET VALUE: ±10% variance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Results:** MET

SSD’s mean (average) student meal prices are 9.4% below the Saint Louis County median (vs. goal ±10%). The breakfast price is now 12.1% below median, suggesting breakfast prices could rise without violating the target value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Breakfast</th>
<th>Lunch</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>-6.5%</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>-6.5%</td>
<td>-6.2%</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>-12.1%</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>-9.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SSD Meal Prices Compared to Other St. Louis County Districts (Percent below County median prices; median = 0%)

Board Approved: 5/26/2015
The following table illustrates meal prices at selected Saint Louis County school districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>Milk</th>
<th>Breakfast 2</th>
<th>Adult Brk</th>
<th>Elem Lunch 2</th>
<th>Sec/HS Lunch 2</th>
<th>Adult Lunch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affton</td>
<td>$0.45</td>
<td>$1.05</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayless</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.20</td>
<td>$2.55</td>
<td>$2.70</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>$0.45</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.30</td>
<td>$2.45</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock Place</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazelwood</td>
<td>$0.45</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkwood</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>$1.90</td>
<td>$2.30</td>
<td>$2.65</td>
<td>$2.80</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladue</td>
<td>$0.55</td>
<td>$1.55</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>$2.55</td>
<td>$2.78</td>
<td>$3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindbergh</td>
<td>$0.85</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$2.70</td>
<td>$2.85</td>
<td>$3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maplewood-Richmond Hts</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$2.55</td>
<td>$2.55</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.35</td>
<td>$2.85</td>
<td>$2.85</td>
<td>$3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattonville</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$2.35</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritenour</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>$2.35</td>
<td>$2.73</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwood</td>
<td>$0.65</td>
<td>$1.55</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>$2.40</td>
<td>$2.55</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Park</td>
<td>$0.40</td>
<td>$1.55</td>
<td>$1.95</td>
<td>$2.15</td>
<td>$2.40</td>
<td>$2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster Groves</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County MEDIAN Prices</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$1.65</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>$2.40</td>
<td>$2.55</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL DISTRICT</td>
<td>$0.55</td>
<td>$1.45</td>
<td>$1.90</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$2.45</td>
<td>$2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSD Percent of Median</td>
<td>+10%</td>
<td>-12.1%</td>
<td>+5.6%</td>
<td>-6.3% 1</td>
<td>-3.9% 1</td>
<td>-3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 SSD’s average student lunch price is 7.4% below the median of average lunch prices of comparable elementary and high schools.
2 Combining student breakfast and lunch prices, SSD’s overall average price is 9.4% below the median of comparable averages.

**Goal 3:** Reduce the annual amount by which SSD subsidizes the Food Service program.

Measurable Objective 1: Reduction in the year-to-year annual dollar value of SSD’s food service subsidy (deficit), expressed as a percent.

TARGET VALUE: Reduction ≥ 5% per year.

Results: MET

The Food Service program reduced its operating deficit (SSD subsidy) by 30.1% over the three-year period included in this evaluation cycle. Year-over-year reductions varied from 5.4% to 15.6%, as indicated in the following chart.
What do customers and other stakeholders consider to be the strengths and opportunities for improvement/weaknesses of the program?

**Strengths**
- Students are fed, under sometimes trying conditions. Some students require assistance with basic functional feeding skills, which cafeteria and SSD staff overcome daily.
- Improved efficiencies (largely at our Sodexo vendor partner) helped reduce costs.
- Program passed DESE financial audits and three-year program review.
- All cafeterias maintained a “Grade A” rating by the Saint Louis County Department of Health.

**Opportunities/Weaknesses**
- Many students don’t like the new recipes and menus; some say they don’t get enough to eat.
- Integration of Food Service with the Health Program and Wellness Program is weak.
- More education of parents is needed regarding the purpose and implementation of HHFKA.
- Serving-line efficiency is impaired because many students come to the cafeteria without valid identification. This problem is inconsistent by school.

How well aligned are the program’s processes with the goals of the program?

The Food Service program is making progress in all areas. The goal of providing nutritious food is being achieved with efficiency. This program’s processes demand close collaboration between SSD and Sodexo, which is being achieved proficiently.

The expanded goals of HHFKA now impose new requirements for additional education of students through integrating Food Service with the Health and Wellness programs, but that process is not yet well-defined. During the next evaluation cycle, the processes of all three of these programs will be examined to identify changes to their educational processes that will more closely align those programs with HHFKA goals and achieve greater student knowledge of healthy eating habits.
**Deployment Level of Program Services:** Services are well deployed, although deployment may vary in some areas or schools.

**Should resources be changed to improve this program?**  
*If Yes, describe changes.*  

The types and quality of kitchen equipment varies in the different schools. Some kitchens lack the equipment necessary to prepare some of the recommended HHFKA recipes (e.g. steamers). An equipment inventory is needed in the next evaluation cycle to compile a recommendation for new or replacement equipment.

Computers and bar-code scanners in each cafeteria execute point-of-sale transactions using real-time student records maintained in Tyler SIS. Those computers are now about ten years old, and are slow. Newer computers (not necessarily “new”) would improve the check-out efficiency for students and cafeteria staff.

**Should goals be changed, added or removed?**  
*If Yes, describe changes.*  

The HHFKA compliance goal (Goal 1) must be improved to respond to additional HHFKA standards as they are phased in over the next seven years.

A student-education goal should be considered, to assure integration of Food Service with the Health and Wellness programs.

A parent-education goal should be considered, to improve parents’ knowledge and support of HHFKA and its goals of healthy eating habits.

**Evaluation Implications**

**What are the actual costs of this program, and how do they compare to budgeted costs?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Costs (projected):</th>
<th>$825,974</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sodexo</td>
<td>$ 825,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing, Postage, Supplies</td>
<td>$ 974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues:</th>
<th>$687,204</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local - cash receipts</td>
<td>$ 112,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service-State</td>
<td>$ 5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$ 569,204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deficit:**  
$138,770

**How many meals are served by this program?**  
274,285

**What is this program’s cost per meal?**  
$ 3.01
Estimated Cost Effectiveness

☐ Mandated program; costs cannot be significantly reduced.
☐ Mandated program; costs could be reduced (include in Action Plan, below).
☐ Benefits greatly outweigh costs.
☒ Benefits outweigh cost, but improvement appears possible (include in Action Plan, below).
☐ Costs outweigh benefits (include in Action Plan, below).

General Recommendation Resulting from this 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 Plans

Review of Action Plan progress since last report

Action Plan 1

Action Plan: Realign the goals to follow the new Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act.

Progress on Action Plan: Accomplished for the first three of ten years. The program is in compliance. Additional effort is needed to monitor phase-in changes to HHFKA and to revise SSD’s processes and goals as needed.

Action Plan 2


Progress on Action Plan: Accomplished for the first three of ten years. The program is in compliance. Additional effort is needed to monitor phase-in changes to HHFKA and to revise SSD’s meal plans as needed.

It must be noted that the new standards leave some students saying “I don’t get enough to eat” and “I don’t like the food.” The full extent of those opinions will be assessed during the next evaluation cycle. The most recent survey of students was conducted in May, 2014. At that time, 43% of the survey respondents disagreed with the statement “I get enough to eat at the cafeteria” and 32% disagreed with the statement “I like the food served at the cafeteria.” During the next evaluation cycle, additional voice-of-the-customer activities will be needed to align customer satisfaction with the standards.
What specific actions are needed?

**Short-term (within the next school year)**

1. Develop and implement a process to identify and track further revisions to HHFKA rules and to plan SSD’s response.
2. Expand the Food Service student survey to elicit additional data for aligning SSD’s meal plans with HHFKA goals, and implement a process for assuring annual administration of the survey.
3. Work with Sodexo to re-institute food taste panels in the schools, to assess student food preferences and align those with SSD’s meal plans and HHFKA goals.
4. Conduct an equipment inventory, to include kitchen and point-of-sale resources, and prepare recommendations for improvements as appropriate.

**Medium-term (1-2 years)**

5. Develop and implement a process for aligning the Food Service, Health, and Wellness programs, with emphasis on student education regarding healthy eating habits and wellness.
6. Develop and implement a communication or education program to inform parents of HHFKA goals, SSD’s revised menu plans, and the benefits of healthy eating habits.

**Long-term (3 years and more)**

n/a
**Correction to Evaluation Results**

What is the status of the program’s progress toward achieving its goals?

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurable Objective 1:</th>
<th>Mean of SSD’s breakfast and lunch student cafeteria prices (numerator), compared to the median of mean prices of available Saint Louis County school districts (denominator), expressed as a percent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TARGET VALUE: ±10% variance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results: MET**

SSD’s mean (average) student meal prices are 9.4% below the Saint Louis County median (vs. goal ±10%). The breakfast price is now 12.1% below median, suggesting breakfast prices could rise without violating the target value.

I have discovered an error in the historical data for the following table (presented here as it was in the original report):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Breakfast</th>
<th>Lunch</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>-6.5%</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>-6.5%</td>
<td>-6.2%</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>-12.1%</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>-9.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table shows the corrected data (highlighted in yellow):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Breakfast</th>
<th>Lunch</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>-8.5%</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
<td>-5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>-9.7%</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
<td>-8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>-12.1%</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>-9.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Consequently, the following chart must also be revised. Here is the original chart as it was in the original report:

The following chart shows the corrected data (changes are apparent):
### Comparative SSD Food Costs and Prices, 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Program Revenues</td>
<td>$704,929</td>
<td>$678,012</td>
<td>$679,644</td>
<td>$687,204</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Program Expenses</td>
<td>$903,409</td>
<td>$845,456</td>
<td>$838,096</td>
<td>$825,974</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals Served</td>
<td>289,155</td>
<td>282,717</td>
<td>275,919</td>
<td>274,285</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Meal</td>
<td>$3.12</td>
<td>$2.99</td>
<td>$3.04</td>
<td>$3.01</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SSD Subsidy</td>
<td>$198,480</td>
<td>$167,443</td>
<td>$158,452</td>
<td>$138,770</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy per Meal</td>
<td>$0.69</td>
<td>$0.59</td>
<td>$0.57</td>
<td>$0.51</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Meal Prices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milk</td>
<td>$0.55</td>
<td>$0.55</td>
<td>$0.55</td>
<td>$0.55</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$1.40</td>
<td>$1.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Breakfast</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>$1.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem Lunch</td>
<td>$2.15</td>
<td>$2.20</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec/HS Lunch</td>
<td>$2.35</td>
<td>$2.40</td>
<td>$2.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Lunch</td>
<td>$2.60</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
<td>$2.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>