



1953

An evaluation of the nature, scope, and effects of federal aid for school lunch programs in California

James Maneval Hemphill
University of the Pacific

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hemphill, James Maneval. (1953). *An evaluation of the nature, scope, and effects of federal aid for school lunch programs in California*. University of the Pacific, Thesis. https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds/1221

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of the Pacific Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact mgibney@pacific.edu.

AN EVALUATION OF THE NATURE, SCOPE, AND EFFECTS
OF FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS
IN CALIFORNIA

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the Department of Education
College of the Pacific

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
James Maneval Hemphill

June 1953

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Importance of the study	1
The problem	2
Delimitation of the study	2
Definition of terms	3
Method of investigation	4
Summary	5
II. THE SCHOOL LUNCH MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES .	6
Early beginnings	6
Beginning of federal aid	15
School Milk Program	21
Community School Lunch Program	23
The National School Lunch Program	27
Summary	48
III. SCHOOL LUNCH MOVEMENT IN CALIFORNIA	50
Early beginnings	50
Early federal assistance	54
Community School Lunch Program	54
National School Lunch Program	57
Summary	60
IV. AN EVALUATION OF THE EFFECTS OF FEDERAL AID UPON SCHOOL LUNCHES IN CALIFORNIA	62

CHAPTER	PAGE
Report of Coordinating Committee on School Lunch Programs, 1945	63
Extent of programs for school lunches	66
Types of lunches provided	72
Pupil participation	81
Personnel training practices	89
Summary	94
V. SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS	97
Summary	97
Recommendations	99
Further research needed	100
Conclusions	101
BIBLIOGRAPHY	102
APPENDIX A. Minimum Lunch Type Requirements Established by The United States Department of Agriculture	106
APPENDIX B. Members of Coordinating Committee on School Lunch Programs 1944-1945	109
APPENDIX C. Preliminary Draft of Suggested Duties and Responsibilities for School Lunch Personnel Prepared by Study Committee on Qualifications for School Lunch Personnel, State Joint Committee on School Health	111

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Direct Distribution of USDA Commodities in the United States Fiscal Years 1936 to 1943	20
II. Size and Scope of the Community School Lunch Program in the United States	26
III. Cash Assistance and Participation under the National School Lunch Program During Fiscal Years 1947-1951	39
IV. Value of Commodities Distributed and Local Food Purchased in the United States During Fiscal Years 1947-1951 (in Thousands of Dollars) . .	45
V. Federal Assistance, Cash and Cost of Commodit- ies for School Lunch Programs in United States, Fiscal Years 1947-1951	47
VI. Selected Data on the School Lunch Programs in California During 1944-45, 1945-46	56
VII. Selected Data on the School Lunch Program in California During 1946 to 1952	59
VIII. Distribution of Lunch Programs in California, 1945	67
IX. Distribution of Lunch Programs in California, April, 1952	69

TABLE	PAGE
X. Types of Lunches Provided in California Schools, 1945	73
XI. Types of Lunches Provided in California Schools, April, 1952	74
XII. Number of California Schools Serving Plate Lunches, 1945 and 1952	76
XIII. California Schools Meeting Type A Lunch Standards 1946 and 1952	78
XIV. Pupil Participation in California School Lunch Programs, 1945	83
XV. Pupil Participation in California School Lunch Programs, April, 1952	84
XVI. Pupil Participation in California School Lunch Programs, 1946 to 1952	85
XVII. Lunch Charge--Participation Relationship in 1700 Schools in the United States, 1949	88

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

School lunch programs of one kind or another have been operated in the United States for many years. Federal aid for such programs, however, has been a comparatively recent development, and has increased steadily during the past six years.

Importance of the study. The National School Lunch Act¹ was passed by Congress in 1946 as a measure to safeguard the health and wellbeing of the nation's children. In 1952 federal, state, and local sources provided \$451,000,000.00 for the operation of the National School Lunch Program.² During the past few years participation in the program has increased at the rate of approximately 10 per cent each year until by 1952 it had reached a total of 9,400,000 children.³ With more schools and children

¹ National School Lunch Act, Public Law 396--79th Congress (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1946), 5 pp.

² United States Department of Agriculture, P.A.-208, The National School Lunch Program. A Progress Report. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1951), p. 14.

³ Ibid., p. 4.

participating indications point to an ever increasing need for additional federal funds to support the program adequately. Recommendations and requests for additional funds can be justified only if there is evidence that the purposes for providing them are being achieved.

The problem. The problem that naturally arises and needs evaluation is: What are the nature, scope, and effects of federal aid to school lunch programs in California? The questions that need to be answered are:

1. How has federal aid for school lunch programs developed?
2. What forms has it taken?
3. What has it accomplished?

The ultimate objectives that evolve in this investigation are:

1. To provide for workers and others interested in public education information regarding the historical background, present status, and effects of federal aid for school lunch programs.
2. To provide possible bases for revision and improvement of the school lunch program as it now exists.

Delimitation of the study. The evaluation of the nature and scope of federal aid for school lunches is made in terms of California and the rest of the United States,

but the evaluation of the effects of this aid is limited to a study of progress which has been made in California during the period 1946 to 1952 in the following specific areas: (1) extent of school lunch programs; (2) types of lunches offered; (3) pupil participation, and (4) personnel training practices.

Definition of terms. Terms that will be used in this study are: National School Lunch Program, Program, Program schools, school lunch programs, Type A lunches, sponsor, administrative reviews, and School Lunch Office.

The terms "National School Lunch Program," "Program," and "Program schools" refer to the federal grant-in-aid program authorized by Congress in 1946.

The term "school lunch program" refers to any school lunch program regardless of whether or not it is receiving federal reimbursement. "Type A, Type B, and Type C lunches" are those meeting the minimum nutritional standards established by the United States Department of Agriculture as a requirement for receiving federal aid.⁴ The term "sponsor" refers to the agency which is legally responsible for the operation of a school lunch program,

⁴ For a complete explanation of lunch standards see Appendix A, page 106.

and has signed a School Lunch Agreement with the State Department of Education. The term "administrative review" refers to the form which is used by representatives of the School Lunch Office, California State Department of Education, in analyzing the operations of a program to determine whether or not minimum standards are being maintained. The term "School Lunch Office" refers to the bureau of the California State Department of Education which is responsible for administering the National School Lunch Program within the state.

Method of investigation. Data used in the evaluation of the nature and scope of federal aid for school lunches were secured from the records and publications of official federal and state agencies of government. The evaluation of the effects of federal aid upon school lunches in California was made on the basis of a survey of 2,886 California schools conducted in 1945 by the Coordinating Committee on School Lunch Programs appointed by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The findings and recommendations of this Committee are compared with 1952 data secured from the files of the California School Lunch Office in Sacramento, and other bureaus of the California State Department of Education. Whenever valid comparisons with the 1945 survey cannot be made, the

evaluation is made in terms of state-wide data covering six years of operation of the National School Lunch Program in California from 1946 to 1952.

Summary. The rapid growth of federally aided school lunch programs in the United States during the past few years has created a need for a study of the background, purposes, and results of this grant-in-aid program. It is the purpose of this investigation (1) to review the origin and development of federal assistance for school lunches; (2) to present some indications of the effects of federal aid upon school lunch programs in California; and (3) to recommend a course of action based upon the conclusions drawn from the study.

CHAPTER II

THE SCHOOL LUNCH MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

There has been interest in school feeding for many years, but the program has developed slowly with early emphasis upon charity. The federal government did not become associated with the program until the depression of the 1930's, and then only as an emergency measure. It was not until the passage of the National School Lunch Act in 1946 that federal assistance for school lunch programs was established on a continuing basis as a measure of national security to promote the health and wellbeing of the nation's children.

Early beginnings. The first record in this country of serving meals to school children is that of the Children's Aid Society of New York.¹ In 1853 this organization opened the first of its vocational schools for the poor, and served meals to all children who attended.

In 1894 the Boston School Committee under the

¹ Mary de Garmo Bryan, The School Cafeteria. (New York: F. S. Crofts and Company, 1943), p. 3.

leadership of Ellen H. Richards, required that all food sold in the city schools had to be approved by the committee. This constituted the real beginning of the school lunch movement in the United States.² The management of the food service was given to the New England Kitchen, and the menus were planned under the supervision of Miss Richards. The food was centrally prepared and distributed to the individual schools.³

The Starr Center Association began school feeding in the elementary schools of Philadelphia in 1894.⁴ Out of this work developed in time a Lunch Committee of the Home and School League which gradually enlarged upon the experiment in school feeding until penny lunches were being served in nine schools of the city.⁵ In 1909 the lunch program was sponsored by the Board of Education on a trial basis in the William Penn High School for Girls, one of the largest

² Ibid., p. 4.

³ Bryan, loc. cit.

⁴ Emma Smedley, The School Lunch--Its Organization and Management in Philadelphia (Philadelphia: Innes & Sons, 1920), p. 70.

⁵ Ibid., p. 71.

schools in the city. This operation proved so successful that by 1912 the Board voted to establish a Department of High School Lunches, and authorized the extension of the system to all high schools in the city.⁶ In 1915 the Board assumed sponsorship of the lunch programs conducted in the elementary schools, and by 1920 lunches were being served in all of the sixteen secondary schools, and in thirty elementary schools out of 197.⁷

Little emphasis was placed upon a nutritionally balanced lunch and a la carte service prevailed in the secondary schools, which featured menus similar to the following:

Bread or roll02
Cocoa, cup, with Whipped Cream05
Milk, pint bottle09
Milk, glass05
Fresh Fruit in season02 .03 .05
Canned Fruit05
Sweet Chocolate01 .02 .03 .05
Chocolate Almond Bar06
Crackers, Cookies, Pretzels, etc.01
Ice Cream07
Turkish soup05
Baked Beans06
Scalloped Corn06
Ham Sandwich06
Egg Sandwich06
Lettuce Sandwich06

⁶ Ibid., p. 13.

⁷ Ibid., p. 14.

Fruit Tapioca Pudding05
 Junket05⁸

In the elementary schools a bowl of soup and cocoa or milk were provided for two cents.⁹ The elementary school lunch was, by admission, largely a between-meal or pick-up lunch served at the morning or afternoon recesses, with a noon lunch served to a small number of children who were unable to go home.¹⁰

General public interest in school feeding was stimulated in 1905 by the book Poverty by Robert Hunter.¹¹ One of Hunter's chief observations was that of malnutrition in children. He estimated that in New York City alone sixty to seventy thousand children arrived at school hungry and unfit to do the work required.¹² He reported his convictions as follows:

Learning is difficult because hungry stomachs and languid bodies and thin blood are not able to feed the brain. The lack of learning among so many poor children is certainly due, to an important extent, to this cause.¹³

⁸ Ibid., p. 33.

⁹ Ibid., p. 94.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 91.

¹¹ Robert Hunter, Poverty (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1905), p. 215.

¹² Ibid., p. 216.

¹³ Loc. cit.

Hunter pointed out that it was utter folly, from the point of learning to have compulsory school laws compelling children in a weak physical and mental state to drag themselves to school, and sit at desks, learning little or nothing.¹⁴

In New York City in 1905 John Spargo undertook to find out by personal interview the facts about underfed children as revealed by Hunter.¹⁵ Through personal interviews of about twelve thousand children in sixteen schools by their teachers, Spargo found that 8 per cent had had what was classified as an inadequate breakfast. He also learned that from 10 to 20 per cent of the children were given pennies daily by their parents for lunches, and that most of the pennies were spent for pickles, bread, ice cream, and candy.

Dr. William H. Maxwell, Superintendent of Schools in New York City, had been urging the installation of lunches in the elementary schools for several years prior to the publication of the Hunter and Spargo material. From a social point of view, there was greater need for school

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 217.

¹⁵ John Spargo, "The Underfed Children in Our Public Schools," The Independent, 58:1060-63, May, 1905.

lunches in elementary schools, yet they were more prevalent in high schools and continued to be so in New York City, as most cities regarded lunch programs as a convenience for the children and not as a means of enabling the children physically and mentally to profit by the education. Dr. Maxwell, however, had seen many children spending their lunch money on pushcarts and corner candy store delicacies, and he urged school authorities to furnish at cost warm, nourishing noon meals to both elementary and high school pupils.¹⁶ The great public interest created by the appearance of the Hunter and Spargo material helped Dr. Maxwell to achieve his goal, and in 1908 through the cooperation of education authorities and a committee of social workers, physicians, and teachers, school lunches were furnished in elementary schools.¹⁷ The lunches were established in two schools, not as a curative measure for malnutrition, but as a laboratory experiment to increase food knowledge, and to broaden the appreciation for school lunches. The program was directed by Mable Kittredge and a three cent lunch consisting of a hot

¹⁶ United States Department of Agriculture, School Feeding in the United States, Production and Marketing Administration (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1947), p. 6.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 7.

dish, bread, and butter was provided to find out if such a program could be made self-supporting and still provide at least one fourth of the child's daily nutritive requirements.¹⁸ After the first year of operation it was determined that if a minimum of three hundred children bought meals daily that the program could be self-supporting even if some meals were given without charge. After two years of operation the Board of Education endorsed the lunches, and gave permission for their installation in other schools. The board provided the rooms, equipment, and gas, while the cost of the food and service was paid out of lunch receipts.¹⁹

About the time that New York City's experimental program was expanded to other schools with the support of the Board of Education, similar work was being started in Chicago. Six schools were furnished with an appropriation of \$1,200.00 by the Chicago Board of Education to begin serving hot lunches to children.²⁰ In Philadelphia, the

¹⁸ School Feeding in the United States, loc. cit.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 8.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 9.

Home and School League came into existence and expanded the work of the Starr Center Association to ten elementary schools. Mid-morning meals for one cent were served in addition to noon meals at three cents to five cents, the latter being a more complete meal.²¹

The period 1910 to 1918 saw a greater development of school lunches throughout the United States than at any similar period prior to that time. By 1913, there were school lunch programs in thirty cities of fourteen states, and more were being planned in eleven additional cities. Although practically all of the program was organized by volunteer civic groups with the cooperation of teachers and medical inspectors, the trend developed toward operation and management by school authorities.²² A survey of school feeding in eighty-six cities of more than fifty thousand population, made by the Bureau of Municipal Research in 1918, revealed that although there was some provision for lunches in high schools, in 76 per cent of the cities, service was maintained in the elementary schools in only 25 per cent of them. Lunch service in high schools was imperative

²¹ School Feeding in the United States, loc. cit.

²² Ibid., p. 11.

because of the shortness of the lunch period, and the distance of these schools from the children's homes.

Elementary school children were presumed not to need lunches at school as they could ordinarily go home for the noon meal.²³ In general, high school service was considered a convenient accessory to the school system, not as a means of improving nutrition. Of the seventy-two cities reporting this service, only five indicated that the lunch had been established to combat malnutrition.²⁴

The school lunch movement continued along these lines during the decade of the 1920's. It was estimated by the Director of Research of the Nation's Schools that in 1931 there were 64,500 school lunchrooms in addition to 11,500 schools serving single hot dishes, and that lunchrooms were being opened at a rate of about 7,500 annually.²⁵

The plight of millions of children during the depression of the 1930's reawakened public concern for child

²³ John C. Gebhardt, Malnutrition and School Feeding, United States Office of Education, Bulletin No. 37 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1921), p. 21.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 12.

²⁵ Bryan, op. cit., p. 9.

welfare. Many teachers contributed from their own money to feed pupils who came to school hungry. Charitable organizations like the American Red Cross and the American Friends' Committee took up the feeding of indigent children in scattered localities. Both state and local municipalities passed enabling legislation and, in some cases, made appropriations for school feeding. Probably the largest of the earlier appropriations was an authorization by the State of New York in 1934 for the expenditure of \$100,000.00 from relief funds for serving free lunches and milk to poor children.²⁶

Beginning of federal aid. For many years before 1930, agencies of the federal government had been interested in school lunch work. The Bureau of Home Economics, and the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture, along with the State Land Grant Colleges, worked primarily in rural areas, specializing in nutrition and home economics, helped to develop techniques for providing lunches in rural schools, and state and county field workers carried on the education aspects for the introduction of hot lunches

²⁶ H. M. Southworth and M. I. Klayman, The School Lunch Program and Agricultural Surplus Disposal, United States Department of Agriculture, Publication No. 467 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1941), p. 14.

in the schools in rural communities. Health and nutrition specialists attached to state and municipal health departments cooperated similarly with the program in urban schools.

With the advent of the depression of the 1930's, widespread unemployment, underpaid farmers, and unfed school children presented an urgent problem to the nation. Millions of workers were without jobs; their incomes ceased to exist; therefore, they could not purchase the goods and services of industry and the products of farms; relief rolls mounted throughout the country. Coupled with this situation, American agriculture had been plagued by so-called farm surpluses brought about by the reduction of domestic and foreign markets, the continuance of full farm production, and industrial unemployment. The price of farm commodities fell, and the returns to farmers were so low that they provided only meager subsistence for many. Public concern over the plight of millions of school children was roused because few children had the money to buy daily lunches and the danger of malnutrition became intensified. Some states passed enabling legislation and made appropriations for school feeding; however, in most cases the local funds were inadequate. This paradox of "want in the midst of plenty" was a challenge that had to

be met by federal action.

The federal government first gave financial aid to school lunch programs in 1932 and 1933 when the Reconstruction Finance Corporation made loans to several southwestern Missouri towns to pay for labor for preparing and serving school lunches.²⁷ These projects were expanded in 1933 and 1934 under the Civil Works Administration, and in 1934 and 1935 under the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, which operated projects in thirty-nine states.²⁸ The Works Progress Administration, later the Works Projects Administration, was created by the government to employ idle labor on the construction of public works and to develop services. Within the framework of the Community Services Division of the Works Projects Administration and the National Youth Administration, substantial aid was offered to school lunch programs in the form of labor. In March, 1941, about two million children were served in the Works Projects Administration program.²⁹

Federal legislation through which it was possible to grant food assistance to school lunch activities was provided

²⁷ Ibid., p. 15.

²⁸ Southworth and Klayman, loc. cit.

²⁹ Loc. cit.

for in Section 32 of Public Law No. 320, 74th Congress, approved August 24, 1935, and with subsequent amendments.³⁰ This law made available to the Secretary of Agriculture an amount of money equal to 30 per cent of annual customs receipts for the purpose of encouraging domestic consumption of farm commodities by diverting them from the normal channels of trade and commerce. Allocations to schools were based on the number of children certified as "needy and/or undernourished," certification being most commonly made by the school authorities or public health or welfare agencies usually after investigation of the children's families. Although regulations were established governing the eligibility of schools and limits were set on the quantities of surplus commodities which might be used, the school lunch programs were sponsored, operated, and administered by local educational, civic, and welfare agencies in cooperation with the state welfare agencies.³¹

The local sponsors of the program were required to sign agreements that the commodities donated by the United

³⁰ The Community School Lunch Program (Washington, D.C.: War Food Administration, 1944), p. 17.

³¹ The School Lunch Program and Agricultural Surplus Disposal, op. cit., p. 17.

States Department of Agriculture would not be used to replace, but supplement normal food purchases. Lunch programs operating for profit could not receive these commodities. No charge could be made for foods which were served to needy children, nor was there to be a distinction made between those children who did not pay and those who paid for their lunches. The quantities and values of commodities distributed to schools under this program during the fiscal years 1936 to 1943, inclusive, are shown in Table I.

It will be noted that the amounts of commodities in terms of pounds and value vary considerably from year to year. This somewhat erratic pattern is due to the fact that purchases were made to support the price of agricultural commodities and, therefore, varied as commodity prices varied from year to year. The general trend, however, was upward until 1941, the year of the entry of the United States into World War II. The value of commodities purchased in fiscal year 1941 was more than twice the amount purchased in the fiscal year 1936. Commodity purchases declined sharply in 1942 and 1943 because of the increasing demands of the armed forces and our allies for agricultural products.

TABLE I

DIRECT DISTRIBUTION OF USDA COMMODITIES IN THE UNITED STATES
FISCAL YEARS 1936 to 1943*

Year	Pounds	Dollars
1936	6,174,000	\$ 244,000.00
1937	4,871,000	171,000.00
1938	16,842,000	575,000.00
1939	28,735,000	1,325,000.00
1940	92,904,000	3,962,000.00
1941	340,780,000	13,119,000.00
1942	454,503,000	21,859,000.00
1943	278,659,000	17,563,000.00

* United States Department of Agriculture, School Feeding in the United States, Production and Marketing Administration (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1947), p. 6.

School Milk Program. In June, 1940, the School Milk Program, more commonly known as the Penny Milk Program, was started.³² One purpose of the program was to increase the consumption of milk among needy school children. Another was to improve the total returns of milk producers by utilizing quantities of milk for fluid consumption which would have otherwise been used for manufacture of butter, cheese, and other dairy products, and, therefore, would have brought lower prices. The milk was made available to the children at one cent per one half pint. School authorities recommended schools for participation to the Secretary of Agriculture, who, after approval, entered into contracts with milk handlers to sell milk to the selected schools at one cent per one half pint. The milk handlers were then reimbursed by the Department of Agriculture at a special rate varying in accordance with the producers' prices.

The program was established first in fifteen selected schools of Chicago on an experimental basis to test the feasibility of increasing the consumption of milk among needy children through distribution on school premises.

³² school Feeding in the United States, op. cit.,
p. 25.

During the first three weeks of operation 102 one half pints of milk were consumed by seven thousand children, or approximately 54 per cent of the children attending school. Some children did not have the one cent but received the milk free through the donation of the purchase price by the teachers or some other interested individuals or groups.³³

The Penny Milk Program was extended to New York City in October, 1940, and by June, 1941, it was operating in eight metropolitan areas. An average of 247,000 children, or 46 per cent of the total enrollment, purchased milk daily in 406 schools.³⁴

From December, 1941, to May, 1942, the School Milk Program was expanded from three to ninety-nine areas, and at the close of the school year in May, 731,000 pupils were receiving milk daily under this program. A total of twenty-four million quarts of milk were distributed during the 1941/42 fiscal year at a total cost to the government of \$1,500,000.00.³⁵

³³ Ibid., p. 26.

³⁴ School Feeding in the United States, loc. cit.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 27.

In July, 1943, the School Milk Program was merged with the Community School Lunch Program, and the United States Department of Agriculture reimbursed the schools directly instead of purchasing from the milk handlers at a reduced price.

Community School Lunch Program. With the entry of the United States into World War II, defense industries employed more and more workers and the number of persons on Works Progress Administration rolls continued to decrease. The Works Progress Administration was abolished early in 1943.³⁶ That agency had not only furnished cooks and other helpers for thousands of projects, but also had supplied most of the workers in the state warehouses from which distribution of foodstuffs was made to the schools. The demand for food by the armed forces reduced the abundant supply available for distribution to schools and transportation facilities were curtailed by priorities favoring war materials and troop shipments.³⁷ The increase in the demand for labor and transportation caused considerable concern for the future of the school lunch program, as the availability of labor and transportation had been

³⁶ Ibid., p. 43.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 57.

very important in the growth and development of school lunches. This concern led to the next development in federal aid for school lunches.

The curtailed supplies of food for civilian use during the war years and the entry of many others into defense industries resulted in inadequate lunches for many children. Consequently, the need for nutritious foods from the standpoint of children was as great as ever. Then too, with the all-out effort of the farmers to provide the food needs of a country at war it was highly desirable to have school lunches as an outlet for any abundance that might occur. The Department of Agriculture, therefore, took steps to change the operation of the program in conformance with the then current needs of school children and of the agricultural situation.³⁸

A transition program was developed which substituted financial assistance for local purchases of food in lieu of donations of commodities when deliveries of commodities were cut off due to wartime restrictions. During the hearings on the Agricultural Appropriation Bill for 1944 doubt was expressed as to the legality of using Section 32 authority and funds for the administration of the school

³⁸ Ibid., p. 60.

lunch program.³⁹ The following specific language, therefore, was included in the appropriation act:

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, funds appropriated by or for the purpose of Section 32 shall be available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the maintenance and operation of a school milk and lunch program under Clause 2 of said Section 32 in a sum not exceeding \$50,000.00.⁴⁰

Under this new plan of operation, known as the Community School Lunch Program, cash reimbursement was made to schools for the local purchase of foods needed in the school lunch program. Specified foods were purchased directly from local sources and reimbursement was provided up to a maximum amount based on the type and number of lunches served. Three lunch types were established: A, B, and C.⁴¹

The program was administered directly within the various states by the Production and Marketing Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture, and remained in operation for two school years, 1944-45, and 1945-46. The size and scope of the Community School Lunch Program is shown in Table II.

³⁹ The Community School Lunch Program, op. cit., p. 2.

⁴⁰ Loc. cit.

⁴¹ For a complete description of lunch type standards, see Appendix A, page 106.

TABLE II

SIZE AND SCOPE OF THE COMMUNITY SCHOOL
LUNCH PROGRAM IN THE UNITED STATES*

	1944-45	1945-46
Number of schools participating	35,268	38,047
Number of children participating	4,629,559	5,176,871
Cash assistance	\$41,613,000.00	\$51,290,000.00
Value of commodities distributed	\$ 5,796,000.00	\$ 5,834,000.00

* School Lunch and Food Distribution Programs.
Selected Statistics, Fiscal Year 1939-1950 (Washington, D.C.:
United States Department of Agriculture, 1950), et passim.

Although the value of commodities distributed under the Community School Lunch Program remained relatively constant during the two years of operation because of reasons explained above, the amount of cash assistance and the number of participating children increased rather noticeably during the second year of operation.

The National School Lunch Program. With the ever-growing realization of the importance of the school lunches as a part of the nation's educational system whereby millions of children learned to eat well, and to eat new foods, and as an important part in developing permanently expanded markets for agricultural commodities, Congress passed the National School Lunch Act, which was signed by the President on June 4, 1946.⁴²

Federal assistance for school lunches, until 1946, as might be expected, was erratic depending upon the availability of labor and commodities. Even under the Community School Lunch Program of the fiscal years 1945 and 1946, the assistance was dependent upon annual appropriations without continuing authorization. Many members of Congress

⁴² National School Lunch Act, Public Law 396--79th Congress (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1946), 5 pp.

were opposed to annual authorization to appropriations because they felt that if the federal government should assist the development of school lunches it should be authorized by Congress on a permanent basis. This would enable Congress to give direction to the development of the program. Numerous organizations interested in the welfare of children were also desirous of having permanent legislation, the objective of which would be to promote school lunches and to enable schools to plan ahead from year to year with a reasonable degree of certainty.⁴³

The movement which culminated in this National School Lunch legislation had the support of many organizations interested in the welfare of children. The National Congress of Parents and Teachers took a very active part in organizing support for it. The farm organizations also were strongly in favor of such legislation. Some opposition was encountered, however, largely in two respects. It was urged first, that the federal government could not afford the expenditures necessary to finance the school

⁴³ School Lunch and Milk Programs, United States Government Printing Office, Publication No. 60233 (Washington, D.C.: 1944), et passim.

lunch programs on a permanent basis and second, that federal assistance of such programs was an invasion of the sphere of state responsibility.⁴⁴ In recognition of the latter objection, the National School Lunch Act is primarily designed to assist states by means of federal grants-in-aid. The federal government provides funds and commodities to the states to promote the establishment and expansion of nonprofit school lunch programs. The Act requires that certain standards of performance be met by the schools, and that an accounting of funds be rendered to the federal government. Beyond that, the states and local authorities have full power to control the operation of their programs.

The objectives as stated in the legislation are: (1) to safeguard the health and wellbeing of the nation's children; (2) to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other foods.⁴⁵

Funds are apportioned to the states on the basis of two factors prescribed in the Act: (1) the number of school children within the state; and (2) the need for assistance

⁴⁴ National School Lunch Act, loc. cit.

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 1.

in the state as indicated by the relation of per capita income of the United States to the per capita income of the state.⁴⁶

The Act authorizes the appropriation of such funds as would enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of the Act, and provides that \$10,000,000.00 of any funds appropriated may be used for "non-food assistance," which is defined as equipment used on school premises in storing, preparing, or serving food.⁴⁷ Non-food assistance funds were available only during the fiscal year 1947, and then, because of limited funds, were discontinued.

The Secretary of Agriculture, or his authorized representative, must enter into an agreement with the state educational agency in each state covering the operation of the program in that state. The states are required to match funds paid to them under the Act during the fiscal years 1947 to 1950 on a dollar for dollar basis; during the period 1951 to 1955 the states are to match with one and a half dollars for each dollar of federal funds; and during

⁴⁶ Ibid., pp. 1-2.

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 2.

the fiscal years after 1955 they are to match with three dollars for each dollar of federal funds. Credit given for matching is not limited to funds appropriated by the state, but includes all funds from sources within the state determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to have been spent in connection with the school lunch program. For example, the payment of children for lunches, and the reasonable value of donated services, supplies, facilities, and equipment may be regarded as funds from sources within the state. In relating the matching requirement to each state, a count is taken of the ability of the state to match federal funds as indicated by its per capita income. In the case of any state where the per capita income is less than the average for the United States, the matching requirement is decreased by the percentage which the state per capita income is below the national average.⁴⁸

Certain requirements are set up which must be met by the programs as carried on by the local schools. The Secretary of Agriculture is to establish "minimum nutritional requirements" for the lunches to be served "on the basis of tested nutritional research." Meals must be served free

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 3.

or at less than cost to any child, determined by local school authorities to be unable to pay the full cost of the lunch. There is to be no segregation or discrimination against any child who receives a lunch free or at less than cost. The programs must be operated without profit. The states' educational agencies and schools must keep such accounts and records as may be necessary to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to determine whether the provisions of the Act are being met. Neither the Secretary nor the state may impose any requirement with respect to teaching personnel, curriculum, instruction, methods of instruction, and materials of instruction in any school.⁴⁹

A school is defined as "any public or nonprofit private school of high school grade and under," and with respect to Puerto Rico, it also includes nonprofit child care centers certified as such by the government of Puerto Rico.⁵⁰ There are some states which are prohibited by their statutes or constitutions from disbursing public funds to parochial or private schools. The National School Lunch Act provides that in those states the Secretary of Agriculture may make disbursements directly to nonprofit

⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. 3-4.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 2.

private schools under the same conditions as are required with respect to disbursements by the state educational agency to schools within the state. The Secretary withholds from the funds a portion to any such state, the same proportion of the funds as the number of children five to seventeen years of age, inclusive, attending non-profit private schools within the state is of the total number of children of those agencies within the state attending school.⁵¹ A private school to be eligible for assistance must be one that is exempt from income taxation under Section 101 (1) of the Internal Revenue Code.⁵²

The National School Lunch Act requires the school lunch program to be administered in the states by the state educational agencies. The Act defines "state educational agency" to mean as the state legislature may determine (a) the chief state school officials, or (b) a board of education controlling the State Department of Education.⁵³

During the development of the school lunch movement a number of states enacted laws specifically dealing with school lunches. Some of these permitted the school

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 4.

⁵² Ibid., p. 5.

⁵³ National School Lunch Act, loc. cit.

authorities to carry on lunch programs at cost, and some provided for free lunches to needy children. In other states without specific legislation, the courts have upheld the power of local boards of education to establish school lunchrooms under their general authority to act in the interest of the schools.⁵⁴ There was a question in the minds of Congressmen whether in all states the state educational agency had authority to accept funds from the federal government and expend them for school lunch purposes. In order to make the funds available immediately to all states, the National School Lunch Act provided that, for the first two fiscal years ending June 30, 1948, the funds might be expended by any state agency the government might designate.

At the present time, all states as well as the District of Columbia, Territory of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Alaska, and the Virgin Islands now have programs in operation under the National School Lunch Act, and there are only five states without specific school lunch legislation. In these five states, however, the legislatures make annual or biennial appropriations to the State Department of

⁵⁴ State Provisions for School Lunch Programs
(Washington, D.C.: Federal Security Agency, United States
Office of Education, Bulletin 1952 No. 4, 1952), p. 8.

Education earmarking them for the school lunch program. In most cases, the state's attorney general has ruled that such appropriations to the state educational agency are tantamount to the legislative authorization for the state agency to administer the school lunch program.⁵⁵

Under authority of the National School Lunch Act, the Director of the Food Distribution Programs Branch on behalf of the Secretary of Agriculture, enters into agreements with state educational agencies placing the major responsibility for administration within the state in their hands. These agreements vary little from state to state since the Secretary has imposed very few requirements not set forth in the Act, and since the Act sets forth definite requirements which apply to all states.

The Department of Agriculture is held responsible for making payments from federal funds to the states in accordance with the Act. Payments to states, after the original allocations, are made on the basis of comprehensive reports of past operations, and the requests of the states. After payments are made to the state, it is the responsibility of the Department to determine that the money so paid is expended within the state in accordance with the

⁵⁵ State Provisions for School Lunch Programs,
loc. cit.

terms of the Act, and the agreement. This is done through periodical audits of the States' books and records. Through the Department field offices a continuing program of administrative reviews is carried on. The main purpose of these administrative analyses is to determine that the over-all objectives of the program are being accomplished and to assist both the state agencies in this regard.

The state's responsibilities are outlined in the agreement by the states' educational agencies and the Department of Agriculture. These responsibilities are to determine the eligibility of each applicant school, to enter into agreements with the eligible schools, to make payments to the schools as provided in the agreements, to assist individual schools in operating their programs in such a way as to fulfill the requirements of the law, and their agreement, and be of maximum benefit to the participating children and the community, to make such reviews and audits of individual programs as is necessary to assure compliance with the Act, and the applicable agreements, and to make such reports to the Department of Agriculture as are required. The state and federal governments have the dual responsibility to cooperate with each other on all phases of operations in which both agencies have a specific responsibility thus avoiding duplication of effort, and

secure with the personnel and time available the maximum benefit to the program.

The local school district is responsible to the state agency for all details of the program's operation. This, of course, involves the fulfillment of both the letter and spirit of the contract which the local district enters into with the state agency.

The National School Lunch Act states that the lunches served under the program must meet the minimum nutritional requirements prescribed by the said Secretary of Agriculture on the basis of tested nutritional research. At the present time the three lunch types are in effect: A, B, and C.⁵⁶

Maximum reimbursement rates are set by the federal government and are: Type A, nine cents; Type B, six cents; and Type C, two cents. However, due to the fact that participation has steadily increased each year since 1946, whereas the federal appropriation has remained relatively constant, most states have been unable to maintain maximum rates. In 1952 the average rate of reimbursement for Type A lunches was six cents. Most states have eliminated the Type B lunch, and reimbursement for the

⁵⁶ For a complete description of lunch type standards, see Appendix A, page 106.

Type C lunch generally remains at two cents.⁵⁷ Table III shows the volume of participation and cash reimbursement under the National School Lunch Program during the fiscal years 1947-1951, inclusive. As shown in Table III, page 39, the number of schools participating in the program has increased by approximately 23 per cent in four years and the number of participating children has increased by approximately 43 per cent. During the same period, however, the cash reimbursement has decreased slightly. The fact that participation in Type A lunches increased approximately 10 per cent during this period is indicative of the increasing interest and efforts on the part of local personnel in providing more nutritious lunches for participating children, even though they have received a proportionately less amount of federal cash assistance.

In addition to making cash reimbursements as partial payments for lunches served in school lunch programs, the United States Department of Agriculture also makes available commodities to participating schools.

Commodities donated by the United States Department of Agriculture are classified as Section 6 commodities,

⁵⁷ The National School Lunch Program--A Progress Report, op. cit., p. 16.

TABLE III

CASH ASSISTANCE AND PARTICIPATION UNDER THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM DURING FISCAL YEARS 1947-1951*

Year	Schools	Cash Reimbursement	Pupil Participation	Percentage of Type A meals
1947	44,537	\$69,572,000**	6,016,129	57.9
1948	44,542	53,989,000	6,014,596	54.9
1949	47,803	58,772,000	6,960,169	59.7
1950	54,157	64,539,000	7,840,250	64.1
1951	54,436	68,275,000	8,638,194	67.2

* School Lunch and Food Distribution Programs. Selected Statistics, Fiscal Year 1939-1950 (Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Agriculture, 1950), p. 2.

** Includes funds for equipment.

Section 32 commodities, and Section 416 commodities. This classification is based on sections of the Act's authorization, and authorizes their purchase and distribution.

Section 6 commodities are purchased by the United States Department of Agriculture with funds appropriated by Congress for school lunch purposes. Commodities thus purchased are available only to schools that are participants in the cash reimbursement phase of the school lunch program. The use of these commodities is limited to Type A lunches.

Section 32 commodities are purchased by the United States Department of Agriculture under the price support program and then made available for use in the school lunch program. These commodities are available to public and nonprofit private schools of high school grade or under. Participation in the cash reimbursement phase of the school lunch program is not a requirement for sharing in these commodities.

Section 416 commodities are purchased by the United States Department of Agriculture and then made available for use in the school lunch program. Charges for transportation of these commodities to warehouses operated by the state are not paid by the Department of Agriculture. These commodities are available to public and nonprofit private schools of high school grade or under. Participation

in the cash reimbursement phase of the school lunch program is not a requirement for sharing in these commodities.

Section 32 and Section 416 commodities may not be served as a la carte items unless they are cooked or processed by other means. They may, however, be used as part of a Type A lunch without cooking or other processing.

The system of direct distribution of commodities varies in administration from state to state. In some states one organization functions as a state-wide agency for distribution to all outlets, whereas in other states several organizations undertake to distribute federally donated commodities to only one type of outlet. The system whereby one organization is the sole distributor, is, of course, preferred since it lends itself more readily to efficient operation. It should be borne in mind, however, that the agency distributing commodities to schools may, or may not, be the same organization as that administering the cash reimbursement program. In 1952 the distribution of commodities was handled by state educational agencies in twenty states, and in twenty-eight states this function was performed by some other agency.⁵⁸

⁵⁸ State Provisions for School Lunch Programs, op. cit., p. 18.

The Department of Agriculture, through its field offices of the Production and Marketing Administration, enters into an agreement with the state agency, specifying distribution responsibilities and procedures. The agency in turn contracts with recipient agencies to utilize all commodities accepted according to regulations. Any public or nonprofit private school, child care center, or institution is eligible to receive commodities upon the acceptance of its application by the distributing agency, and provided that (1) donated commodities will be used for their consumption and will not be sold, traded, or otherwise disposed of; (2) there will be no discrimination or segregation of the paying and non-paying persons receiving donated commodities; (3) adequate facilities will be provided for the handling, storing, and use of the donated commodities; (4) expenditures for food will not be reduced because of the receipt of such donated food commodities; and (5) commodities available will be requested only in such quantities as will be fully utilized.

It should be noted that in order to receive full benefit from the school lunch program it is necessary for a school to have two agreements, one for school lunch, and one for commodities. Because of this fact it is most desirable that cash reimbursement and direct distribution of

commodities be handled by one agency. Otherwise there exists the possibility of some school being eligible for cash reimbursement but not food, while others might be eligible for food but not reimbursement.

Thus far the systems of commodity distribution have not been uniform throughout all states. To present a brief resume of distribution operations within a state, the system in California is described as a typical example.

Commodities available for use in school lunch programs are distributed by the California State Department of Education from surplus property warehouses operated by the Department in Sacramento, Oakland, and Los Angeles. A nominal service and handling charge is made for handling each box, case, or sack of commodities. When it is necessary in handling Section 416 commodities to do re-packaging, there is an additional charge which is over and above the regular service and handling charge that is made for all commodities. The cost of transportation of these commodities to the warehouse from the point at which they are made available by the United States Department of Agriculture is added to the regular service and handling charge whether or not the commodities are repackaged.

When a school district has negotiated a "feed agreement" with the California State Department of Education,

a copy of the agreement is sent to the warehouse that will serve the school. The officer in charge of the warehouse then sends "offering forms" to the school as commodities are available. The school completes the forms, ordering amounts of food suitable to its needs, and returns the forms to the warehouse. Shipments are made as soon as possible after receipt of the orders and billed to the school district by the warehouse making the shipment.

Problems relating to commodity distribution are handled by the Deputy Surplus Property Officer who is in charge of the warehouse from which the shipment is made.

Table IV shows the value of Section 6 and other commodities distributed during fiscal years 1947 to 1951, inclusive, and for comparative purposes, the expenditures for food purchased locally by schools during the same period, as is shown.

It will be noted from Table IV, page 45, that distribution of Section 6 and 32 commodities increased steadily until 1951, when section 6 commodities declined slightly and Section 32 commodities dropped sharply. This decrease in commodity distribution was caused by the fact that the Korean War and the rearmament program, both at home and in Europe, resulted in increasing demands for American agricultural products thus reducing the need for

TABLE IV

VALUE OF COMMODITIES DISTRIBUTED AND LOCAL FOOD PURCHASED
IN THE UNITED STATES DURING FISCAL YEARS 1947-1951
(In Thousands of Dollars)*

Year	Value of Section 6 Commodities	Value of Section 32 Commodities	Value of Section 416 Commodities	Value of Local food Purchased
1947	\$ 5,735.	\$ 5,185.		\$128,648.
1948	13,438.	33,082.		142,813.
1949	14,475.	35,552.		168,242.
1950	16,684.	50,326.	\$ 11,500.	181,790.
1951	15,089.	19,374.	40,766.	213,510.

* School Lunch and Food Distribution Programs.
Selected Statistics, Fiscal Year 1939-1950 (Washington,
D.C.: United States Department of Agriculture, 1950), p. 10.

the United States Department of Agriculture to support farm prices. The Section 416 commodities distributed in 1950 and 1951 were largely stocks of food held by the Commodity Credit Corporation because of surpluses up until 1950. These items consisted largely of dried eggs and dried milk, and these supplies were practically exhausted by the end of the fiscal year 1951.

At the present writing, complete data are not yet available for the fiscal year of 1952, but incomplete data on file in the School Lunch Office, California State Department of Education, indicate that the value of federally distributed commodities was considerably less than in 1951. It appears, however, that the military needs have leveled off, and indications are that distribution during fiscal 1953 will reach a much higher volume than in 1950. It appears that the upward trend noted in 1951 will continue during the next several years barring any drastic change in the international situation.

The steady, year by year increases in the amounts of food purchased by local programs are indicative of the steady growth of the School Lunch Program in terms of participating schools and children.

Table V shows the total amount of federal assistance, cash and cost of commodities for school lunch programs

TABLE V

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE, CASH, AND COST OF COMMODITIES
FOR SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS IN UNITED STATES
FISCAL YEARS 1947-1951 *

Year	Amount
1947	\$ 77,619,000.
1948	86,768,000.
1949	94,794,000.
1950	119,728,000.
1951	118,200,000.

* School Lunch and Food Distribution Programs.
Selected Statistics, Fiscal Year 1939-1950 (Washington,
D.C.: United States Department of Agriculture, 1950), p. 8.

during fiscal years 1947 to 1951, inclusive.

The steady increase in the total amount of assistance year by year until fiscal 1951, and the slight decline in that year, are consistent with the trend indicated in Table IV, page 45, and for the same reasons as previously explained.

Summary. School Lunch Programs began in the United States during the middle and latter part of the nineteenth century, with major emphasis upon charity. School feeding developed rapidly during the first part of the twentieth century, although most such facilities were purely of the commercial type designed to sell food to children at cost, but little emphasis upon nutrition and education. Federal assistance to school lunch programs began during the depression years as one method of relieving hunger, and at the same time providing an outlet for surplus agricultural commodities. The first cash reimbursement began in 1940 in connection with the School Milk Program. In 1944, this program was combined with the Community School Lunch Program. In June, 1946, Congress passed Public Law No. 396, generally known as the National School Lunch Act, which is the present basis for federal aid to school lunch programs.

The number of schools and children participating in the National School Lunch Program has steadily increased

each year. Federal cash assistance for the program has remained relatively constant during the past several years, although the value of government commodities distributed to schools steadily increased until 1951, when the Korean War, and the changed international situation made increasing demands upon American agriculture. The value of commodities distributed to schools declined during the fiscal years 1951 and 1952, but increased sharply during the first part of fiscal 1953. Barring a radical change in the international situation, all indications point to a much larger food distribution program in the future.

CHAPTER III

SCHOOL LUNCH MOVEMENT IN CALIFORNIA

The development of school lunch programs in California has followed the same general pattern as the movement throughout the United States. The passage of the National School Lunch Act in 1946 gave great impetus to the establishment and extension of lunch programs in California.

Early beginnings. The investigator was unable to find any literature dealing with the historical development of school lunch programs in California. In the absence of such literature, the investigator contacted several people who have been associated with school lunch work in California for many years. In some cases, the contact was made by means of correspondence, and in others information was secured through personal interview. The following districts were contacted and reports received from each: Lennox,¹ Burbank,²

¹ Letter of January 15, 1953 from Lillian Gisbrecht, Lennox School District.

² Letter of November 4, 1952, from Katherine Waggoner, Burbank Unified School District.

Oakland,³ San Francisco,⁴ Pasadena,⁵ and San Jose.⁶

All of the reports indicate a definite pattern of development. Most of the early programs began between 1914 and 1922, and were sponsored and operated by Parent-Teacher Associations, student body organizations, or other voluntary agencies. Food items were sold on an a la carte basis and emphasis was placed upon providing one or two hot dishes and supplementary food items rather than on providing a lunch designed to meet the nutritional needs of growing children and youth. Although some boards of education assumed administrative responsibility for operating the lunch program, legislation authorizing governing boards of education to sponsor and operate school lunch programs was not passed until 1927 when the California Education Code was amended as follows:

³ Letter of January 6, 1953, from Ruth E. Walker, Oakland Public Schools.

⁴ Interview with Edith Murphy, San Francisco Unified School District on January 15, 1953.

⁵ Letter of February 7, 1953, from Lydia M. Kellogg, Pasadena City Schools.

⁶ Interview with Josephine Morris and Fern Hickman, San Jose Unified School District on January 20, 1953.

Boards of school trustees and city boards of education shall have power and it shall be their duty to establish cafeterias in schools under their jurisdiction whenever in their judgment it is advisable to do so. The cost of housing and equipping such cafeterias shall be a charge against the funds of the school district. The food served shall be sold to the patrons of the cafeteria at such a price as will pay the cost of operating and maintaining the cafeteria.⁷

Following the passing of this enabling legislation, boards of education generally provided school lunch facilities and equipment, but complete responsibility for operation was not assumed by most boards until the late 1930's and early 1940's.

The development of the lunch program of the Lennox School District in Los Angeles County is representative of the pattern that has been followed by many California districts, and for that reason is presented here.⁸

The school lunch programs of the Jefferson School District (later the Lennox School District) began about 1922. It was equipped by the Parent-Teacher's Association, and a large part of the labor was also provided by that organization.

⁷ State School Law of California, Section 1607e, Superintendent of Public Instruction (Sacramento: State Printing Office, 1927), p. 101.

⁸ The investigator is indebted to Mrs. Lillian Gisbrecht, Lennox School District, for the information furnished in her letter of January 15, 1953.

The records show that during the early years of operation expenditures for food were almost entirely for ice cream, candy, milk, meat, and bread. Approximately one hundred children, or 20 per cent of the enrollment were served lunches, but, in addition, a number of needy children received free milk financed by regular contributions from the teachers.

By 1928, ice cream sales were reduced by two thirds, candy sales by one third, milk sales remained high, and grocery and meat purchases increased. A plate lunch was introduced, but its selection was optional. However, the plate lunch was emphasized by making it more of a bargain than the individual dishes. All individual food items were priced at five cents, whereas the plate lunch would be purchased for only ten cents.

The program was entirely self-supporting until 1927 when the governing board assumed responsibility for replacing equipment as authorized by the Education Code. The Board assumed full responsibility of the program in 1939.

At the present time, Lennox has five schools participating in the National School Lunch Program, and serves approximately 50 per cent of the children a Type A lunch at a price of fifteen cents. The school lunch supervisor reports that the National School Lunch Program has been

helpful in improving the nutritional standards of the lunches.

Early federal assistance. The federal government first provided assistance to school lunch programs in California in 1935 in the form of surplus commodities distributed by the United States Department of Agriculture, and labor provided by the Works Progress Administration. Records on the scope of these programs are not available at the present time. California did not participate in the school milk program until the 1942-43 school year, during which time \$884,000.00 in cash reimbursement and commodities were allocated to California schools.⁹

Community School Lunch Program. At the beginning of the 1944-45 school year, the Community School Lunch Program was established and a number of California schools took advantage of the cash and commodities provided by the federal government under this program. The program was administered by the Food Distribution Programs Branch of the United States Department of Agriculture, with headquarters

⁹ School Lunch and Food Distribution Programs. Selected Statistics, Fiscal Year 1939-1950 (Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Agriculture, 1950), p. 8.

in Berkeley. Federal auditors and school lunch nutritionists provided assistance to participating schools in the areas of accounting, reporting, menu planning, and operations.

Selected data on the Community School Lunch Program in California during 1944-1946 appear in Table VI.

Reluctance of many administrators and governing boards to subject their programs to audit and inspection by federal personnel, particularly when the program was administered by the United States Department of Agriculture rather than by the United States Office of Education, appears to be one reason why comparatively few California schools entered this program. The program showed no marked growth during its second year of operation. The number of sponsors actually declined, but the number of participating schools increased by about 25 per cent during the second year, due to enrollment growth within the districts already participating. It is significant that during the two years the Community School Lunch Program was in operation, approximately one third of the total Type A lunches were served without milk. It appears that children were permitted to take lunches with or without milk, even though federal regulations provided that reimbursement could not be granted for lunches served without milk unless a safe supply

TABLE VI

SELECTED DATA ON SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS
IN CALIFORNIA DURING 1944-45, 1945-46*

	1944-45	1945-46
Number of sponsors	737	732
Number of schools	839	1,035
Pupil participation	149,719	172,014
Total meals served**	24,033,846	28,239,930
Type A	16,122,267	19,304,786
Type A without milk	1,221,333	1,333,048
Type B	1,379,880	1,715,690
Type B without milk	245,244	192,787
Federal cash reimbursement	\$ 1,687,000	\$ 1,993,000
Value of federal commodities	\$ 1,286,000	\$ 2,866,000
Total program expenditures	\$ 5,339,892	\$ 6,707,655

* Data secured by investigator from Food Distribution Programs Branch, United States Department of Agriculture, Area Office, San Francisco, California, January 15, 1953.

** For a complete description of various meal type standards see Appendix A, page 106.

of whole milk was not available in the area. It will be noted, too, that an appreciable number of lunches served were Type B, consisting of considerably smaller portions than the Type A lunch. It is also significant that over one half of total program expenditures were provided by the federal government in the form of cash and commodities during 1944-45.

National School Lunch Program. On June 4, 1946, President Truman signed the National School Lunch Act. Under the provisions of this Act the responsibility for administering the program within the states was transferred from the United States Department of Agriculture to the representative state departments of education. Like other states, California was faced with the urgent necessity of establishing a staff to administer the program, developing policy, procedures, and forms, and negotiating agreements with schools in order that the program might get under way by the opening of school in September.

John P. Puffinbarger was appointed School Lunch Supervisor by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and to him fell the task of providing the necessary leadership during this period. Mr. Puffinbarger was assisted by Malcolm C. McGilvray of the United States Department of Agriculture, who had administered the Community School

Lunch Program in California from 1944 to 1946. The investigator succeeded Mr. Puffinbarger as Supervisor in December, 1946.

Selected data on the National School Lunch Program in California during the period 1946 to 1952, inclusive, are presented in Table VII.

During the period 1946 to 1952 the number of California schools participating in the National School Lunch Program doubled, and pupil participation more than doubled. The number of Type B lunches steadily declined until they were eliminated entirely in 1951-52. The number of Type A lunches without milk declined to an almost negligible amount in 1950-51, but increased sharply in 1951-52. This increase was due to the fact that districts were permitted to serve Type A lunches without milk not more than one day per week during 1951-52, provided that menus were carefully planned to make up for the loss of calcium due to the elimination of milk.¹⁰ This policy was instituted for one year because of reduced federal appropriations in cash and commodities, and because the cost of

¹⁰ California State Department of Education, School Lunch Bulletin No. 31, September 7, 1951, p. 1.

TABLE VII

SELECTED DATA ON THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM IN CALIFORNIA DURING 1946 TO 1952^a

	1946-47	1947-47	1948-49	1949-50	1950-51	1951-52
Number of schools	1,483	1,832	2,134	2,376	2,659	2,892
Pupil participation	250,820	302,106	361,778	445,040	533,860	609,720
Total lunches served ^b						
Type A	24,718,650	29,279,071	33,514,703	40,588,708	46,879,706	52,956,271
Type A without milk	969,807	294,880	249,917	120,055	105,084	420,808
Type B	1,186,350	1,280,888	714,591	262,548	95,020	
Type B without milk	83,974	42,995	27,106	6,521	803	
Type C	8,720,644	16,936,348	24,544,727	30,620,979	36,356,280	42,773,793
Totals	35,679,425	47,834,182	59,051,044	71,598,811	83,436,893	96,150,872
Federal Reimbursement	\$ 2,840,530	\$ 2,042,768	\$ 2,376,404	\$ 2,712,997	\$ 3,197,370	\$ 2,947,144
Federal commodities	\$ 223,000	\$ 1,760,000	\$ 1,913,000	\$ 3,356,733	\$ 4,170,488	\$ 1,100,000 ^c
Total program expenditures	\$10,487,919	\$14,541,479	\$16,961,068	\$18,514,642	\$23,367,550	\$27,929,365

^a Data secured from files of School Lunch Office, California State Department of Education, Sacramento.

^b See Appendix A, page 106.

^c Estimated.

milk had increased throughout the state. This policy was changed during 1952-53,¹¹ and the number of lunches served without milk during 1952-53 will be fewer than during any previous year.

It will be noted that the amount of federal cash reimbursement has remained relatively constant during the period 1946 to 1952, and that while the value of commodities increased sharply until 1950-51, it has not kept pace with program growth. In 1946 the total value of cash and commodities equalled approximately one third of total program expenditures, while in 1952 federal assistance amounted to only one seventh of total program expenditures.

Summary. School lunch programs in California generally developed in much the same manner as programs throughout the country. Sponsorship and operation of the programs were first assumed by voluntary agencies, and emphasis was usually placed upon providing "something to eat or drink" rather than upon providing nutritionally balanced lunches. Boards of education were slow to assume responsibility for the local programs, and it was not until after the passage of the School Lunch Act in 1946 that local governing boards began to consider the operation of the school lunch program

¹¹ California State Department of Education, School Lunch Bulletin Number 34, August 25, 1952, p. 1.

a part of the total school program.

The number of schools, and the number of children participating in federally aided lunch programs have increased tremendously during the six years of operation of the National School Lunch Program. Federal aid has not kept pace with program growth, and local programs have had to assume an increasing proportion of operational costs.

CHAPTER IV

AN EVALUATION OF THE EFFECTS OF FEDERAL AID UPON SCHOOL LUNCHES IN CALIFORNIA

It is most difficult to evaluate the effects of school lunches upon the nutritional health of children. Hezeltine¹ has pointed out that the difficulty in making such an evaluation is due to the absence of an index of the nutritional status of a large group of children, and the fact that it is almost impossible to secure two groups of children comparable in every respect, except that one will have a lunch at school, and the other will not. Another factor which would influence experiments in this field is the difficulty of assessing the clinical signs of a nutrient deficiency; present methods are unsatisfactory for evaluating the less striking differences in nutritional status.²

Because of these difficulties, the investigation of the effects of federal aid upon school lunches in California is limited to a consideration of the following four factors:

¹ Marjorie M. Hezeltine, "The Complete Noon Meal," Nation's Schools, 29:37-8, June, 1942.

² Loc. cit.

(1) extent of school lunch programs; (2) types of lunches offered; (3) pupil participation; and (4) personnel training practices. A survey conducted in 1945 by the Coordinating Committee on School Lunch Programs is used as the basis for evaluating the progress which has been made in these areas under the National School Lunch Program 1946-1952, whenever valid comparisons can be made. Where it is impossible to make valid comparisons between the 1945 survey and data compiled under the National School Lunch Program, the evaluation is made in terms of a comparison of 1952 data with 1946 data.

Report of Coordinating Committee on School Lunch Programs, 1945. Early in 1941 the state Superintendent of Public Instruction, Walter F. Dexter, established a Coordinating Committee on School Lunch Programs to serve in an advisory capacity and to make recommendations to the State Department of Education regarding the development of good programs for serving lunch in the public schools. Membership of the Committee was state-wide, representing various agencies concerned with problems in this field.³

³ The personnel of the Committee serving during 1944-45 is listed in Appendix B, page

A survey of existing facilities and practices in the serving of school lunches was initiated by the Committee and conducted cooperatively, by the State Department of Education and the State Department of Public Health in 1945.⁴ In order to secure the information wanted, the Committee prepared a questionnaire which was printed in a quantity sufficient for all California public schools. The project was brought to the attention of county superintendents of schools, and with their cooperation the plan was formulated under which they would distribute and collect the forms for the schools under their jurisdiction. They were asked to designate any districts to which forms should be sent directly by the State Department of Education. Most of the large city districts were so designated, and in these districts the city superintendent of schools either circulated the forms or prepared a summarized report on the basis of data available in his office. In a few counties, the superintendents did not undertake to collect the forms, and in these the returns were low.

⁴ Coordinating Committee on School Lunch Programs, School Lunches in California (Sacramento: State Printing Office, 1945), 42 pp.

Of the fifty-seven counties (excluding the City and County of San Francisco) in California, fifty-three are represented in the survey. Of the twenty-two city school systems (including San Francisco) in which the average daily attendance in elementary grades is four thousand or more, sixteen are represented. In twelve of the counties returning the forms, the percentage of returns was 100, in thirty-eight it was above 80 per cent, and it was above 70 per cent in forty-three. There was apparently little relation between population of county and percentage of returns. In some of the most populous counties, as well as in some of the most sparsely settled ones, forms were returned by 90 per cent or more of the schools.

Schools were divided into three groups and were classified as follows: (1) rural and small town (in districts having an average daily attendance of less than one thousand); (2) large town (in districts having an average daily attendance of one thousand, but not including four thousand); and (3) large city (in districts having an average daily attendance of over four thousand).

The remainder of this chapter evaluates the progress which has been made by California schools under the National School Lunch Program in terms of the findings and recommendations of the 1945 study. Unpublished data on file in the

School Lunch Office, California State Department of Education, Sacramento, and data secured from other bureaus of the State Department of Education, have been used in making the evaluation.

Extent of programs for school lunches. Results of the 1945 study relative to the number of schools serving lunches at that time are presented in Table VIII.

An analysis of these data reveals that in 1945 lunches were served in 29 per cent of the rural and small town schools, in 65 per cent of the large town schools, and in 61 per cent of the large city schools. Lunch or milk only was served in 34 per cent of the rural schools, in 72 per cent of the large town schools, and in 81 per cent of the large city schools. In 1945, 41 per cent of the total schools reporting served lunches, and 48 per cent serve either lunch or milk.

The Committee was particularly concerned with the small percentage of rural and small town schools serving lunches. The report emphasized the fact that many of these schools had such small enrollments, were so remotely situated, and were so lacking in facilities that the difficulties of securing and preparing food appeared to be

TABLE VIII
 DISTRIBUTION OF LUNCH PROGRAMS IN CALIFORNIA, 1945*

	Small town	Large town	Large city	Total
Lunch is served	552	386	241	1,179
Milk only is served	87	43	78	208
No food is served	1,259	167	73	1,499
Totals	1,898	596	392	2,886

* Coordinating Committee on School Lunch Programs, School Lunches in California (Sacramento: State Printing Office, 1945), p. 11.

insurmountable.⁵ The Committee recommended that more aid in planning and financing school lunches should be provided, and that particular attention should be given to rural schools.⁶

Table IX shows the extent of school lunch programs in California in April, 1952.

The six large city school districts, with 492 schools which were not included in the 1945 survey have been excluded from the data for comparative purposes. The Bureau of Research of the State Department of Education reported that there were 4,409 schools of high school grade or under in California in 1952.⁷ A distribution of schools according to size of district was not available, and for this reason it was impossible to distribute the number of schools not providing food in 1952, by size of district.

A comparison of Table VIII, page 67, with Table IX, page 69, shows that the number of small town schools serving lunch increased by 78 per cent between 1945 and 1952, the number of large town schools serving lunch increased by

⁵ Ibid., p. 8.

⁶ School Lunches in California, loc. cit.

⁷ Unpublished data on file in the Bureau of Research, California State Department of Education, Sacramento.

TABLE IX
 DISTRIBUTION OF LUNCH PROGRAMS IN CALIFORNIA,
 APRIL, 1952*

	Small town	Large town	Large city	Total
Lunch is served	982	592	603	2,177**
Milk only is served	153	153	257	568
No food is served				1,172**
Totals	1,140	745	860	3,917

* Data secured from the files of the School Lunch Office, California State Department of Education, Sacramento.

** Excluding 492 schools which were not included in the 1945 report.

53 per cent, and the number of large city schools serving lunch increased by 150 per cent. Although the percentage increase of the small town schools did not keep pace with that of the large city schools, it did surpass that of the large town schools. The comparatively large percentage of increase of the small town schools serving lunch is most significant in view of the recommendation of the Coordinating Committee that particular attention should be given to the rural and small town schools in assisting them in establishing school lunch programs.

In 1945, 41 per cent of the schools reporting served lunch, and 48 per cent served either lunch or milk. In 1952, 56 per cent of the schools in the state served lunch, and 70 per cent served either lunch or milk.

Funds for equipment provided under the National School Lunch Act in 1946-47 undoubtedly aided many schools in establishing lunch programs. In California \$324,000.00 was allocated for equipment during the first year of the operation of the National School Lunch Program.⁸

In allocating these funds every effort was made to give particular attention to the small rural schools and to

⁸ School Lunch Selected Statistics, op. cit., p. 7.

impoverished districts. State school building aid provided by the California Legislature has also been helpful in securing multi-use rooms, including kitchens, for many impoverished districts. Since 1947 a total of \$490,000,000.00 has been provided by the Legislature for school buildings.⁹ Although multi-use rooms are provided with state funds, only built-in or fixed equipment as listed in the California School Accounting Manual can be provided with state funds, according to Section 5046 of the Education Code.¹⁰ Stoves, refrigerators, peelers, mixers, dishwashers, and similar items are excluded. In order to secure state building aid, the district must tax within one half cent of the maximum rates established in Section 6357 of the Education Code, and must bond in excess of 95 per cent of its bonding capacity, according to Section 5026 of the Education Code.¹¹ Because of these facts, many impoverished districts cannot institute a lunch program because there are not means of securing basic equipment. The Arden-Carmichael and Del Paso Heights School Districts in Sacramento County are two specific examples.

⁹ Unpublished data on file in the Office of School Planning, California State Department of Education, Sacramento.

¹⁰ California Education Code, 1951, p. 194.

¹¹ Ibid., pp. 186-87.

If the School Lunch Program in California is to be expended to include more than approximately one half the schools, financial assistance from some source or sources must be provided for equipment for impoverished districts.

Types of lunches provided. The types of lunches provided daily in California schools in 1945 are shown in Table X.

It will be noted that the five basic foods¹² were provided in approximately two thirds of the rural and large city schools, and in three fourths of the large town schools. The five basic foods were provided in 74 per cent of the total schools reporting.

The types of lunches provided in 1952 are indicated in Table XI.

The five basic foods were provided in approximately three fourths of the rural and large town schools, and in 57 per cent of the large city schools. The five basic foods were provided in 70 per cent of the total schools reporting. These figures are quite comparable with those in Table X, page 73. However, the 1945 report pointed out

¹² Milk, vegetable, and/or fruit, whole grain or enriched bread, meat, fish, eggs, cheese, dried beans or peas, and butter or enriched margarine.

TABLE X
 TYPES OF LUNCHESES PROVIDED IN CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS, 1945*

	Rural and small town	Large town	Large city	Total
a, b, c, d, e**	429	338	232	999
a, b, c, d,	6	9	1	16
Some other combination	68	18	1	87
Hot dish, ingredients varied	29	3	1	33
Milk only	87	43	78	208
Totals	619	411	313	1,343

* Coordinating Committee on School Lunch Programs,
School Lunches in California (State Printing Office, Sacra-
 mento) p. 17.

** a--milk
 b--fruit or vegetable
 c--whole grain or enriched bread
 d--meat, fish, eggs, cheese, dried beans or peas
 e--butter or enriched margarine

TABLE XI
 TYPES OF LUNCHES PROVIDED IN CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS,
 APRIL, 1952*

	Rural and small town	Large town	Large city	Total
a, b, c, d, e,**	883	546	493	1,922
Some other combination	99	46	110	255
Milk only	158	153	257	568
Totals	1,140	745	860	2,745

* Data secured from files of School Lunch Office,
 California State Department of Education, Sacramento.

** a--milk
 b--fruit or vegetable
 c--whole grain or enriched bread
 d--meat, fish, eggs, cheese, dried beans or peas
 e--butter or enriched margarine

that many children do not select food wisely when given an unlimited choice, and for this reason schools should be encouraged to serve plate lunches which include the five basic foods.¹³

Table XII indicates the number of schools serving plate lunches in 1945 and 1952, respectively. In 1945, 69 per cent of the rural schools, 63 per cent of the large town schools, and only 34 per cent of the large city schools served a plate lunch. In 1952, a plate lunch was served by 77 per cent of the rural schools, 73 per cent of the large town schools, and 57 per cent of the large city schools. These data indicate that the National School Lunch Program has been effective in developing an awareness of the importance of nutritionally balanced school lunches.

Experience has shown, however, that not all schools claiming to serve nutritionally adequate lunches, actually meet the minimum nutritional standards established for Type A lunches. Since 1946, field nutritionists of the California State Department of Education have evaluated the nutritional standards of school lunches by comparing the number of plate lunches reported as served with amounts of

¹³ School Lunches in California, op. cit., p. 10.

TABLE XII
 NUMBER OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS SERVING PLATE LUNCHES,
 1945 AND 1952*

	Rural and small town	Large town	Large city	Total
Plate lunch served, 1945	431	259	106	796
Plate lunch served, 1952	883	546	493	1,922
No plate lunch served, 1945	193	153	209	555
No plate lunch served, 1952	257	199	367	823

* Data secured from files of School Lunch Office,
 California State Department of Education, Sacramento.

food purchased. For example, if a school reported it had served sixteen hundred Type A lunches, food invoices and inventory records should indicate that sixteen hundred one half pints of milk, two hundred pounds of meat, or its equivalent, and thirty-two pounds of butter or margarine were used during the report period.

In order to evaluate more accurately the effects of the National School Lunch Program upon the nutritional standards of school lunches in California, the investigator selected thirty administrative reviews made by school lunch nutritionists in 1946, the first year of operation of the National School Lunch Program, and compared these with reviews of the same school districts made in 1952. Ten small districts (under one thousand average daily attendance), ten medium districts (one thousand to four thousand average daily attendance), and ten large districts (over four thousand average daily attendance) are included in the study. The results are presented in Table XIII.

Several significant trends are indicated by the study. The number of participating schools meeting minimum nutritional standards increased by an average of 23 per cent. By far the greatest improvement in nutritional standards was made in the area of protein, 39 per cent, and butter/oleomargarine, 51 per cent. This is significant for

TABLE XIII
CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS MEETING TYPE A LUNCH STANDARDS,
1946 AND 1952*

	1946- 47	1951- 52	Per cent increase or decrease
Number of districts	30	30	
Number of schools reviewed	72	97	+ 35
Per cent of schools meeting minimum nutritional standards:			
Protein	37	74	+ 37
Butter/Oleo	10	75	+ 65
Milk	86	98	+ 12
Fruit/Vegetable	96	96	
Bread	100	100	
Average per cent of schools meeting minimum nutri- tional standards	66	89	+ 23

* Data secured from files of School Lunch Office,
California State Department of Education, Sacramento.

several reasons. Most of the school lunch managers are untrained in the fundamentals of nutrition and institution management. Many of them find it rather difficult to plan menus and recipes which include the proper quantity of protein-rich foods. The butter/oleomargarine requirement is difficult to meet unless butter or oleomargarine is used in cooking in addition to the amount used on the bread. Educating managers regarding the importance of good planning in these two areas has been a constant challenge to field representatives of the School Lunch Office, California State Department of Education. The milk requirement is not a problem, since it is easily calculated--one half pint per person. The fruit/vegetable, and bread requirements are almost impossible to evaluate objectively since fruits and vegetables vary in the yield per edible portion, and the various types of bread products used in the school lunch do not permit an objective evaluation in terms of purchased amounts. Therefore, the evaluation of the fruit/vegetable and bread requirements is made by observing whether or not these items are served in sufficient amounts on the day of the visit by the school lunch nutritionist. Accordingly, the program might be markedly deficient in fruit/vegetable or bread, whereas it might have met the minimum standards on all other days. Conversely,

the program might be rated as having met these standards on the day of the visit, but actually might have failed to meet them on all other days. As previously explained, however, the evaluation of protein and butter/oleomargarine standards are made on an objective basis over a period of a month or longer. For this reason, the improvement in the protein and oleomargarine standards is most gratifying.

The improvement in the protein standard is also significant for another reason. In 1946, schools received nine cents reimbursement per Type A lunch. In 1952, not only were they receiving less than one half this reimbursement, four cents, but food prices had increased substantially.

This study indicates that the National School Lunch Program has been effective not only in developing a better understanding of food planning on the part of school lunch managers, but in developing an awareness of the importance of nutritionally adequate lunches to a point where nutritional standards have improved, notwithstanding reduced reimbursement and increased food costs.

Although the data presented in Table XIII, page 78, indicates that there has been a marked improvement in the nutritional standards of school lunches in California under

the National School Lunch Program, it must be remembered that the provision of nutritious school lunches does not necessarily mean that the food is accepted by the children. The investigator recently observed approximately one third of the food served in a school lunch program rejected by the children. The food was well prepared and tasty, and was served in an attractive environment, yet the acceptance was poor. A study is very much needed to determine some of the factors relating to food acceptance by children, and to correlate the relationship between a planned program of nutrition education in the classroom and the improvement of pupil food habits.

Pupil participation. Participation is a problem which has long concerned those interested in school lunch programs. The best facilities, food service, and the highest nutritional standards mean little if they reach only a small percentage of the school enrollment. Furthermore, participation must be in terms of nutritionally balanced lunches if school lunch programs are to be justified. Too often, purchases of candy, soft drinks, or individual food items are counted as units of school lunch participation. Such "participation" is almost meaningless so far as the health or educational program is concerned.

The relationship of the pupil participation in the school lunch program to the average daily attendance of the school, according to the 1945 survey, is indicated in Table XIV. The great weakness of these figures lies in the fact that they give no indication of the types of food selected by the pupils. Presumably a unit of participation would be counted if a pupil purchased a candy bar, ice cream, or a soft drink.

Data relative to participation in nutritionally balanced lunches and milk only are presented in Table XV, page 84. A comparison between Tables XIV, page 83 and Table XV, page 84, is most difficult, because participation in a la carte food items is not included in Table XV. For this reason, the median percentage of participation in Table XV falls in the 25 to 49 per cent grouping, whereas the median percentage in Table XIV is higher, falling in the 75 to 99 per cent grouping.

In order to present an indication of the trend in school lunch participation during the six years of operation of the National School Lunch Program, Table XVI, page 85, lists the relationship of pupil participation to the total school enrollment in California during the years 1946 to 1952. During this period, pupil participation in all lunch types, A, B, and C, more than doubled, while the enrollment in grades kindergarten through twelve increased by

TABLE XIV

PUPIL PARTICIPATION IN CALIFORNIA SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS,
1945*

Percentage indicating the relation of the approximate number of pupils served daily to the average daily attendance of the school

	Small town	Large town	Large city	Total
1--24 per cent	6	34	9	49
25--49 per cent	49	131	69	249
50--74 per cent	125	121	54	300
75--99 per cent	218	57	18	293
100-- per cent	113	9	2	124
Totals	511	352	152	1,015

* Coordinating Committee on School Lunch Programs, School Lunches in California (Sacramento: State Printing Office, 1945), p. 16.

TABLE XV

PUPIL PARTICIPATION IN CALIFORNIA SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS,
APRIL, 1952*

Percentage indicating the relation of the approximate number of pupils served daily to the average daily attendance of the school	Rural and Small town	Large town	Large city	Total
1--24 per cent	32	60	82	174
25--49 per cent	171	329	1,092	1,592
50--74 per cent	305	194	42	541
75--99 per cent	208	8		216
100-- per cent	39			39
Totals	755	591	1,216	2,562

* Data secured from the files of School Lunch Office, California State Department of Education, Sacramento.

TABLE XVI

PUPIL PARTICIPATION IN CALIFORNIA SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS, 1946 TO 1952*

	1946-47	1947-48	1948-49	1949-50	1950-51	1951-52	% increase or decrease
Enrollment Kind.-12	1,350,135	1,428,380	1,506,098	1,590,221	1,661,051	1,806,598	34
All type lunches	250,820	302,106	361,778	445,140	533,860	609,720	143.09
Per cent	19	21	24	28	32	34	79
Enrollment Grades 1-12	1,264,538	1,318,486	1,383,971	1,457,890	1,523,898	1,621,171	28
Type A lunches	173,817	178,956	204,804	248,300	286,963	327,169	88
Per cent	14	14	15	17	19	20	+43
Rate of reimbursement	9¢	5¢	5¢	5¢	4¢	4¢	-55

* Data secured from the files of School Lunch Office, California State Department of Education, Sacramento.

approximately one third. During the 1946-47 school year only 19 per cent of California school children in grades kindergarten through twelve participated in the National School Lunch Program, while in the 1951-52 school year, 34 per cent participated, an increase of 79 per cent. Participation in Type A lunches only has also increased, but to a more limited extent. In calculating the per cent of pupil participation in Type A lunches, only the kindergarten enrollment is excluded, since kindergarten children do not normally participate in the school lunch at noon.

In 1946 approximately 14 per cent of the pupils in grades one to twelve received Type A lunches under the National School Lunch Program, while in 1952 participation had increased 20 per cent. The percentage of increase would be higher if it were possible to exclude the number of children on double sessions from the enrollment figures as double session children usually do not have an opportunity to participate in the lunch program. A question might be raised, however, as to the reasons why double session children should not have such an opportunity. Possibly some minor changes in class and bus schedules might enable more of these children to receive school lunches.

Although the data presented in Table XVI, page 85, show that the percentage of children participating in Type A and Type C has steadily increased, the fact remains that in

1952 only one third of California's school children were participating in the National School Lunch Program. Only one fifth were receiving nutritionally balanced Type A lunches at school under this program.

One factor to be considered in this relatively low percentage of participation is the relationship of the lunch charge to participation. Table XVII shows this relationship according to a study of over seventeen hundred schools in seventeen states conducted by the United States Department of Agriculture. It will be noted that, as the lunch charge increases, participation decreases sharply.

The study shows reduction in federal reimbursement during the period 1946 to 1952 has resulted in increased lunch charges to children in many cases. In 1950 the median charge for the Type A lunch in California was twenty cents in the elementary schools, and twenty-five cents in the secondary schools. In 1952, the median charges had increased to twenty-five cents and thirty cents, respectively.¹⁴

The State of California makes no direct contribution to local operating programs. Several states have

¹⁴ Unpublished data on file in School Lunch Office, California State Department of Education, Sacramento.

TABLE XVII

LUNCH CHARGE--PARTICIPATION RELATIONSHIP IN 1700
SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES, 1949*

Charge Per Lunch	No. of schools	Total enrollment	Participation	Per cent participation
\$.00	137	15,208	11,554	76.0
.05	55	5,700	4,196	73.6
.10	279	54,887	33,696	61.4
.15	676	205,408	107,656	52.4
.20	486	168,371	76,100	45.2
.25	135	61,416	17,613	28.7

* United States Department of Agriculture, "Food Distribution Bulletin #16," (San Francisco: October 20, 1949), p. 1.

supplemented federal reimbursement in order to reduce the charge to the children, and thus encourage participation. For the 1950-51 school year, Illinois provided \$2,200,000.00 for school lunches; Louisiana provided \$8,163,469.00; New York provided \$2,900,000.00, and Utah contributed \$625,000.00. Puerto Rico provided \$3,350,000.00 for support of the program and provided free lunches to all children.¹⁵

It is realized that other factors in addition to the price of the lunch affect participation. Distances from home, access to neighborhood eating facilities, the length of the serving time, and other factors all affect participation in one way or another. A study is very much needed to determine the effect these and other factors have upon participation, and to indicate ways and means by which school lunch participation might be increased.

Personnel training practices. The 1945 report emphasized the great need for better trained school lunch personnel and for more adequate consultant services provided by qualified nutritionists. The report points out that:

¹⁵ United States Department of Agriculture, National School Lunch Program. Program Operation Summary Sheets by States (Washington, D.C.: Production and Marketing Administration, 1951), et. passim.

The field representatives of the Community School Lunch Program of the United States Department of Agriculture give assistance in the schools they serve, and the nutritionists for the State Department of Public Health are available for consultants upon request. These services are valuable, but they cannot reach all schools, nor can they take the place of systematic training of workers. In-service training should be given to all persons supervising or directly responsible for the preparation and serving of food in school cafeterias. The most effective method of providing training is to make it a part of the regular duties of the employee.¹⁶

The report continues:

While much good training is being provided, the program is not coordinated, and there is need for further work in all localities. A statewide type of organization under the direction of a coordinating agency might be effective, but so far efforts to develop this plan have not been successful. Attention should be given to the problem of stimulating the development of a program of training that will reach workers in school cafeterias in all parts of the State.¹⁷

Based upon the survey findings, the Coordinating Committee recommended that all menus should be planned according to the plan of adequate nutrition, that services of a nutritionist should be available to all schools, and that a school lunch consultant should be employed by the State Department of Education.¹⁸

¹⁶ School Lunches in California, op. cit., p. 19.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 20.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 42.

One direct result of the passage of the National School Lunch Act in 1946 was the establishment of a School Lunch Bureau in the California State Department of Education. The Federal-State agreement under which school lunch funds are made available to California provides in part that:

The State Agency shall be responsible for the operation of the school lunch program in participating schools in accordance with the terms and conditions of this agreement and in accordance with regulations issued by the Department pursuant to the Act.

In order to discharge this responsibility, the State Agency will designate a State Supervisor of school lunch programs, and will appoint or cause to be appointed sufficient personnel to perform all functions necessary to insure the proper operation of the program, including the inspection of local operations, the maintenance of adequate records, and the expeditious handling of applications, claims for reimbursement and other operating details with the local schools. The State Agency will be responsible for the distribution to all participating schools of complete information as to the requirements pertaining to program operations, record-keeping and reports.

For the inspection of local programs, the State Agency will appoint or cause to be appointed not less than the number of qualified personnel shown in the State Plan of Operation, submitted by the State Agency and approved by the Department.¹⁹

¹⁹ "School Lunch Agreement, United States Department of Agriculture and the California State Department of Education," August 8, 1946, p. 2.

At the present time one school lunch supervisor, one supervising nutritionist, and eight field nutritionists are employed by the California State Department of Education. Approximately one third of the school lunch programs in the State are reviewed each year, and all districts have the privilege of requesting the services of the field nutritionists. During the 1951-52 school year, 1,074 complete reviews of local operations were conducted by the school lunch staff, and in addition 728 visitations were made in answer to requests for operational assistance.

Since 1946 the school lunch staff of the California Department of Education has cooperated with local districts, county officials, and other agencies in establishing an in-service training program to up-grade the standards of school lunch personnel. The Department of Education began to publish a monthly school lunch bulletin in September, 1947, providing suggested school lunch menus, recipes, and operational suggestions. A school lunch guide was prepared and distributed to all schools in June, 1952. This guide was developed to provide worth-while information pertaining to lunchroom planning and lunchroom operation for the use of school administrators, lunchroom managers, and supervisors, and school lunch cooks. Over one hundred pages of school lunch recipes are included, and

the guide is illustrated with fifteen photographs and contains tables and charts which should prove helpful to school lunch managers.

County-wide school lunch workshops and institutes have become an established part of the in-service training program. Each year approximately twenty such workshops are conducted with the cooperation of the representative county superintendents. Menu planning, quantity food preparation, care and use of equipment, sanitation, and similar topics are discussed at the workshops.

Since 1951 the Department of Education has sponsored summer school lunch workshops at the college and university level. In 1951 a two-week school lunch workshop was conducted at the University of Redlands, and in 1952 a similar workshop was conducted at San Jose State College. Tentative plans at the present time provide for a one-week workshop to be conducted at both Humboldt State College and San Diego State College in 1953.

In 1951, the state Joint Committee on School Health appointed a study committee to consider the problem of establishing qualifications for school lunch personnel. During the past two years the study committee has been active in developing an outline of the duties and responsibilities for school lunch personnel, and recommendations for

the qualifications necessary to meet those duties and responsibilities.²⁰

While much has been accomplished in the area of personnel training during the past six years, the fact remains that at the present time there are no established qualifications for school lunch personnel, and much more needs to be done at the local, county, and college level to provide a coordinated pattern of training.

Summary. According to a survey conducted in 1945 by the Coordinating Committee on School Lunch Programs, approximately 41 per cent of 2,866 schools reporting, serve lunches, and approximately 48 per cent serve either lunch or milk. In 1952, after six years of assistance under the National School Lunch Program, approximately 56 per cent of a total of 3,917 California elementary and secondary schools were serving lunch, and 70 per cent serve either lunch or milk. Particular improvement is noted among the rural and small town schools. In 1945, less than one third of the rural schools served lunch, whereas by 1952 the number of these schools serving lunch had increased by 78 per cent.

²⁰ For a preliminary draft of suggested duties and responsibilities for school lunch personnel, see Appendix C, page 111.

While these figures are encouraging, the fact remains that only 56 per cent of California schools were providing lunches in 1952, and it appears that more financial assistance is needed in many impoverished districts in order to build and equip lunchrooms.

The data indicated that the National School Lunch Program has been effective in improving the nutritional standards of lunches in California. In 1945, approximately 59 per cent of the schools served nutritionally balanced, or plate lunches, whereas in 1952, 70 per cent were serving plate lunches. Particular improvement is noted among the large city schools which had 34 per cent providing plate lunches in 1945 and 57 per cent in 1952. A comparison of the nutritional standards maintained by thirty school districts in 1946 and in 1952 shows a marked improvement. In 1945, only 66 per cent of the schools reviewed were meeting minimum nutritional standards established for the Type A lunch. In 1952, 89 per cent were meeting minimum standards.

During the period 1946 to 1952, the percentage of the total school enrollment participating in both Type A and Type C lunches increased by 79 per cent, and the percentage participating in Type A lunches only increased by 88 per cent. These increases in participation were made notwithstanding the fact that federal assistance under the

National School Lunch Program declined from nine cents per Type A lunch in 1946 to four cents per lunch in 1952. It is noted, however, that in 1952 only 20 per cent of the school children of California were receiving the benefit of nutritionally balanced school lunches. Since school lunch participation is closely related to the lunch charge, additional financial aid is necessary if nutritionally adequate school lunches are to reach a higher percentage of children.

Much progress has been made under the National School Lunch Program in improving the standards of school lunch personnel. A full-time school lunch staff is maintained by the State Department of Education. Monthly school lunch bulletins, and a school lunch guide have been published by the Department. A committee on qualifications for school lunch personnel is currently developing material on the duties and responsibilities of school lunch personnel, and an outline of the training needed to perform such duties.

Much remains to be done in the area of personnel training, however. Colleges and universities, as well as county superintendents of schools, need to provide more leadership in this area.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary. The rapid growth of federally aided school lunch programs during the past several years has created a need for a study of the background, purposes, and results of this grant-in-aid program. The questions which must be answered are:

1. How has federal aid for school lunch programs developed?
2. What forms has it taken?
3. What has it accomplished?

This study attempts to evaluate the nature and scope of the program as carried on throughout the United States, and to evaluate the effects of the program in California schools. The objectives which are basic to this investigation are: (1) to provide information regarding the historical background, and the present status of federally aided school lunch programs; and (2) to furnish possible basis for revision and improvement of the National School Lunch Program as it now exists.

The evaluation of the nature and scope of federal aid for school lunches is based upon data secured from the records and publications of official federal and state

agencies. The evaluation of the effects of federal aid upon school lunches in California was made on the basis of a survey conducted in California in 1945 by the Coordinating Committee on School Lunch Programs appointed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The findings and recommendations of this committee were compared with 1952 data secured from the files of the School Lunch Office of the California State Department of Education, Sacramento, and other bureaus of the California State Department of Education. Whenever valid comparisons with the 1945 survey cannot be made, the evaluation is made in terms of state-wide data covering the six years of operation by the National School Lunch Program in California during the period 1946 to 1952. The evaluation of the effects of federal aid upon school lunches in California is limited to a consideration of four specific areas: (1) the extent of school lunch programs; (2) the types of lunches offered; (3) pupil participation; and (4) personnel training practices.

Historically, school lunch programs began with major emphasis upon charity. Federal assistance on a nationwide basis began during the depression of the 1930's, and at first was limited to a provision of surplus foods by the United States Department of Agriculture, and the provision

of labor by the Works Progress Administration. Cash reimbursement was first granted in 1940, and federal assistance was placed on a permanent basis with the passage of the National School Lunch Act in 1946. Since that time the number of participating schools and children have steadily increased, although federal cash assistance has not kept pace with the program growth.

In general, federal aid has contributed much to the improvement of school lunch programs in California. Much remains to be done, however. Only 56 per cent of California schools operated lunch programs in 1952. Less than one fourth of the school enrollment of California received Type A lunches in 1952, and only 34 per cent received Type A or Type C lunches. No qualifications for school lunch personnel have been established on a state-wide basis, and the colleges and county superintendents of schools, generally, are doing very little to provide training in school lunch supervision or management.

Recommendations. In order for California school lunch programs to become more effective and to reach more children, the following recommendations are made:

1. Additional operating funds, federal, state, and local, should be provided so that lunch charges to children may be reduced and participation thus encouraged.

2. A combination of federal and state funds for equipment should be furnished so that impoverished districts may be assisted in establishing programs.

3. School administrators should consider the possibility of adjusting schedules so that children on double sessions may have the opportunity to participate in the school lunch program.

4. State-wide qualifications for school lunch personnel should be established.

5. The colleges and universities, as well as county superintendents of schools, should take more leadership in providing a coordinated training program for school lunch personnel.

6. Classes in school lunch and nutrition education should be established in the teacher training institutions so that teachers and administrators might develop a better understanding of the relationship of the school lunch program to the total school program.

Further research needed. Further research could be profitably carried on in the following areas:

1. A basis for better means of financing the school lunch program in terms of federal, state, and local aid.

2. Factors affecting pupil participation in the school lunch program.

3. Factors affecting food acceptance by pupils.
4. The relationship between nutrition education and food acceptance by pupils.
5. The effects of nutritious school lunches upon the physical and mental health of children.
6. The advantages and disadvantages of plate lunch service as compared with a la carte service.

Conclusions. The results of this study suggest the following conclusions regarding the nature, scope, and effects of federal aid for school lunches in California:

1. Federal aid has enabled or encouraged many schools to establish and operate school lunch programs.
2. Federal aid has increased, or helped to increase, pupil participation in school lunches.
3. Federal aid has helped to improve nutritional standards of school lunches.
4. Federal aid has helped to improve the qualifications of school lunch personnel.
5. Federal aid has not kept pace with the growth of school lunch programs throughout the United States, and for this reason, additional funds, either federal, state, or local are needed to extend the benefits of nutritious school lunches to a higher percentage of the nation's children.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, O. D., and others, Effectiveness of the School Lunch in Improving Nutritional Status of School Children. Gainesville, Florida: Agricultural Experiment Station, 1946. 32 pp.
- Augustine, Grace, and others, "Nutritional Adequacy, Cost and Acceptability in an Iowa School Lunch Program," Journal of the American Dietetic Association, 26:654-62, September, 1950.
- Bryan, Mary de Garmo, The School Cafeteria. New York: F. S. Crofts and Company, 1943. 740 pp.
- Bryant, Louise S., School Feeding: Its History and Practices at Home and Abroad. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1914. 345 pp.
- California Education Code. Sacramento: State Printing Division, 1951. 1059 pp.
- California State Department of Education, California School Lunch Guide, 1952. 197 pp.
- California State Department of Education, "School Lunch Bulletin No. 31," September 7, 1951. 3 pp.
- California State Department of Education, "School Lunch Bulletin No. 34," August 26, 1952. 6 pp.
- California State Department of Education, "School Lunch and Nutrition News." (Price Participation)
- Coordinating Committee on School Lunch Programs, School Lunches in California. Sacramento, California: State Printing Office, 1945. 42 pp.
- Driesbach, Margaret B., "Some Criteria for Evaluating School Lunch Programs," Journal of the American Dietetic Association, 23:857-61, October, 1947.
- Federal Security Administration, School Lunch and Nutrition Education. Washington, D.C.: United States Office of Education. Bulletin No. 14, 1951. 12 pp.

- Federal Security Administration, State Provisions for School Lunch Programs. Washington, D.C.: United States Office of Education Bulletin No. 4, 1952. 40 pp.
- Florida State Department of Education, Growing Through School Lunch Experiences. Tallahassee, Florida: Florida State University, Bulletin No. 33A, 1948. 177 pp.
- Gebhardt, John C., "Malnutrition and School Feeding," United States Office of Education, Bulletin No. 37, 1921. 39 pp.
- Hathaway, Millicent L., "School Lunches: Their Nutritive Value and Relation to the Health of Children," American Journal of Public Health, 40:9, 1096-1100, September, 1950.
- Hezeltine, Marjorie M., "The Complete Noon Meal," Nation's Schools, 29:37-8, June, 1942.
- Hunter, Robert, Poverty. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1905. 382 pp.
- Maxwell, Elsie, "The Broader Value of the School Lunch Program," The American School Board Journal, 122:3, 23-4, March, 1951.
- Mosher, Ada M., The Nutritional Condition of Children in Relation to School Lunches in Two South Carolina Rural Communities. Clemson, South Carolina: South Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin No. 359, 1945. 110 pp.
- "School Lunch Agreement, United States Department of Agriculture, and the California State Department of Education," August 8, 1946. 9 pp.
- School Lunch and Milk Programs. United States Government Printing Office, Publication No. 60233 (Washington, D.C., 1944), 250 pp.
- Smedley, Emma, The School Lunch--Its Organization and Management in Philadelphia. Philadelphia: Innes and Sons, 1920. 164 pp.

Southworth, H. M., and M. I. Klayman, The School Lunch Program and Agricultural Surplus Disposal. United States Department of Agriculture. Washington, D.C.: Publication No. 467, 1941. 66 pp.

Spargo, John, "The Underfed Children in our Public Schools," The Independent, 58:1060-63, May, 1905.

State School Law of California. Sacramento: Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1927. 455 pp.

Tansil, Blanche, "School Lunches Aid Nutritive Progress," Nation's Schools, 37:64-5, March, 1946.

United States Department of Agriculture, National School Lunch Program--Program Summary Sheets by States. Washington, D.C.: Production and Marketing Administration, 1951. 54 pp.

United States Department of Agriculture, "School Feeding in the United States." Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1947. 123 pp.

United States Department of Agriculture, School Lunch and Food Distribution Programs, Selected Statistics, 1939-1950. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1950. 15 pp.

United States Department of Agriculture, The National School Lunch Program, A Progress Report. PA-208. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1951. 19 pp.

Velat, Clarence, "Evaluating School Lunches and Nutritional Status of Children." Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Agriculture, Bulletin No. 859, 1951. 85 pp.

War Food Administration, The Community School Lunch Program. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1944. 19 pp.

APPENDIX A

LUNCH TYPES

1. Type A is a complete lunch, hot or cold, providing one third to one half of one day's nutritive requirements and must contain at least:

- (a) One half pint whole milk (which meets the minimum butter-fat and sanitation requirements of state and local laws) as a beverage;
- (b) Two ounces of fresh or processed meat, poultry meat, cooked or canned fish, or cheese, or one half cup cooked dry peas, beans, or soybeans, or four tablespoons of peanut butter; or one egg;
- (c) Six ounces (three fourths cup) of raw, cooked, or canned vegetables and/or fruit;
- (d) One portion of bread, muffins, or other hot bread made of whole-grain cereal or enriched flour; and
- (e) Two teaspoons of butter or fortified margarine.

The requirements of this lunch type are best adapted to a plate or tray service. The protein requirements in (b) above may be met by serving one half the required quantities of each of two proteins. One half cup of fruit juice may be served in meeting one half of the requirements of (c).

2. Type B lunch is an incomplete lunch, hot or cold, which is less adequate nutritionally. It must contain at least:

- (a) One half pint whole milk (which meets the minimum butter-fat and sanitation requirements of State and local laws) as a beverage;
- (b) One ounce of fresh or processed meat, poultry meat, cooked or canned fish, or cheese, or one half egg; or one fourth cup cooked dry peas, beans, or soybeans, or two tablespoons peanut butter;
- (c) Four ounces (one half cup) raw, cooked, or canned vegetables and/or fruit;
- (d) One portion of bread, muffins, or other hot bread made of whole-grain cereal or enriched flour; and

- (e) One teaspoon of butter or fortified margarine

The requirements of this lunch are designed to fit the limited facilities of some schools or may be supplemented by food brought from home. The lunch may be built around a main dish (thick soup, chowder, stew, casserole or salad) including items (b) and (c) and served with milk and bread and butter or margarine. As an alternative, items (b), (d), and (e) may be used as a sandwich and served with milk and fruit and/or vegetables.

3. Type C lunch is one half pint of whole milk (which meets the minimum butter-fat and sanitation requirements of State and local laws), as a beverage.

NOTE: No meal for children can be considered complete unless milk is served. However, if milk cannot be secured, a Type A or B lunch without milk may be served.

APPENDIX B

MEMBERS OF COORDINATING COMMITTEE
ON SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS 1944-1945

Verne S. Landreth, Chief, Division of Physical and Health
Education, State Department of Education,
Chairman

Bertha V. Akin, Chief, Bureau of Homemaking Education, State
Department of Education

Dr. Jessie Bierman, Chief, Bureau of Maternal and Child
Health, State Department of Public Health

Vera Fowler, Assistant to the Director, California State
War Council

Leo Hart, County Superintendent of Schools, Kern County

Christine Heller, Nutrition Consultant, State Department of
Public Health

Mrs. A. B. Jewel, Chairman, School Lunch Project, California
Congress of Parents and Teachers

Kenneth May, War Food Administration

Joe P. Mitchell, District Superintendent, Livermore Elemen-
tary School District

Mrs. Cecyl Nelson, Supervisor, Community Health Education
Project, State Department of Education

Rt. Rev. James T. O'Dowd, Superintendent of Schools,
Archdiocese of San Francisco

Mrs. I. E. Porter, Executive Secretary, California School
Trustees Association

Jane Sedgewick, Food Administrator, California Youth Author-
ity

Dr. Ellis Sox, Division of Local Health Service, State
Department of Public Health

APPENDIX C

SCHOOL LUNCH MANAGER

Duties and Responsibilities of the school lunch manager under the local administrative officer:

1. Responsible for menu plans with emphasis on meeting at least one third of the daily nutritional needs of children and youth at minimum cost.
2. Responsible for efficient and sanitary food preparation.
3. Responsible for preparing appetizing and attractively served foods.
4. Responsible for recommending the selection, assignment and rating of lunchroom personnel.
5. Responsible for on-the-job training of school lunch personnel to develop maximum efficiency and safety.
6. Responsible for establishing duties and work schedules of employees.
7. Responsible for proper storage and efficient use of food and supplies; and for quality and quantity of foods prepared using standard recipes, standard portions.
8. Cooperates in the selection of food, supplies and equipment.
9. Cooperates in providing necessary records for financial accounting, including food and equipment inventories.
10. Cooperates in school activities relating to the school lunch program.
11. Assists in planning the school lunchroom, and in the selection and placement of suitable equipment.
12. Responsible for efficient use, care, and maintenance of equipment.
13. Responsible for meeting requirements for periodic health examinations for all lunchroom personnel.

14. Responsible for recommending the exclusion of the worker with temporary illnesses, such as colds or skin diseases.

Duties and Responsibilities of the school lunch manager serving under a school lunch supervisor:

1. Responsible for the efficient operation of the school lunch program within a given school.
2. Responsible for carrying out menu plans submitted by the school lunch director, with emphasis on meeting at least one third of the daily nutritional needs of children and youth at minimum cost.
3. Responsible for efficient and sanitary food preparation and service.
4. Responsible for the preparation and service of appetizing and attractive food.
5. Responsible for proper storage and efficient use of food and supplies.
6. Cooperates in the training and scheduling of work of lunchroom personnel to develop maximum efficiency and safety.
7. Cooperates in providing necessary records for financial accounting, including food and equipment inventories.
8. Cooperates in the selection and purchase of food, supplies, and equipment.
9. Cooperates in school activities relating to the school lunch program.
10. Responsible for the efficient use, care, and maintenance of equipment.
11. Responsible for the on-the-job training of personnel in the proper use of the equipment.
12. Responsible for recommending the exclusion of the worker with temporary illnesses, such as colds or skin diseases.
13. Responsible for employees carrying out their duties and work schedules.
14. Responsible for maintaining harmonious relationships with the principal and all school personnel.

The Director of the School Lunch Program is responsible to the Superintendent and other administrative officers as designated by the Superintendent.

The scope of the duties --

1. Planning and operating a school lunch program which meets the nutritional needs of children and youth.
 - a. Responsible for menu plans for all food service operations in the district with emphasis on meeting at least one third of the daily nutritional needs of children and youth at minimum cost.
 - b. Responsible for efficient and sanitary food preparation and for the provision of attractively served, appetizing food.
 - c. Responsible for recommending selection, placement and transfers; and for the training, assignment and evaluation of lunchroom personnel.
 - d. Responsible for recommending fiscal operating policy of the school lunch program.
 - e. Responsible for all income and expenditures relating to the school lunch program.
 - f. Responsible for proper storage and efficient distribution of food and supplies to and in the school lunch units.
 - g. Cooperates in developing specifications and determining amounts for food and operating supplies and all equipment to be purchased.
 - h. Cooperates in maintaining necessary accounting information for retirement records, profit and loss statements, food inventories, reports and payrolls.
 - i. Assists in planning school lunchrooms and in the selection and placement of suitable equipment.
2. Working with administrators, teachers, other school lunch personnel, parents and children in integrating the school lunch program with the school curriculum.

- a. Cooperates with principals and teachers in the individual schools in integrating the school lunch program with the total school program (supervision of lunch period, staggered lunch period, etc.)
 - b. Cooperates in the integration of nutrition education and school lunch with other aspects of the total health program.
 - c. Prepares school lunch and nutrition bulletins for distribution (to community, children, administrator, teachers, and other school lunch personnel).
3. Keeping the community informed about the program.
- a. Appears before P. T. A. and other groups.
 - b. Arranges for parent visitations to lunchrooms.
 - c. Prepares copies of weekly or monthly menus for distribution to parents.
 - d. Arranges for menus and other material to be printed in local paper.