

Draft minutes
SFUSD Student Nutrition and Physical Activity Committee meeting
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Present: Trish Bascom, Laura Brainin-Rodriguez, Erica Davis, Jan Link, Melissa Mooney, Iman Nazeeri-Simmons, Debbie Odiye Leah Rimkus, Philip M. Smith, Ed Wilkins, Dana Woldow

1. Co-chair Dana Woldow called the meeting to order at 3:45 p.m. Minutes of the previous meeting (Jan. 18, 2005) were read and approved.

2. Subcommittee reports

a. Publicity:

Dana Woldow read an update provided by Caroline Grannan. Much of the energy of the Publicity Subcommittee has been focused on the meal application outreach effort and communicating the importance of the meal applications to principals. Additionally, the nutrition policy changes in SFUSD were mentioned in each of the following media:

- Film entitled “Generation Extra Large”
- KPIX evening news
- Child magazine
- Edutopia
- “Making it Happen” Report (USDA and CDC)
- Bay Family Digest

b. Nutrition Education/Physical Activity:

Laura Brainin-Rodriguez reported back regarding a teleseminar cosponsored by the American Dietetic Association and the Bay Area Nutrition and Physical Activity Collaborative on February 17th. The teleseminar was organized in order to review new federal legislation requiring all school districts to establish and implement local wellness policies by 2006 that include, at a minimum, goals for nutrition education, physical education, and nutritional guidelines for all food and beverages served and sold at school. Laura commented that the district’s current nutrition policy seems to do a good job the area of food served and sold on campus, but may need to be fleshed out more around nutrition education and physical education.

Trish Bascom clarified that the standards require 20 sessions of health education, of which nutrition is one. She suggested adding language to the existing policy such as, “Health education, including nutrition education, will be implemented as based on the standards...”

Laura Brainin-Rodriguez commented that California Department of Education is intending to provide technical assistance with this policy development process and that a contact at USDA is providing assistance in the area of commodity foods available to the district. There was some discussion around the flexibility the district has in working with USDA commodity products (e.g. cheese).

c. School Food:

1. Meal application outreach

Dana Woldow presented a summary of the success of and findings from the targeted schools project. The project illustrates how it takes everyone to work on the meal application outreach, including Student Nutrition Services, principals, community based organizations, etc. The subcommittee working on this outreach will continue to talk about the importance of meal applications from now until August so that the message is clear and is not lost in the rush at the beginning of the school year. Dana hopes to get on the agenda for the principals' meeting before the summer.

Trish Bascom suggested that the meal application message be tied into the Administrative Institute. Erica Davis asked whether applications and labels could be sent out to administrators in June. Ed Wilkins clarified that application labels are received from the IT Department and are sent in duplicate to the school site administrator at the beginning of the year (ideally the first day that principals return). Before meal applications are distributed, they are adjusted with any changes from the prior year, sent to the state for approval, then to translators, and finally to reproduction. Last year the district partnered with the DHS MediCal program to combine outreach efforts and save mailing costs. Because this partnership resulted in a tremendous response, yet with few respondents who actually qualified for the MediCal program, it is unclear whether this partnership will continue next year. Imani Nazeeri-Simmons suggested that the district consider partnering with SF Health Plan since there is a lower threshold for qualification. Philip Smith requested that the subcommittee work with Marina Levy or another SNS employee in the meal application outreach process.

2. Provision 2

Dana commented that only 10 elementary schools in the district have at least 85% of students qualifying for free or reduced price meals. Because there are so few schools that meet this reasonable threshold to use for instituting Provision 2, it doesn't seem cost effective to start this extra paperwork and monitoring at this time. If we push for a higher return of meal applications in the next year, we may see a higher number of schools at or above the 85% free/reduced mark and reconsider Provision 2.

3. Breakfast

Dana mentioned that breakfast was an issue that was highlighted during Sophie Maxwell's hearing on child nutrition. The breakfast program is underutilized in the district, but for a variety of reasons (e.g. busing, scheduling, and staff/supervision). The School Food Subcommittee is looking into trying several things to improve participation in breakfast.

4. Salad Bar at Harvey Milk Civil Rights Academy

Leah Rimkus reported on the evaluation of the salad bar pilot to date. She and the Site Nutrition Coordinator conducted a survey of a sample of Harvey Milk students regarding the salad bar in February and can share the summary with anyone who is interested. Leah handed out a summary of the financial comparison of salad bar and hot lunch days

at Harvey Milk for the first five months of operation. For the months of November and December, the salad bar had costs and revenue comparable to hot lunch days and posted an overall surplus. For the other three months, the costs on salad bar days were higher than on hot lunch days and this addition was not offset by revenue from increased student participation. Based on these data, Student Nutrition Services has suggested that any continuation of expansion of the salad bar pilot operate within the following model: (1) school with a higher percentage of students qualified for free and reduced price meals; (2) meal price of \$2.00 rather than the current \$1.50; and (3) co-payment of \$0.40 collected from students qualified for reduced price meals. Leah is currently exploring the figures to assess the break-even point, or potential for making a profit, at a sample of prospective sites and plans to speak with principals at prospective sites.

Philip Smith commented that the district is completely focused on the budget and fiscal impact of all programs and projects. He suggested that figures be shared regarding any projected costs so that Student Nutrition Services could address this in the 2005-06 budget. Dana Woldow expressed concern regarding the collection of co-payment and the increased meal price, especially if these changes were to happen for just two days per week. She advocated for the selection of school with a 90% or higher free/reduced percentage and a regular \$1.50 paid meal price. She also suggested that new food items be added to the salad bar menu to keep the interest up and participation high.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

The next meeting will be on May 17, 2005.