

Central Washington University
ScholarWorks@CWU

Electronic Theses

Student Scholarship and Creative Works


1955

A Survey of Existing Practices of the School Lunch Program in the State of Washington

William E. Davis

Central Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), and the [Other Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Davis, William E., "A Survey of Existing Practices of the School Lunch Program in the State of Washington" (1955). *Electronic Theses*. Paper 55.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship and Creative Works at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU.

A SURVEY OF EXISTING PRACTICES
OF THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM
IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the School of Education
Central Washington College of Education

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

by

William E. Davis

August 1955

APPROVED FOR THE
GRADUATE FACULTY

Donald J. Murphy, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

D. Thompson

Leo Nicholson

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation to Dr. Donald Murphy for encouragement, guidance, and direction in the completion of this study.

Special acknowledgments to Professor Nicholson and to Professor Thompson for serving on the graduate committee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED . . .	1
The problem	1
Definitions of terms used	5
Limitations	9
II. DEVELOPMENTAL HISTORY OF SCHOOL LUNCH	11
Early development	11
Growth through Federal assistance	12
Establishment of State control	16
Predictions of future expansion	20
III. CRITERIA FOR PLANNING THE LUNCHROOM AND TYPE A LUNCH	21
Minimum requirements	22
Type A lunch	29
IV. THE STUDY	32
Administrative policies	32
Supervisory methods	37
Lunchroom facilities	40
Comments from schools	43

CHAPTER	PAGE
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	45
Conclusions	49
Implications	50
BIBLIOGRAPHY	53
APPENDIX	57

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Price Range of School Lunches, 1954-1955	35
II. Percentage of Prices Tabulated	35
III. Refrigeration Units in School Lunch Programs	42

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Serving children food for their noon meal was started in the depression days of the 1930's. Since the beginning of food lunch programs, there has been steady progress from local, state and national groups to make this program a part of the school curriculum. The schools participating in serving food to children during the lunch hour include those in the forty-eight states, District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

Educators, with the help of civic and community groups, are continually striving to better the health of children. Nutritionists, dietitians, home economics teachers, and administrators with the help of the Federal and state governments are working together to provide better meals for the school children at lower prices.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. It was the purpose of this study (1) to survey the existing conditions in the lunchrooms of the schools in the State of Washington which are classed as group three, four, and five, according to the Washington Education Association's Thirty-Second Annual Teachers' Salary Schedule; and (2) to show the practices,

types of equipment being used, supervisory methods, and administrative policies of these programs.

From the data compiled, an attempt was made to show the practices common to the lunchroom programs in the schools of the State of Washington which were surveyed.

The study attempts to determine (1) what means of supervision is used in the lunchrooms, (2) what amount of student help is utilized, (3) what prices are charged for the school lunch, (4) what attitudes and learnings are being developed, (5) what equipment is being used and if this equipment is adequate, (6) what planning is being done in relation to menus, and (7) what changes need to be made in the lunchroom conditions.

Importance of the study. Educators are recognizing the importance of health more and more and are concerned with improving the health and welfare of the children throughout the world. The first cardinal aim of education is health and physical education. Since schools are realizing the importance of these aims and striving to stress them in curriculum planning, more consideration is given to teaching children how to maintain good health through proper eating habits. The school lunch program provides opportunities in the health curriculum for experiences in selecting proper foods for well-balanced meals, as well as first-hand experiences in practicing proper etiquette.

A second reason for the importance of this study is the need to find solutions to problems relating to the school lunch program. Many state and city supervisors are seeking solutions for a number of pertinent problems. One way of providing answers is for state and local supervisors and curriculum workers to confer together in workshops with others interested in the school lunch. Personnel who can be of assistance are nutritionists, local school lunch managers, college instructors in institutional management, local school administrators, health instructors, and physical education directors.

Another source of answers to problems relating to the school lunch program may lie in the direction of studies undertaken by graduate students at institutions of higher learning. Although this writer has failed to locate studies relating to the problem at hand, it is felt that a survey of existing conditions might bring to light trends of importance. Administrators, board members, and other policy-making groups might then utilize these trends in making decisions.

Problems with which the state and local schools are confronted relate to the physical plant and essential equipment in schools of differing sizes, selection and certification of professional personnel, salary schedules and retirement provisions, personnel training programs, supervision of programs at state and local levels, financing and public relations. Other problems with which educators are concerned are

making the program of maximum educational value and a supplement to classroom study of nutrition, health and business. The problem of planning lunchroom facilities so they can be used for other activities such as social functions and entertainment of non-school groups must be considered if the lunchroom is to accommodate civic groups and other community and parent groups.

It would be difficult to justify building an adequately equipped lunchroom and only using it for one hour a day for the 180-day school year.

There are many educational opportunities for learning experiences which educators and other forward-looking people see for the school lunch program. There is no better place in the public or private school curriculum to teach etiquette, proper food selections and social interchange of ideas than in the lunchroom. The lunch hour is no longer a free period for teachers, but a time when guidance and supervision are needed.¹

Educators and lunchroom personnel are finding problems in planning menus that are suitable to students. In some cases, the waste from a well-planned lunch has been tremendous. The likes and dislikes of the students need to be taken into consideration before the menus are

¹"How Does Your Lunchroom Measure Up?" Practical Home Economics, XXXII (January, 1954), p. 20.

prepared. Children are being consulted and asked to look over the menus and make suggestions. Children need to be made to feel the lunch program is for them. The greater the part the student performs in connection with his cafeteria, the better the results.²

It was the purpose of this study to survey the existing conditions and practices in the schools of the State of Washington, excluding the very large districts and the very small districts. From the results of the questionnaire, an attempt will be made to show what is being done to adequately plan and serve the school lunch program.

II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

School District Classifications. A school district having a population in excess of 10,000, as shown by any regular or special census or by any other evidence acceptable to the county superintendent, shall be a school district of the first class. Any school district (a) containing an incorporated city or an area of one square mile with a population of at least 300, or (b) maintaining a fully accredited high school shall be a district of the second class. All other school districts shall be districts of the third class.

²"A Student Looks at the School Lunch Program," Practical Home Economics, XXX (January, 1952), p. 33.

The Washington Education Association's Thirty-Second Annual Teachers' Salary Study, 1954-1955, grouped the districts as follows:

- I. Large first-class districts with over 20,000 enrollment.
- II. Smaller first-class districts with over 2,000 enrollment.
- III. Large second-class districts with over 1,000 enrollment.
- IV. Middle-sized second-class districts and large third-class districts with an enrollment of 250 to 999.
- V. Small second-class districts and larger third-class districts under 250 enrollment.
- VI. Third-class districts employing one to four teachers.

In this study we are concerned with groups III, IV, and V above.

The National School Lunch Act. The National School Lunch Act is "declared to be the policy of Congress, as a measure of national security, to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other food, by assisting the States, through grants-in-aid and other means, in providing an adequate supply of foods and other facilities for the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of non-profit school-lunch programs."³

³The National School Lunch Program, A Progress Report, United States Department of Agriculture, Pamphlet 208 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1952), p. 19.

Type A Lunch. Federal regulations provide that cash reimbursement and commodities can be granted only for those lunches which meet minimum Type A requirements. The Type A lunch is to consist of:

1. One-half pint of milk
2. Two ounces per serving of a protein food
3. Three-fourths cup per serving of vegetables or fruit
4. A portion or more of bread per serving
5. Two teaspoons per serving of butter

Commodities. Any foods or food products given to the state lunch program by the Federal government for assistance at the local level.

Federal Aid. Any food commodities or cash assistance given to the state lunch program for use at the local level.

Cash Reimbursements. Money made available to the state school lunch program for division and use among the local school lunch programs.

State Aid. Assistance to the local school districts from the state for the maintenance and operation of local school lunch programs.

Seven Cardinal Aims of Education. The most widely known and published influential statement of educational aims is that of 1918. The Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education was appointed by the National Educational Association to study the aims of education. Although the seven cardinal objectives were designed for the secondary schools, they have been widely accepted by all other levels of education

as well.⁴ These aims are as follows:

1. Good health
2. Command of fundamental processes
3. Worthy home-membership
4. Vocational efficiency
5. Civic efficiency
6. Worthy use of leisure time
7. Ethical character

School lunch program. Schools which prepare and serve food are considered to have a school lunch program. Schools that serve milk and do not prepare and serve food are providing a service, but are not considered as having a school lunch program.

Civic Groups. Groups that are interested in the welfare of the community and whose aim is to improve facilities and the well-being of the community are called civic groups.

Parent Groups. Groups of parents meeting and working together for the betterment of their children are considered parent groups. The National Parent-Teacher Association is an example of this type of group.

Basic Seven. The Basic Seven are foods which include milk, protein-rich foods or meats, bread, enriched or whole grain, vegetables, fruits, butter or fortified margarine.

Equipment. The stoves, refrigerators, trays, or plates are

⁴Ward G. Reeder, A First Course in Education (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950), p. 72.

samples of the equipment used in the school lunch. Articles or supplies necessary for any particular service are designated as equipment.

School Lunch Facilities. School lunch facilities is a term used to include the equipment plus the school lunch kitchen, lunchroom, and storage space.

Commissary. A place where food is served and sold is known as a commissary. The terms "cafeteria" and "lunchroom," as used in this study, are synonymous with the term "commissary."

Administrator of the School Lunch Program. One who manages or administers direct application of the laws is known as an administrator of the school lunch program. At the Federal level the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of State administer or carry out the laws made by Congress. At the state level, the administration of the school lunch carried out by the state department of education. At the local level, the local superintendent and the school board administer the laws as described by the state.

III. LIMITATIONS

Since the group of schools surveyed by this study excluded the very large school districts and the very small school districts, the reader should keep in mind the results of the study will not be a complete picture of what is being done in all school lunch programs in the State of

Washington. The value of the study to schools with an enrollment of over 2,000 students and schools with an enrollment of less than 150 students will be limited.

The value of the study to the nationwide school lunch program will be limited because the survey was limited to one state; therefore, nationwide problems were not included in the questionnaire.

CHAPTER II

DEVELOPMENTAL HISTORY OF SCHOOL LUNCH

I. EARLY DEVELOPMENT

The school lunch program started in the rural schools for those who could not go home for lunch. The main task of the school was to provide a place to eat at noon and some facilities. The facilities first set up were of the commissary type designed to sell food to students at cost. The lunch program was seldom related to the children's educational program.

Later, there was an attempt by the Parent-Teacher Association to provide one hot dish to supplement the children's lunch.

Growth of the hot lunch program paralleled consolidation for many reasons. As school districts were consolidated, children were transported long distances to school by bus and were required to eat cold lunches from paper bags and dinner pails.

Forward-looking teachers found ways of making the school lunch a learning experience for children as well as a noon meal.¹

¹Myrtis Keels Jeffries, State Provisions for School Lunch Programs, Laws and Personnel, Bulletin 1952 No. 4 (Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1952), pp. 1-2.

II. GROWTH THROUGH FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

Federal assistance to the school lunch program was initiated during the depression days as one method of providing a market for agricultural commodities. Federal assistance was started under the administration of Public Law 320, Section 32, approved by the Seventy-fourth Congress in 1935.²

The purpose of this law was to provide markets for the surplus agricultural commodities. The Secretary of Agriculture spent \$244, 114 as one means of encouraging consumption of domestic foods for school lunch commodities. The surplus commodities were purchased and distributed to schools to create a market for the surplus and to provide food for lunchrooms over the United States. Buying surplus agricultural commodities and distributing them to the school lunch programs continued up to World War II. There were few surplus commodities available after the beginning of World War II because of large demands of food and agricultural products by the armed forces.

The first cash reimbursements came as early as 1939 and 1940 in connection with the school milk program. The schools kept an account of the milk that was sold and each school district was reimbursed by the Federal Government. In 1943, the school milk program was

²Ibid.

combined with the indemnity plan. The Secretary of Agriculture reimbursed the schools in cash for the purchase of seasonally designated or over-abundant agricultural products used in the preparation of certain types of school lunches. The purpose of the two plans was to compensate for the loss to the schools of commodities which, because of wartime needs, could not be made available by the Secretary of Agriculture.

In June, 1946, the Seventy-ninth Congress approved Public Law 396, which is generally known as the National School Lunch Act.³

The National School Lunch Act reads as follows:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress, as a measure of national security, to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other foods, by assisting the states, through grants-in-aid and other means, in providing an adequate supply of foods and other facilities for the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of nonprofit school-lunch programs."⁴

Every year the program reaches more and more children. In nine years the number of children participating in the National School Lunch Program has more than doubled and is increasing at a rate of 8 to 10 per cent each year.

³Ibid., p. 3.

⁴The National School Lunch Program, A Progress Report (Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1952), p. 19.

Federal cash assistance to school lunch programs was first provided in 1944 and that year the program reached over 3,760,000 children. By 1947, the first year of operation under the National School Lunch Act, 6,000,000 children were participating. Since 1947, participation has increased year by year to a total of 9,400,000 children in 1952. Another measure of program growth is the increase in the number and quality of meals served by participating schools. Less than half a billion meals were served in 1944; in 1952, over one and one-half billion meals were served.⁵

Many schools have improved facilities in order to serve higher quality meals. In 1944, less than one-half of the meals served were of the type A lunch. To meet the requirements of the type A lunch, the meal has to be complete with milk. In 1952, more than two out of every three meals served met the type A standard.

Every year the program uses more and more food. Participating schools used 500 million pounds of food in 1944. In 1952, schools used two billion pounds of food in the meals served under the program.

Nutritional standards established by the Federal lunch program require schools to serve type A lunches to be entitled to Federal aid. The type A lunch is designed to help plan lunches which will supply the

⁵Ibid., pp. 4-6.

kinds and amounts of foods children need. It provides a simple framework for planning menus which include foods from each of the basic seven food groups. Because of the nutritional standards established for the meals served under the program, the large amounts of foods used were the protective foods. These are milk and other dairy products, meats and other protein foods, fruits, and vegetables. Increased use of these foods is in accord with good farm production and food consumption practices.

Good food habits are being developed which will carry over into adult life; thus, a basis for a continuing expansion in domestic food markets is being built.⁶

A survey by the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, shows that in program schools many more children eat a complete lunch than in non-program schools. The average price in the program school was 22¢, compared to 40¢ in the non-program school.⁷

Most of the food used in the program is purchased locally. As more and better meals have been served under the program, schools have purchased larger and larger quantities of food from local wholesalers,

⁶Planning Type A School Lunches (Washington, D. C.: United States Department Printing Office, 1952), p. 23.

⁷Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics Survey (Washington, D. C.: United States Printing Office, 1950), p. 10.

retailers, and producers. In six years of operation under the National School Lunch Act, the value of the food purchased has increased from approximately \$129,000,000 in 1947 to \$250,000,000 in 1952. Local purchases represent over 80 per cent of the value of all foods used by the schools.⁸

The food commodities supplied to schools by the Federal Government are used to supplement foods purchased locally. They help schools to provide children with more adequate amounts of the nutrients commonly lacking in children's diets and add variety to the meals served. The Federal Government provides commodities and cash assistance to the states, and through the states to the local districts.

III. ESTABLISHMENT OF STATE CONTROL

State legislatures are playing an increasingly significant part in the development of school lunch programs. The National School Act states that "Funds paid to any state during any fiscal year shall be disbursed by the state educational agency." At the time this Act was passed, many of the states had no legal authorization for this phase of the state educational program. In order that states desiring Federal assistance for their school lunch programs might legally receive it

⁸National School Lunch Program, op. cit., p. 12.

for the first year, the state governors were asked by the Department of Agriculture to give authorization to their state educational agencies to accept Federal funds for their school lunch programs. State legislatures, which had not previously given such authorization, have subsequently confirmed their governor's authorization for the state board of Education or the chief state school officer to establish, maintain and operate the state school lunch program and to accept Federal funds provided for that purpose.⁹

In many instances the legislatures have established a broad plan of purposes and objectives for their school lunch programs. Through such permissive legislation or delegated authority, the determination of those standards, rules, and regulations, not designated in the Federal act, were left to the discretion of the state board of education, the state department of education, or the chief state school officer.

In other instances, states have enacted legislation which contains detailed prescriptions for the establishment and operation of the school lunch program.

There are certain areas where it is desirable for legislation to be specific. Authorities and administrators are generally agreed that

⁹Myrtis Keels Jeffries, op. cit., p. 5.

one of these concerns state aid for the development of special education service programs. As applied to the school lunch, special aid legislation is proving useful in developing school lunch programs in a number of states, among them Utah, which has had special aid legislation for school lunch purposes since 1943.¹⁰ Special forms of state aid, and consequently special aid legislation may be repealed after a program has become well established.

For many years school lunch programs were developed in local school communities with little encouragement or aid from state departments of education except as local individuals concerned with rural education, home economics education, or health education saw the need for and manifested some interest in the school lunch program.

Federal, state, and local funds finance the program. In 1952, \$415,000,000 was provided for the program by the Federal, state and local sources. Of this amount, the Federal government supplied approximately \$95,000,000 in cash and commodities.¹¹

The amount of additional Federal assistance, in the form of surplus foods contributed by the U. S. Department of Agriculture, has varied each year. The amount of commodity support depends upon the

¹⁰Ibid., p. 6.

¹¹National School Lunch Program, op. cit., pp. 14-16.

need to purchase for market stabilization. In 1950, the value of these commodities totalled \$38,500,000, but small quantities were available in 1951 and 1952.

Funds from state and local governments and from local organizations totalled \$85,000,000 in 1952. Income from the sale of lunches totalled about \$235,000,000. Together, the funds from these state and local sources financed about three-quarters of the total cost of the program.¹²

Federal funds are now used for a larger program. With the Federal appropriations being used, each year per-meal rates of Federal cash assistance have declined. These are the payments made to participating schools to assist them to make local purchases of food.

In 1947, schools received nine cents in cash assistance for each type A meal served. In 1952, the average cash assistance rate for a type A meal was about six cents. In some states, the type A rate was four cents or lower.

During this period of steadily increasing operating cost and declining rates of Federal assistance, schools have taken all possible measures to maintain meal quality, short of increasing the price of the lunch.

¹²Ibid.

IV. PREDICTIONS OF FUTURE EXPANSION

The present chapter has shown the beginning of the lunch program and the progress that has been made by the Federal and state governments. Local school districts have planned better lunchrooms, secured better equipment, and planned expansion of the school lunch program through Federal and state assistance.

The National School Lunch Program Progress Report published by the Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., makes the following predictions in the June, 1952, publication:

1. More children will be attending school. Enrollment totalled 30,600,000 children in 1952; it will be 37,000,000 by 1960.
2. More communities are planning lunch programs as an essential auxiliary school service.
3. More and more schools will be equipped with lunchroom facilities, as a result of the school construction program.¹³

The next chapter will deal with planning the present-day lunchroom and planning the type A lunch.

¹³Ibid., p. 18.

CHAPTER III

CRITERIA FOR PLANNING THE LUNCHROOM AND TYPE A LUNCH

Today a school lunch program is widely accepted as a part of a functioning educational system. More and more, school administrators are taking advantage of the opportunities for learning that are available in a well-planned, well-supervised school lunch organization. They see it as education for living in its broadest sense and are exploring ways to derive the most value from it.

The school lunch program has become the focal point for the development of good health habits in many American schools. The school cafeteria fits into the educational scheme to provide meals which apply the theories of health and nutrition learned in the classroom.

If the school lunch program is to take its rightful place in the school program, careful thought needs to be given to its development. There must be objectives for the lunch program just as there are for any subject that is taught in the school. There must be money in the budget for the program, and there must be space provided for food preparation and serving.

Ways in which schools provide space for an up-to-date school cafeteria are as follows:¹

¹Margaret M. Morris, Planning the School Lunchroom (Washington, D. C.: United States Department of Agriculture, 1947), p. 1.

1. A new wing may be the place selected for the lunchroom.
2. A separate building may be constructed for it.
3. A classroom or two may be converted to this new use.
4. Remodeling of the present lunchroom is also in the offing for many schools in order to provide more adequate facilities.

Planning a lunchroom that will be functional takes the combined abilities of a food service manager and an architect. If careful plans are made prior to construction, there is more chance of eliminating extra cost caused by later remodeling of inefficient units.

Long before an architect's plan can be drafted for a school lunchroom, many decisions must be made by the school administration. The type of lunch served, the means of paying for the lunch, and the policies governing participating of pupils in the program will affect the kind of lunchroom to be designed. Whether students are required to stay in the building at noon, the length of the lunch period, and whether the dining room is to be used for more than food service are other factors to consider.

I. MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

Minimum requirements can be met if the administrator is unable to build a completely equipped lunchroom. The minimum standards for health and sanitation, relationship of areas, storage space, food preparation units, food service, dining room space, dishwashing, manager's desk, workers' room, and selection of equipment are pointed out by

Morris.²

Health and Sanitation. Safeguards to health and sanitation are basic to school lunchroom planning. This means ease of cleaning must be a consideration in the selection of surface finishes for the walls, floors, and equipment and in the installation of the equipment. Attention must be given to the protection of rodents and insects as well as proper ventilation, heat, and lighting in all units connected with the lunch program.

Relationships of Area. Storage, working and serving areas must be closely related to allow the orderly sequence of work, with a minimum crossing of paths by workers. It should be such that good supervision is possible.

Storage Space. The location of the food service rooms in a school building is of prime importance. Ideally, they are on the first floor with an outside entrance or very near to one, so that deliveries of food are facilitated.

Storage space must be planned for and not added as an after-thought. It is one of the areas of work in the lunchroom organization and must be located and constructed so as to be functional.

For canned foods, staples, and root vegetables, a room is needed which is free from heat and water pipes and other undesirable

²Ibid., pp. 2-9.

structural features. Motors and compressors should not be housed in the food storage space. Protection from extreme temperature is important in the keeping of food, and ventilation either by louvers or mechanical means is a necessity. The construction should be such as to render the store room rodent-proof. Another detail to consider in drawing the plan is locating the door or doors to the storeroom so that they can be controlled, as there is always danger of theft.

In addition to dry storage, adequate refrigeration must be provided. By and large, school lunch programs have been poorly equipped to handle the quantities of milk and other daily products, meats, fresh fruits and vegetables which are emphasized in nutritionally-balanced meals for growing children. When at least sixty cubic feet of refrigeration is needed, it is usually less expensive and more satisfactory to use a 6' x 8' walk-in refrigerator. For example, to serve 250 to 350 lunches, a 6' x 8' walk-in, plus a 20 cubic foot reach-in near the counter, would be optimum. If much frozen food is used, a holding cabinet may be needed.

Food Preparation Units. In the past, school lunchrooms served "light lunches," but with the trend toward the complete meal there is greater use of fresh vegetables. This feature requires more space for preliminary preparation of vegetables. Space and provisions are needed for sorting, washing, trimming, cutting, and peeling them, and for

placing hampers and crates when they are brought into the kitchen. There should be space for two 24" sinks with 27" drainboards for washing leafy vegetables and hardwood cutting surfaces.

Lunchrooms serving seventy-five or more pupils need a heavy-duty institutional range with ovens underneath. This type of range may be obtained in sections according to the number to be served.

The location of the cooking unit should be near the serving unit. Table surface, preferably of metal, should be provided in front of the range or next to it with pot and pan storage either as a hanging rack or shelves below the table.

Food Service. All of the activities connected with the food preparation should be so related that the result will be a satisfying, wholesome lunch which will appeal to the students. Thus, the preparation and the serving of food are closely related. In order to have the food served at its proper temperature, the counter must be located and arranged for convenience to workers in the kitchen and to students coming into the dining room.

A short counter, no more than 10 feet in length, permits expedient serving in the school lunchroom where a single type lunch is served with limited choice of vegetables or the main dish.

A glass plate in front of the serving counter to protect food from the germs emanating from the breaths of those in line is required by law

in some states.

Dining Room Space. In the original planning of the dining room, thought should be given to the entrances and exits. There are certain regulations to observe in regard to fire and safety; but in addition, smoothness of service is a prime requisite to be considered in cafeteria planning. The entrance should be near the serving counter, and an exit should be convenient to the soiled-dish window. Within the dining room or near the entrance, shelves for books and some arrangements for hanging wraps are essential if students come to the lunchroom with these items.

In planning the dining room space, 10 to 15 square feet should be allowed per seated child. Cafeterias for high school students require the maximum amount. An aisle of at least 18 inches between backs of chairs after seating should be provided. The main passage needs to be at least 3 feet wide. Chairs, rather than benches, and tables seating no more than eight are desirable. Comfort in eating contributes to enjoyment of the meal and to good social conduct. Acoustical treatment will also make the lunchroom a more comfortable place.

Dishwashing. Public health regulations are very specific for dishwashing and requirements for washing, rinsing, and sanitizing should be checked before installations are made.

For programs serving more than 150 students, a dishwashing machine not only facilitates work, but assures properly washed dishes. Where a dishwasher is not used, three sinks 18 to 24 inches square with at least 60 inches of work surface for scraping, stacking, and draining are required in schools serving up to 150 lunches.

Manager's Desk. In a small kitchen, a hanging "desk" near the receiving entrance, so that invoices can be checked as food and supplies are brought in, will serve the purpose. A desk is needed to keep records, menus, and invoices and should be located to make supervision easy.

Workers' Room. Facilities to meet public health and sanitary regulations as well as to provide for the comfort and well-being of employees are necessary. In a very small program, teachers' restrooms are often used by cafeteria workers. When new lunchrooms are built or old ones remodeled, workers' rooms containing lockers, toilets, and lavatories should be included. People working with food must not wear street clothing on the job; therefore, they must have a room in which to change clothing and hang wraps. This room should be convenient to the kitchen.

Selecting Equipment, Size and Cost. For a long time the cry has been "not enough space and too little equipment." An equally serious situation is too much space and too much or too large equipment for

most efficient use in the situation. Great distances between pieces of equipment and separate working units in a kitchen are wasteful of workers' time and energy. Passages of four feet in the kitchen are ample.

The kind of equipment selected should be determined by noting what utilities are needed to prepare meals each day. Valuable space in the kitchen should not be filled with equipment that is seldom used. Labor-saving devices justify the cost of their purchase only if they are needed to do a more efficient job, and are installed and used correctly.

All too often cheap equipment is purchased because funds are low, but in the long run the expenditure is high because of fast depreciation. If the cost of more lasting equipment can be pro-rated over a longer period of time, the overall costs will be less. School lunch programs are not emergency measures and should not be treated as such.

Cooperation. Cooperation insures efficient operation. The school lunch program needs the thinking of school administrators, teachers, community leaders, food service managers, nutritionists, architects, sanitarians, and equipment engineers if the lunch program is to go forward.

II. TYPE A LUNCH

Menu planning is a challenge as well as a responsibility.

Persons planning school lunches make valuable contributions to the health and well-being of the children. It is through good menu planning that schools are able to serve appetizing, satisfying lunches to children at a price they can afford to pay. Good menu planning results in lunches which provide enough of the right kinds and amounts of foods necessary to help children be healthy, grow properly, and develop normally.

When menus are well planned, type A lunch requirements will be met, attractive and appetizing lunches will be served, and children will have a chance to develop good food habits. Well-planned menus will make good use of foods donated by the United States Department of Agriculture. Costs can be controlled by using low-cost seasonal foods, and food purchases and deliveries can be scheduled more easily through the use of proper planning methods. Planning will include organization of time so that each worker knows and understands her job.

There is more to planning the lunch meal than merely planning the menu for the day or week. Specific planning needs to be done in (1) getting ready to plan menus, (2) the type A lunch pattern, (3) what type A lunches should include, (4) suggested foods for type A lunches,

and (5) points to remember in planning menus.³

Getting Ready to Plan Menus. A well arranged place where one can work will make the task of planning menus easier. An office, if one is available, or a quiet corner in the kitchen or dining room would be a good place to plan. Whatever space is used should be equipped with a desk or a table, a chair, a bulletin board, and file cases or built-in shelves for files and recipes.

Schedule a Time to Plan. Planning in advance will make the task easier. Menus should be planned at least one week before they are to be served. One day a week should be decided upon to check the menu, make work plans, and prepare market orders.

A schedule of time should provide for the study of inventories, current food reports, prices, and previous menus used.

Reference Material. Reference materials arranged in an orderly way and kept at the menu-planning center will make the material more accessible. File cases can be made from cardboard boxes, and should be labeled weekly menus, inventory, market orders, food costs, or donated foods to make the finding of materials easier.

Books and pamphlets can be kept in bookcases or on shelves ready for use. There should be menu forms, scratch pads, and pencils

³Planning Type A School Lunches (Washington, D. C.: United States Department of Agriculture, 1954), pp. 1-4.

kept at the planning center for use when they are needed.

Type A Lunch Pattern. The type A lunch pattern is a guide to well-balanced nutritious lunches. It is designed to help plan lunches which will supply the kinds and amounts of foods children need in their diets. It provides a simple framework for planning menus which include food from each of the seven basic food groups.

In elementary schools, the quantities of food specified in the type A pattern should be prepared for the total number of children participating in the program. Portions may need to be adjusted slightly to meet the needs of children of various age groups.

In junior and senior high schools, these quantities should be increased or additional foods included to help meet energy needs of the children.

CHAPTER IV

THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to survey the existing conditions in the lunchrooms of the schools of the State of Washington to ascertain the types of equipment in use, the supervisory methods practiced, and the administrative policies in force.

The data used in this study was obtained through the use of a questionnaire which contained twenty questions calling for seventy-nine items of information. It was mailed in February, 1955, to 240 schools selected from the Thirty-second Annual Teacher's Salary Study prepared by the Washington Education Association. Of the schools surveyed, 190 or 79.2 per cent returned the completed questionnaires. Because fourteen of the 190 schools reporting had no lunchroom program, the study is based on the answers of 176 questionnaires, or 73.3 per cent of the schools surveyed.

For the purpose of showing the results of this survey, this chapter will be divided into three sections: administrative policies, supervisory methods, and lunchroom facilities.

I. ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES

Of the 176 schools reporting lunchroom situations, 81 per cent

of the questionnaires were answered and returned by the superintendent of the district, 10 per cent by principals, 6 per cent by lunchroom supervisors, and the remaining 3 per cent by school clerks, dietitians, or classroom teachers.

Questions one through seven and fifteen of the questionnaire dealt with the administrative policies of the school lunch program. A copy of the questionnaire is located in the Appendix of this study. The data compiled from these items showed the number of employees, students, or volunteer help used; prices charged; place of meal serving; and who is in charge of the lunchroom program.

The number of employees used throughout the state in the school lunch program varies from one to nineteen. Of the schools reporting, 9 per cent used one employee, 34 per cent employed two persons, 19 per cent used three, 30 per cent used four through ten employees, 3 per cent used from eleven through nineteen persons, and 5 per cent showed no answer.

Student help, according to the survey, was used in 86 per cent of the schools for dishwashing, serving, clearing and cleaning tables, ticket taking, and general lunchroom work. Free lunches were served to the student help in 87 per cent of the schools, 6 per cent did not serve free lunches, and 7 per cent did not answer. Two of the schools reporting paid the student help.

There were no particular grades reported from which these students were selected. Some schools used high school students, some used grade school students, and some used a combination from both grade and high school. All schools reporting used students above the fifth grade level. None of the schools reporting used voluntary help such as Parent-Teacher Association members or parents, but five schools noted outside help was used when preparing for special meals at Thanksgiving or Christmas.

Prices charged for meals served in the lunchrooms ranged from 10 cents to 40 cents per day per student. Primary children received lunches for 25 cents in 42 per cent of the schools reporting and for 20 cents in 34 per cent of the schools. The 25-cent lunch was served to 50 per cent of the intermediate grades, 50 per cent of the junior high grades, and 45 per cent of the senior high grades. Tables I and II show the range of prices charged students, teachers, and custodians. The tables show that junior and senior high school students are charged from 5 cents to 10 cents more than the primary or intermediate grade pupils, and that teachers and custodians pay an additional 5 cents to 10 cents more than the senior high school group.

The survey showed that special rates were given by four schools to families with three or more children eating lunches. Three schools reported giving free lunches to teachers supervising students during the

TABLE I. PRICE RANGE OF SCHOOL LUNCHES, 1954-1955

Grade Level	No Answer	P R I C E S															Total No.
		10¢	15¢	17 ¢	19¢	20¢	22¢	23¢	24¢	25¢	26¢	27¢	28¢	30¢	35¢	40¢	
Primary	4	1	8	6	1	57	1	2		74			1	16	4	1	176
Intermediate	4	1	7	3	1	39	2	2		84	1		2	25	4	1	176
Junior High	10	1	5	2		21	1		1	83	1	1	1	41	7	1	176
Senior High		1	3	1		13			1	60	1	2	1	47	9	1	140
Teachers	10	1	4	1		14				46	1			62	31	6	176
Janitors		1	3	1		8				37				49	25	5	129
TOTAL	28	6	30	14	2	142	4	4	2	384	4	3	5	240	80	15	973

TABLE II. PERCENTAGE OF PRICES TABULATED

20¢ Lunch	25¢ Lunch	30¢ Lunch	Other	Total
15%	40%	25%	20%	100%

lunch hour. One school reported teachers paid an additional 5 cents per lunch to be served in a teachers' room. One school reported an over-all price of \$18 per year for everyone eating in the lunchroom, including teachers and janitors, if arrangements were made in advance. Five schools reported giving free lunches to janitors who assisted the cooking staff with heavy lifting or maintenance of the kitchen.

Of the schools reporting, 19 per cent gave a discount if meal tickets were purchased by the week or by the month.

No extra charge was made in any of the schools for second helpings; however, rules were made to the effect that all students desiring lunches had to be served first before second helpings were given and that the first serving had to be eaten before the student would be entitled to a second serving.

Children were served in a central lunchroom in 77 per cent of the schools surveyed. The remaining 23 per cent of the districts used a combination of central lunchroom and classroom feeding wherein the grade school pupils were served in their classrooms and the high school students were served in a central lunchroom.

Students who bring sack lunches eat with those taking hot lunch in 86 per cent of the schools, while 14 per cent of the schools separated the two groups. Those students bringing sack lunches could supplement their cold lunch with milk in all but eight schools. In 20 per cent of the

schools, children could supplement a cold lunch with soup, vegetables, fruit, sandwiches, or dessert.

The administration and supervision of the lunchroom is delegated to a head cook or lunchroom supervisor in 53 per cent of the schools reporting, and to the superintendent or member of the teaching staff in 47 per cent of the cases. One school reported a Parent-Teacher Association member supervised the lunchroom program.

Purchases of food and supplies for use in the hot lunch program were made by a head cook or lunchroom supervisor in 63 per cent of the districts. The remaining 37 per cent of the buying was done by the superintendent or combinations of superintendent, principal or home economics teacher.

II. SUPERVISORY METHODS

Questions eight through eleven of the questionnaire dealt with the supervisory methods prevalent in the school systems of the State of Washington concerning the hot lunch program in regard to pupil management, menu planning, and methods of menu publishing.

Each teacher is responsible for the supervision of his own group in the lunchroom in 69 per cent of the schools reporting. In 30 per cent of the districts, teachers rotate lunchroom duty, and in 1 per cent of the schools surveyed the principals supervised the lunchroom.

Teachers in schools where the duty is rotated have this responsibility either every week, every other week, or once a month. No definite pattern of rotation resulted from the tabulation of this data.

In 93 per cent of the schools surveyed, there are rules and regulations governing the conduct of the students during the lunch period. Children were encouraged to eat all of the food served them in all except three schools reporting. Free talk during this period was permitted by all schools submitting answers; however, quiet and orderly conduct was required. The following list of rules reported are given in order of frequency of occurrence; however, no definite pattern was established as rules varied with the individual system:

1. Observe proper etiquette.
2. Maintain good behavior.
3. No running and no throwing in the lunchroom.
4. Must spend from 15 to 20 minutes in the lunchroom and wait for dismissal by the teacher in charge.
5. Maintain orderly lines.
6. Return soiled utensils to designated area.
7. Take only what food can be eaten.
8. Must drink milk.
9. No loitering in the lunchroom after meal is completed.
10. Must enter and leave the lunchroom with class.

One school reported that children wait until an entire table is served and begin eating after the host and hostess have begun. One grade school reported that the children could leave one item of food on their plates, but that they must taste all foods served them.

Menus were planned by a head cook or supervisor in 84 per cent of the schools. The superintendent helps with the planning in 12 per cent of the districts. In the remaining systems various combinations were stated: Parents' Lunch Committee, cooks and home economics teacher, cooks and principal, and supervisor, head cook, and school nurse.

Menus were planned in advance by the day, by the week, by the month, or by the year; however, 77 per cent reported menus were planned by the week and 17 per cent were planned by the month. The remaining 6 per cent planned menus from day to day. Only one school reported that menus were planned by the year. Eighty-nine per cent of the menus were planned to consider attractiveness, variety, and color combinations of foods. The remaining 11 per cent reported menus were planned without consideration of these items.

Publication of the school lunch menu was reported by 73 per cent of the schools through the mediums of the local newspaper, the school newspaper, bulletin board and bulletins to the homes. Some schools reported using more than one method of publicity, but use of the bulletin board was the most frequently noted with a combination of local newspaper and bulletin board following. Eighty-three per cent of the schools publicizing the school lunch menu in advance did so by the week, 7 per cent by the day, 7 per cent by the month, and 3 per cent

biweekly.

III. LUNCHROOM FACILITIES

Questions twelve through fourteen and sixteen through nineteen sought to discover the types of equipment and facilities used by the schools in the State of Washington in carrying out a hot lunch program.

Various combinations of metal or plastic trays, and plastic, china or pottery dishes were reported. Plastic trays or dishes were used in 48 per cent of the schools and 18 per cent of the systems used a combination of plastic dishware and pottery, glass or metal. Pottery dishes were used by 21 per cent and the remaining 13 per cent used combinations of pottery, glass and metal trays.

Automatic dishwashers are used in 50 per cent of the schools while 45 per cent of the schools reported having no automatic dishwashers. Five per cent of the schools polled did not answer this question.

Electric stoves were used in preparing food in 90 per cent of the schools. Three per cent of the districts used a combination of electric and oil stoves, three per cent used a combination of electric and gas stoves, and three per cent used gas stoves. One school reported using oil stoves and one school reported using a wood and coal stove to prepare the meals.

All of the schools surveyed reported having refrigeration: 31 per cent use refrigerators, 30 per cent use a combination of refrigerators and deep freeze units, 17 per cent have a combination of refrigerators and walk-in freezers, 8 per cent have a combination of refrigerator and local food lockers, and 7 per cent reported a combination of refrigerators, deep-freeze and walk-in units. The remaining 7 per cent noted various combinations of refrigeration units. One school reported using ice boxes.

Of the 176 schools returning the questionnaire, 71 per cent had lunchroom facilities that were originally designed for that purpose. Twenty-nine per cent of the lunchrooms were not so originally designed; however, 47 per cent of these schools stated remodeling of rooms had been necessary to facilitate the lunch program.

In the opinion of the districts reporting, 59 per cent believed they had adequate facilities, 35 per cent believed their facilities were inadequate, and 6 per cent did not answer the question. Larger dining space was listed more frequently as being the item which needed improvement. Some other needs listed were larger and better arranged kitchens, more refrigeration, more modern equipment, more storage space, and electric dishwashers.

Ninety-five per cent of the districts' home economics classes did not use lunchroom facilities for classwork. Five per cent of the

TABLE III. REFRIGERATION UNITS IN SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS

Type of Refrigeration	No. of Schools	Per Cent
Refrigerators	54	31
Refrigerators and Deep Freeze Units	53	30
Refrigerators and Walk-In Freezers	29	17
Refrigerators, Deep Freeze and Walk-In Units	14	8
Refrigerators and Lockers Down Town	12	7
Walk-In Units	6	3
Deep Freeze and Walk-In Units	6	3
Ice Boxes and Walk-In Units	2	1
TOTALS	176	100%

districts reported using the lunchroom equipment for home economics classes every day and 17 per cent reported using the lunchroom equipment occasionally. The home economics equipment was used for hot lunch preparation in 19 per cent of the schools sometimes, while 81 per cent of the schools reported that the home economics equipment was never used for hot lunch preparation.

The custodians cleaned 88 per cent of the lunchrooms and only 38 per cent of the kitchens. The remaining 12 per cent of the lunchrooms and 62 per cent of the kitchens were cleaned by the cooks and helpers. The lunchrooms are mopped every day or when needed in 81 per cent of the districts, every week in 17 per cent of the districts, and twice a week in the remaining 2 per cent of the schools.

IV. COMMENTS FROM SCHOOLS

Question twenty requested comments, criticisms and suggestions regarding the school lunch program. The following list summarizes the comments made on the questionnaires returned:

1. Seven schools planned to have classroom feeding in new plants under construction. Others reported being very happy with a central kitchen and classroom feeding. One reported plans for classroom feeding because they felt there was a better atmosphere there which led to the forming of better eating habits. Serving in rooms provided a better controlled situation. Best results come when teachers eat with students: less waste, better manners, try new foods, and follow teacher's example.

2. A need was felt for better menu planning and for good cooks who understand cooking for children. Two schools reported having difficulty finding uses for government commodities.
3. It was difficult in small schools to "make ends meet."
4. Parents should be invited to eat lunches, offer suggestions, and help with menu planning. Such activity would afford them a chance to realize how the child receives such a good lunch for such a nominal cost. Board members should also be encouraged to eat in the lunchroom.
5. The school lunch program set-up is good with Federal Aid and parents should be encouraged to take advantage of it for their children.
6. The lunchroom is recognized as part of the modern school program and should receive proper consideration with the rest of the program. Teaching of character, health, and citizenship can be accomplished in the lunchroom as well as in the classroom.
7. This part of the school program can be the biggest of administrative headaches; however, with the proper personnel, it can run very smoothly.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to survey the existing conditions in the school lunchrooms of the state of Washington to ascertain the types of equipment in use, the supervisory methods practiced, and the administrative policies in force.

The status of the school lunch program as it exists today is very much different from the first attempts to establish a school lunch program. The present-day lunch program provides well-balanced meals which meet required specifications and which are prepared in more adequately equipped kitchens than the first lunches which were served to children to supplement the cold lunch children carried to school in sacks or dinner pails.

The school lunch program started in the rural schools for those who could not go home for lunch. The main task of the school was to provide a place to eat at noon and some facilities. The school lunch was seldom related to the children's educational program.

Growth of the hot lunch program paralleled the consolidation movement. As the districts were consolidated, children were transported long distances to school by bus and were required to eat away

from home. This, in turn, brought about a greater demand for lunch services.

Federal assistance to the school lunch program was initiated during the depression days as one method of providing a market for agricultural commodities. Federal assistance was started under the administration of Public Law 320, Section 32, approved by the Seventy-fourth Congress in 1935.

The purpose of this law was to provide markets for the surplus agricultural commodities. The Secretary of Agriculture purchased domestic foods and distributed them to the school lunch programs as one means of providing a market for surplus food commodities. Buying surplus agricultural commodities and distributing them to the school lunch programs continued until World War II. There were few surplus commodities available after the beginning of World War II because of large demands of food and agricultural products by the armed forces.

The first cash reimbursements came as early as 1939 and 1940 in connection with the School Milk Program. In June, 1946, the Seventy-Ninth Congress approved Public Law 396, which is generally known as the School Lunch Act. With Federal Aid to the school lunch program there has been continued growth of school lunches.

Every year the schools serve more and better meals. Another measure of program growth is the increase in the number and quality of meals served by participating schools. Less than half a billion meals were served in 1944; in 1952, over one and one-half billion meals were served. The school lunch program has grown and expanded and today there are schools participating in serving food to children during the lunch hour in all of the forty-eight states, District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

From the literature reviewed for this study, the following findings were noted:

1. School lunches are improved through Federal Aid.
2. School lunches are being sold to children at cost.
3. More and better lunches are being served each year.
4. School lunches and lunchrooms
 - a. are a part of the school curriculum.
 - b. are being included in the school budget as part of the educational program.
 - c. have definite educational goals.
5. The purpose of Federal Aid is to assist, not to control the school lunch.
6. Classroom feeding by use of carts provides a better controlled situation and atmosphere and provides a better

opportunity to teach etiquette, character, and health.

7. Best results come when teachers eat with students because there is less waste, better manners, children try new foods, and follow the teacher's example.
8. School lunchrooms need good cooks with an understanding of cooking for children.

Through the use of a questionnaire, a survey was made of the school lunch programs in the state of Washington. The questionnaire contained twenty questions calling for seventy-nine items of information. It was mailed in February, 1955, to 240 schools selected from the Thirty-second Annual Teachers' Salary Study prepared by the Washington State Education Association. Of the 240 schools surveyed, 190 or 79.2 per cent returned the completed questionnaires. Because fourteen of the 190 schools reporting had no lunchroom program, the study is based on the answers of 176 questionnaires, or 73.3 per cent of the schools surveyed.

For the purpose of showing the results of the survey, the study was divided into three sections: administrative policies, supervisory methods, and lunchroom facilities.

The following conclusions are based on the data compiled from the survey:

CONCLUSIONS

1. It is the opinion in 35 per cent of the districts that the lunchroom facilities are inadequate and improvement is needed.
2. Districts planning for new buildings are providing space for lunchrooms and kitchens with more modern equipment.
3. There is a trend away from the use of the same kitchen equipment by the home economics classes and the school lunch program.
4. Student help is being widely used for many jobs in the school lunch program.
5. None of the schools surveyed by the questionnaire were using volunteer help.
6. There is a trend to charge teachers and janitors more than secondary students, and a trend to charge secondary students more than intermediate or primary pupils.
7. Approximately 20 per cent of the schools surveyed give a discount to students if meal tickets are purchased on a weekly or monthly basis. A trend to give a further discount to children from large families was noted.
8. None of the schools surveyed made an extra charge for second helpings.

9. Central lunchroom feeding is the most commonly used method of serving the school lunch.

10. Results of the survey show that menu planning is being done on the weekly and monthly basis.

11. Publication of the school lunch menu is being accomplished through the use of the local newspaper, school newspaper, bulletin board, teachers' bulletin, and bulletins to the home.

IMPLICATIONS

1. Educators, administrators, parent groups, school board members, and lay groups being consulted on school building planning need to be far-sighted when planning lunchroom facilities to meet the needs of the continuous growing school enrollment.

2. School lunchrooms should be adequately designed to provide ample heat, lighting, and space. The lunchroom should be near the kitchen and so designed as to provide for serving of the number eating in the lunchroom in a minimum length of time.

3. Administrators, school boards, and lunchroom supervisors purchasing equipment for the kitchens should consider the type and amount of lunches to be served in the selection of equipment. Good makes of equipment should be purchased even though it may cost more than inferior equipment because it will last longer and actually be

cheaper to the school districts in the long run.

4. There should be money in the school budget for the employment of skilled lunchroom personnel. Such personnel would include dietitians, supervisors, and experienced cooks.

5. Supervision of elementary children during the lunch period should be by the classroom teacher to provide the maximum trainings in health, character, and etiquette. Teachers supervising the lunch period should be freed from any other duty during the lunch hour.

6. Children bringing sack lunches to school should be encouraged to supplement the cold lunch with milk and other food items from the school lunch cafeteria.

7. Parent committees, administrators, physical education teachers, home economics teachers, and the school nurse should all be consulted by the school lunch supervisor in planning the best possible school lunch program.

8. School districts should be encouraged to take advantage of the commodities and cash assistance made available by the Federal Government.

9. The lunchroom supervisor should insist that all lunchroom personnel observe the highest possible standards of health and sanitation.

10. School districts planning to serve school lunches should ask

the assistance of specialists available through the state department of education. Districts will find this guidance and direction very beneficial if they are setting up school lunch facilities for the first time.

11. School lunch menus should be published at least a week in advance so as to familiarize the parent with the type and quality of lunch being served in the school lunch cafeteria.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Elsbree, Willard S., and Harold J. McNally. Elementary School Administration and Supervision. New York: American Book Company, 1951.
- Reeder, Ward G. A First Course in Education. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950.
- Kyte, George C. The Principal At Work. New York: Ginn and Company, 1952.

Periodicals

- "A Student Looks At The School Lunch Program," Practical Home Economics, 30:33, January, 1952.
- Cronan, Marion. "Meet Our School Lunch Editor," Practical Home Economics, 31:45, September, 1952.
- Drummond, Laura (Panel Leader). "How Does Your Lunchroom Measure Up?" Practical Home Economics, 32:20 ff., January, 1954.
- Hibbard, Elizabeth. "We Do It This Way," Practical Home Economics, 30:223, May, 1952.
- McMillan, Martha. "School Cafeterias Are Big Business," Practical Home Economics, 31:37, November, 1952.
- "School Lunch Notes," Practical Home Economics, 31:43, February, 1953.
- _____ . Practical Home Economics, 32:43-45, September, 1953.
- _____ . Practical Home Economics, 32:39, October, 1953.
- _____ . Practical Home Economics, 32:51, November, 1953.

- _____. Practical Home Economics, 32:37, May, 1954.
- "Questions on Nutrition," Practical Home Economics, 32:45, February, 1954.
- Vail, Gladys E. "What Do They Like To Eat?" Practical Home Economics, 29:441-46, October, 1951.

Publications of the Government and Learned Societies

- Jeffers, Myrtis Keels. State Provisions for School Lunch Programs, Laws and Personnel. Federal Security Agency, Bulletin No. 4. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1952.
- Morris, Margaret M. Planning the School Lunchroom. School Lunch Division, United States Department of Agriculture. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1947.
- United States Department of Agriculture. Planning Type A School Lunches. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1954.
- _____. School Lunch Management in Relation to Nutritive Value, Cost, and Acceptance of Foods Served. Pamphlet 114. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1951.
- _____. Storage for School Lunch Food and Supplies. Pamphlet 63. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1952.
- _____. The National School Lunch Program, A Progress Report. Pamphlet 208. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1952.
- United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The School Lunch--Its Educational Contribution. Nutrition Education Series, Pamphlet 6. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1954.
- Wanamaker, Pearl. State Manual of Washington. Olympia, Washington: Office of State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1950.

Washington Education Association. Washington Education Association's
Thirty-second Annual Teachers' Salary Study. Seattle, Wash-
ington: Washington Education Association, 1955.

APPENDIX

LUNCHROOM SURVEY

STATE OF WASHINGTON

PLEASE CHECK SUITABLE ANSWERS:

Filled out by Superintendent _____, Principal _____, or other _____.

1. Number of employees used in the cafeteria. _____

2. Is the supervisor of the lunchroom
 _____ a member of the teaching staff? _____ superintendent?
 _____ principal? _____ head cook?

3. Do you use student help in the lunchroom? Yes _____ No _____
 If so, how many? _____ For what jobs? _____
 Do students helping in the lunchroom receive free lunches?
Yes _____ No _____
 Children working in the lunchroom are selected from which grades?
 (Circle those applying) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

4. Do you use outside volunteer help, such as P-TA members?
Yes _____ No _____

5. What are the prices of lunches? Per Day Per Month

Primary	_____	_____
Intermediate	_____	_____
Junior High	_____	_____
Senior High	_____	_____
Teachers	_____	_____
Janitors, etc.	_____	_____

6. Circle grades of children who are served in a central lunchroom.
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
 If children are served in their own classroom, circle grades.
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

7. Do children who bring sack lunches from home eat with those buying hot lunches? Yes _____ No _____
 Can children who bring sack lunches supplement these with items from the hot lunch program? Yes _____ No _____
 If so, with what item? Milk _____, Soup _____, Dessert _____, Vegetable _____, Fruit _____, Other _____, _____, _____.

8. Are the children encouraged to eat all of their food? Yes _____ No _____
 Are the children required to clean their plates before leaving the lunchroom? Yes _____ No _____
 Are the children permitted to take such food as apples, ice cream bars, or oranges from the lunchroom to eat them? Yes _____ No _____
 Are the children permitted to talk during the lunch period? Yes _____ No _____
9. Are there any rules and regulations regarding their conduct in the lunchroom? Yes _____ No _____
 If so, please list them:
 a.
 b.
 c.
 d.
10. Does each teacher eat with his group? Yes _____ No _____
 Do the teachers take turns with the lunchroom duty? Yes _____ No _____
 If so, how often do they have lunchroom duty? _____
11. The menus are planned by _____
 How far in advance are your menus planned?
 Day to day _____ By the month _____
 By the week _____ By the year _____
 Are your menus planned to consider the following points? Yes _____ No _____
 Color combinations _____ Variety _____ Attractiveness _____
 If your menus are published in advance, please check by which means:
 School newspaper _____ Posted on bulletin board _____
 Local newspaper _____ Put in teachers' bulletin _____
 Other _____
 How far in advance are the menus published? Day _____ Week _____
 Month _____
12. What type of dishes are used in the lunchroom?
 Metal trays _____ Plastic dishes _____ Pottery dishes _____
 Plastic trays _____ Glass dishes _____ Other _____
 Do you have an automatic dishwasher? Yes _____ No _____
13. What type of stove is used in preparing the food? Electric _____
 Gas _____ Other _____

14. What type of refrigeration is used?
 Ice boxes _____ Deep freeze refrigerators _____
 Refrigerators _____ Walk-in freezers _____
 Other _____
15. Who is in charge of buying for the lunchroom program?
 Superintendent _____ Lunchroom supervisor _____
 Principal _____ Other _____
16. Was your present lunchroom and kitchen originally designed for the hot lunch program? Yes _____ No _____
 Have you remodeled rooms to accommodate a lunchroom program?
 Yes _____ No _____
 In your opinion, is your lunchroom adequately planned as to size and adequately equipped to accommodate the number of people you are serving? Yes _____ No _____
 If not, what changes would you like to see in your own lunchroom program? _____

17. Do your Home Economics classes use any of the lunchroom equipment for classwork?
 Yes _____ No _____ Everyday _____ Sometimes _____ Never _____
18. Is any of the Home Economics equipment used for the preparation of food for the hot lunch program? Yes _____ No _____
 Everyday _____ Sometimes _____ No _____
19. Does the custodian clean the lunchroom? Yes _____ No _____
 If No, who does clean the lunchroom? _____
 Does the custodian clean the kitchen? Yes _____ No _____
 If No, who does clean the kitchen? _____
 How often is the lunchroom mopped? Everyday _____
 Every week _____ When needed _____
20. Please add comments, criticisms, and other suggestions:

Box 605
Brewster, Washington
March 1, 1955

Superintendent of Schools

Dear Sir:

The attached questionnaire is being sent to each Superintendent of Class "B" schools in the State of Washington to find some of the problems and practices in the school lunch program. From this data an attempt will be made to make recommendations for improvement in the school lunch program.

Your help in filling in this questionnaire is requested so that I may fulfill partial requirements for my Masters Degree from the Central Washington College of Education.

If a copy of the results of this survey is desired, please check the following square.

Your cooperation is sincerely appreciated.

Sincerely,

William E. Davis

Enclosures:

Questionnaire
Stamped return envelope