

1 **School and meal characteristics associated with plate waste in K-12 cafeterias in the United**
2 **States**

3

4 Eunice S. Adjapong¹, Kathryn E. Bender², Sophia Schaefer², Brian E. Roe^{3*}

5

6 ¹ Department of Economics, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, United States of
7 America

8

9 ² Department of Economics, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware, United States of
10 America

11

12 ³ Department of Agricultural, Environmental & Development Economics, Ohio State University,
13 Columbus, Ohio, United States of American

14 * Corresponding author

15 E-mail: roe.30@osu.edu (BER)

16

17

18

Abstract

19 Food wasted in primary and secondary education institutions creates nutritional losses, financial
20 inefficiencies, and environmental degradation. While there is some evidence of how particular
21 interventions within schools may influence the amount of waste created, there is little recent
22 information about typical levels of food waste observed in U.S. schools and how these correlate
23 with school and meal characteristics. We analyze data reported by more than 100 schools from 24
24 states as part of the World Wildlife Fund’s Food Waste Warriors project and identify how plate
25 and beverage waste from school lunches are associated with school and meal service
26 characteristics. We find schools that permit students to choose their own amount of milk report
27 76% less milk waste than those reliant upon individual milk cartons while schools that implement
28 at least one non-curricular intervention (e.g., a table where students can share unopened) report
29 significantly less produce waste than other schools. We confirm several patterns observed or
30 hypothesized in the literature, including more waste generated by younger students and during the
31 earliest and shortest lunch periods. We document several novel associations including more plate
32 waste at smaller schools, during winter months and in the Northeast region. We find several
33 nuanced patterns of waste related to the prevalence of free and reduced meal service and whether
34 all meal elements are offered versus served. While this study cannot support rigorous evaluation
35 of intervention effectiveness, it provides insights into school and program characteristics that may
36 pose challenges for schools interested in reducing student plate waste.

37

38

39 **Introduction**

40 Federal and local governments invest billions of dollars per year in school meal programs
41 to ensure that school-age children in the United States receive the nutrition needed to perform well
42 in and outside of school (USDA 2023). When children leave food and beverages unconsumed
43 during meals (plate waste), financial and natural resources are wasted, which undermines the goals
44 of school meal programs while contributing to environmental degradation associated with wasted
45 food. After reviewing studies of plate waste in primary and secondary (K-12) school cafeterias
46 from the 1990's, Buzby and Guthrie (2002) estimated that as much as 12 percent of the calories
47 served as part of these programs were wasted, which was valued around \$600 million, while
48 studies using US data from the 2014/15 academic year estimate that 21% of served calories became
49 plate waste (USDA 2019).

50 Buzby and Guthrie (2002) identified several possible reasons for cafeteria plate waste
51 including that some meals are scheduled when children are not hungry (e.g., very early lunch
52 periods or lunch periods before rather than after recess), deviations between child food preferences
53 and meal content, and the inability to customize portion sizes to children's appetites, among others.
54 Cohen et al.'s (2021) review of more recent literature on school meal consumption points to several
55 additional reasons for excessive plate waste including short lunch periods and limited options for
56 individual meal components.

57 Despite significant changes in K-12 school meal programs over time, there has been limited
58 analysis of plate waste patterns across U.S. schools which hampers identification of current
59 inefficiencies and potential responses to reduce plate waste in school meal programs. Other than
60 the large-scale USDA-administered studies summarized in Buzby and Guthrie (2002), Potamites
61 and Gordon (2010) and USDA (2019), most research on U.S. school cafeterias has gathered data

62 from a small number of schools in a limited geographic area, often with the intent to evaluate a
63 specific intervention or policy change (e.g., Byker et al. 2014, Byker Shanks et al. 2021, Byker
64 Shanks et al. 2023, Cohen et al. 2013, Blondin et al. 2014, Hakim and Meissen 2014, Wilkie et al.
65 2015, Sharma et al. 2021, Burg et al. 2021, Hass et al. 2014, Capps et al. 2019; see Cohen et al.
66 2021 for a systematic review). However, to our knowledge, there have been no studies analyzing
67 waste data from schools drawn from throughout the United States since the USDA (2019) covering
68 the 2014/15 school year.

69 Our work fills this gap by utilizing data gathered from World Wildlife Fund’s (WWF) Food
70 Waste Warriors program, which encourages schools across the United States to conduct audits of
71 school cafeteria plate waste to teach students about food waste and its environmental impacts on
72 the food system and upload the results to a centralized database. Between 2018 and 2023, staff and
73 volunteers from 134 schools in 24 states took advantage of this opportunity and provided data in
74 a standardized format about the levels of plate waste they recorded, school features, and
75 characteristics of their cafeteria and meals service. We analyze nearly 500 observations of the
76 average plate waste per student, both in total and for four constituent categories (milk, entrees and
77 sides, produce, and other liquids) and use regression analysis to identify associations between
78 waste levels and the characteristics of the school and meals served.

79

80 **Materials and Methods**

81 Data were collected by staff and volunteers at individual schools throughout the United
82 States who participated in the World Wildlife Fund’s Food Waste Warriors program and entered
83 results from a standardized audit process (USDA, EPA and University of Arkansas, undated)

84 into the Food Waste Warriors Dashboard (WWF 2023). The audit prescribes methods for
85 consistently collecting and measuring plate waste, including the use of an electronic kitchen
86 scale or luggage scale to assess waste quantities. Some schools entered results from a single audit
87 while other schools entered results from multiple audits which could consist of audits on several
88 different days, across varying lunch periods on the same day, across varying subgroups of
89 students or combinations therein. Each observation is derived from the audit of plate and non-
90 water beverage waste at a single school and then expressed on a per student served basis. Waste
91 is reported in total and separately for produce (fruits and vegetables), all other (non-produce)
92 wasted food items (e.g., entrees and non-produce sides), milk, and, when applicable, all other
93 non-water liquids (e.g., juice and soup). Data from an average of 3.5 days observed in 134
94 schools from 24 different states across all four regions were collected between August 2018 and
95 May 2023 and were available for analysis. Eleven observations were excluded because the
96 reported food waste figures represent data from 10 or fewer students. The school-level free or
97 reduced lunch enrollment percentages were collected from state websites that published such
98 data.

99 Sample summary statistics are listed in Table 1. While the sample consists of schools who
100 took the initiative to audit and upload data (a self-selected convenience sample), Table 1 reveals a
101 broad array of institutions who participated, including 45% with a majority of students receiving
102 free or reduced-price meals and 71% who have not implemented any interventions to reduce school
103 food waste. The sample skews towards elementary schools (just over half) and towards schools in
104 western states (44%) with about twice as many observations occurring prior to the start of the
105 COVID pandemic. The modal and median school provides a single audit, though several schools

106 provided many audits (up to 27 in one case) and, hence, the average number of audits per school
 107 is nearly 4.

108 **Table 1. Summary Statistics**

VARIABLES	Mean or %	Std. Dev.
Lunch Start Time		
< 11 am	26.5%	
11:00 – 11:59	27.8	
Noon or later	27.6	
Not reported	18.2	
Length of Lunch		
< 30 mins	9.0	
30 mins	28.8	
> 30 mins	5.7	
Not reported	56.5	
Offer vs. Serve		
Serve	23.1	
Offer	65.3	
Not reported	11.6	
Free & Reduced Lunch		
<25%	20.8	
25-49%	20.8	
50-74%	17.6	
75% or more	27.1	
Not reported	13.7	
Grades Served		
Elementary	54.7	
Middle	33.5	
High	9.2	
Not reported	2.7	
School Size		
<500 students	88.0	
500 – 999 students	10.6	
1000 or more students	1.4	
Milk Service Method		
In cartons		
By dispenser or jug		
Not reported		

VARIABLES	Mean or %	Std. Dev.
School in WWF Program (yes=1)	55.9	
Interventions Implemented		
None	70.6	
1 intervention (curricular)	9.8	
> 1 intervention (curricular + other)	10.4	
1 intervention (non-curricular)	6.5	
> 1 intervention (non-curricular)	2.7	
Time Period		
Pre-COVID	63.3	
During COVID (Autum '20 – Spring '21)	2.0	
Post COVID (Summer '21 or later)	34.7	
Season		
Spring	37.6	
Summer	1.2	
Autum	15.9	
Winter	45.3	
Region		
Northeast (CT, MD, NH, NY, VT)	9.2	
West (AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, OR, WA)	44.1	
Midwest (IL, IN, NE, OH, WI)	29.0	
South (FL, GA, KY, LA, NC, TN, VA)	17.8	
Number of entrees served	2.457	1.596
Number of previous audits	3.855	5.133
Total Plate + Beverage Waste	0.290	0.181
Produce waste	0.101	0.088
Non-produce food waste	0.109	0.125
Milk waste	0.088	0.065
Other liquid waste	0.013	0.022

109 *Notes:* N=490 except for produce waste (N=450), non-produce waste (N=482), milk waste
110 (N=456), and other liquid waste (N=328).

111

112 The distribution of the total waste is depicted in Figure 1 with separate box plots for
113 elementary and all other schools (middle schools, high schools and schools who did not report
114 grade level). To understand the school and meal level characteristics that are correlated with the

115 observed waste levels, we regress these characteristics on the natural logarithm of total waste and
116 each of the four waste subcategories using Stata (version 18.0). The distribution (Fig. 1) is clearly
117 skewed with a long right tail (multiple outliers exceeding the upper whisker), which motivates our
118 natural logarithm transformation of the waste levels for the purposes of regression analysis.
119 Statistical significance is set at the 5% level with results featuring p -values between the 0.05 and
120 0.10 deemed marginally significant. We base all statistical tests on robust standard errors for the
121 regression estimates.

122 [Figure 1 here]

123 **Figure 1.** Box Plot of Plate and Beverage Waste per Student for Elementary and Other Schools.
124 Scale truncated at 1 lb. per student, which omits 1 elementary observation (1.08 lbs./student) and
125 2 other school observations (1.35 and 2.39 lbs./student).

126

127 Results

128 Average waste among the sample schools is 0.29 pounds per student per meal, which
129 includes roughly equal amounts of produce waste (0.10), non-produce (e.g., entrée and non-
130 produce sides) waste (0.11 lbs./student), and milk waste (0.09) with a small amount of other liquid
131 waste (0.01). As confirmed in Table 2, plate waste is significantly greater in elementary schools
132 with 52% more total waste than other schools. Most schools provide waste amounts by meal
133 component, permitting assessment of association among waste streams (e.g., Figure 2 depicts a
134 positive association between produce and non-produce waste within a school) with positive
135 correlations between produce and non-produce ($r = 0.079$, $p=0.097$), produce and milk ($r = 0.201$,
136 $p<0.001$) and milk and non-produce waste ($r = 0.097$, $p=0.039$). We can also confirm that

137 significantly more waste is created in elementary schools for each of the three major meal
 138 components (Table 2).

139 The regression results for total food and beverage waste are presented in Table 3 for all
 140 schools and for two groups of schools (elementary and all other schools) while the regression
 141 results for three key subcomponents (non-produce, produce and milk with other liquid waste
 142 omitted due to fewer observations and less variation) pooled across all schools are presented in
 143 Table 4. The models generally display good fit with R² statistics ranging from 0.585 (total waste
 144 from middle and high schools) to 0.376 (produce waste). We focus on presenting results on total
 145 waste and highlight when patterns differ by grade level or by subcomponent.

146 [Figure 2 here]

147 **Figure 2.** Scatter Plot of Plate Waste from Produce and Non-produce Foods (N=448). Axis
 148 truncated for purposes of visualization, omitting two observations with larger values.

149

150 **Table 2. Average Plate and Beverage Waste by Age Group (lbs./student/meal).**

Variables	Elementary	All Other	
Total Plate + Beverage Waste	0.343 (0.008)	0.226 (0.014)	n=490 <i>p</i> < 0.001
Produce waste	0.113 (0.004)	0.085 (0.007)	n=450 <i>p</i> < 0.001
Non-produce food waste	0.123 (0.005)	0.092 (0.011)	n=480 <i>p</i> = 0.008
Milk waste	0.111 (0.0040)	0.058 (0.003)	n=456 <i>p</i> < 0.001

151 *Notes:* Standard errors in parentheses. *p*-values are for the *t*-test statistics of the null hypothesis
 152 of equality between the column figures. All Other schools include middle schools, high schools
 153 and schools that did not report grade level. No significant differences were identified between
 154 middle and high school averages other than for milk: middle school's reported 0.064 vs. 0.032
 155 lbs./student for high schools (*p* < 0.001).

156

157

158

159

160 **Table 3. Total Plate and Beverage Waste Regression Results**

VARIABLES	(1) All	(2) Elementary School	(3) Middle & High School ^a
Lunch Start Time (< 11 am omitted)			
11:00 – 11:59	-0.155** (0.0699)	0.0258 (0.0732)	-0.320* (0.163)
Noon or later	-0.287*** (0.0723)	-0.276*** (0.0959)	-0.214 (0.160)
Not reported	-0.479*** (0.0876)	-0.337*** (0.0846)	-0.511** (0.208)
Length of Lunch (< 30 mins omitted)			
30 mins	-0.00409 (0.0809)	-0.182** (0.0914)	0.0682 (0.180)
> 30 mins	-0.00526 (0.124)	-0.0155 (0.171)	0.0529 (0.213)
Not reported	-0.0407 (0.0823)	-0.169 (0.113)	0.0871 (0.171)
Offer vs. Serve (serve omitted)			
Offer	0.323*** (0.0779)	0.00171 (0.139)	0.540*** (0.128)
Not reported	0.0729 (0.126)	-0.232 (0.166)	0.217 (0.255)
Free & Reduced Lunch (<25% omitted)			
25-49%	0.239*** (0.0823)	0.178* (0.103)	0.164 (0.169)
50-74%	0.333*** (0.0913)	0.260** (0.109)	0.410*** (0.150)
75% or more	0.0569 (0.0638)	0.0335 (0.0776)	0.162 (0.127)
Not reported	0.149 (0.0961)	0.0196 (0.134)	0.252* (0.150)
Grades Served (elementary omitted)			
Middle & high school	-0.470*** (0.0551)		
Not reported	-0.587*** (0.191)		0.0467 (0.350)
School Size (<500 students omitted)			
500 – 999 students	-0.782*** (0.143)	-0.241* (0.134)	-1.257*** (0.381)
1000 or more students	-0.167 (0.312)	-0.0666 (0.213)	-0.141 (0.457)
Milk Service Method (in cartons omitted)			
By dispenser or jug	-0.496*** (0.107)	-0.593*** (0.114)	-0.523*** (0.258)
Not reported	0.213**	0.165	0.375

VARIABLES	(1) All	(2) Elementary School	(3) Middle & High School ^a
School in WWF Program	(0.107) -0.0936 (0.125)	(0.114) -0.140 (0.116)	(0.258) -0.316 (0.608)
Interventions Implemented (none omitted)			
1 intervention (curricular)	0.0364 (0.0707)	0.0549 (0.0852)	-0.0228 (0.110)
> 1 intervention (curricular + other)	-0.101 (0.0822)	-0.0894 (0.103)	-0.221 (0.157)
1 intervention (non-curricular)	-0.270** (0.107)	-0.0397 (0.0695)	-0.663 (0.424)
> 1 intervention (non-curricular)	-0.0362 (0.130)	-0.160 (0.151)	0.113 (0.261)
Time Period (pre-COVID omitted)			
During COVID (Autum '20 – Spring '21)	-0.718** (0.288)	-0.883*** (0.310)	-0.234 (0.609)
Post COVID (Summer '21 or later)	-0.0723 (0.135)	-0.0459 (0.144)	-0.284 (0.617)
Season (Spring omitted)			
Summer	-0.0379 (0.216)	-0.101 (0.250)	0.219* (0.115)
Autumn	0.125 (0.0893)	-0.0571 (0.105)	0.343** (0.154)
Winter	0.192*** (0.0565)	0.159*** (0.0569)	0.223** (0.103)
Region (Northeast omitted)			
West	-0.205* (0.118)	-0.00434 (0.158)	-1.106*** (0.243)
Midwest	-0.321** (0.128)	-0.0495 (0.149)	-1.188*** (0.260)
South	0.0966 (0.137)	0.0570 (0.176)	-0.810** (0.320)
Number of entrees served	0.0286* (0.0155)	-0.00183 (0.0182)	0.0273 (0.0243)
Number of previous audits	-0.00195 (0.00445)	-0.00119 (0.00711)	0.00910 (0.00737)
Constant	-1.103*** (0.208)	-0.817*** (0.264)	-0.782 (0.697)
Observations	489	268	221
R-squared	0.522	0.382	0.585

161 Notes: a – this column also includes schools that did not report grade level. Robust standard
162 errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

164 **Table 4. Waste by Food Type Regression Results.**

VARIABLES	(1) Non-produce	(2) Produce	(3) Milk
Lunch Start Time (< 11 am omitted)			
11:00 – 11:59	-0.294*** (0.106)	-0.179 (0.128)	-0.172* (0.0925)
Noon or later	-0.521*** (0.117)	-0.132 (0.134)	-0.270*** (0.0933)
Not reported	-0.506*** (0.129)	-0.509*** (0.149)	-0.383*** (0.125)
Length of Lunch (< 30 mins omitted)			
30 mins	0.107 (0.120)	0.133 (0.124)	-0.0495 (0.107)
> 30 mins	0.105 (0.189)	-0.194 (0.190)	0.103 (0.183)
Not reported	-0.0511 (0.130)	0.0592 (0.116)	-0.310*** (0.116)
Offer vs. Serve (serve omitted)			
Offer	0.512*** (0.108)	0.425*** (0.109)	0.0540 (0.115)
Not reported	0.205 (0.170)	0.0514 (0.191)	-0.0800 (0.190)
Free & Reduced Lunch (<25% omitted)			
25-49%	0.0960 (0.126)	0.415*** (0.120)	0.109 (0.113)
50-74%	0.0261 (0.120)	0.629*** (0.134)	0.147 (0.127)
75% or more	-0.234** (0.0978)	0.241** (0.0974)	0.228** (0.0974)
Not reported	0.177 (0.133)	0.297** (0.141)	0.195 (0.225)
Grades Served (elementary omitted)			
Middle & high school	-0.354*** (0.0799)	-0.461*** (0.0825)	-0.688*** (0.0829)
Not reported	0.334 (0.271)	-0.271* (0.151)	
School Size (<500 students omitted)			
500 – 999 students	-0.709*** (0.204)	-0.992*** (0.142)	-0.611*** (0.203)
1000 or more students	0.269 (0.404)	-0.910*** (0.245)	-0.814*** (0.309)
Milk Service Method (in cartons omitted)			
By dispenser or jug	-0.301** (0.125)	-0.135 (0.144)	-1.413*** (0.178)
Not reported	0.448*** (0.177)	0.261 (0.138)	0.321 (0.138)

VARIABLES	(1) Non-produce	(2) Produce	(3) Milk
School in WWF Program	0.0448 (0.135)	0.0640 (0.173)	-0.139 (0.200)
Interventions Implemented (none omitted)			
1 intervention (curricular)	-0.0205 (0.107)	0.0120 (0.0937)	0.0396 (0.116)
> 1 intervention (curricular + other)	-0.207 (0.140)	-0.295*** (0.101)	-0.0201 (0.108)
1 intervention (non-curricular)	-0.214 (0.144)	-0.365*** (0.134)	-0.200 (0.155)
> 1 intervention (non-curricular)	0.150 (0.209)	-0.282* (0.155)	0.0299 (0.244)
Time Period (pre-COVID omitted)			
During COVID (Autum '20 – Spring '21)	-0.463* (0.281)	0.611 (0.405)	0.121 (0.281)
Post COVID (Summer '21 or later)	-0.0177 (0.199)	0.418** (0.164)	-0.185 (0.163)
Season (Spring omitted)			
Summer	-0.471* (0.262)	-0.337 (0.472)	0.0662 (0.368)
Autumn	0.370*** (0.123)	-0.0919 (0.127)	0.357** (0.138)
Winter	0.317*** (0.0788)	0.0415 (0.0847)	0.230*** (0.0829)
Region (Northeast omitted)			
West	-0.666*** (0.144)	0.406 (0.255)	-0.0429 (0.204)
Midwest	-0.847*** (0.157)	0.0729 (0.259)	-0.303 (0.210)
South	-0.347* (0.194)	0.879*** (0.252)	-0.0121 (0.208)
Number of entrees served	0.00892 (0.0240)	0.0365 (0.0224)	0.0318 (0.0219)
Number of previous audits	0.00618 (0.00624)	-0.00708 (0.00795)	0.00503 (0.00666)
Constant	-1.965*** (0.292)	-3.307*** (0.338)	-1.986*** (0.296)
Observations	482	445	427
R-squared	0.399	0.376	0.486

165 Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

166

167

168 *School Meal Service Characteristics*

169 Several school meal service characteristics are significantly associated with total per
170 student waste. One core aspect of school meal service involves the length and timing of meals
171 (Figure 3). The regression results suggest that waste is greater when the lunch period begins before
172 11:00 am (Table 3, column 1). For example, total waste is about 25% lower ($[\exp(-0.287)-1]*100$
173 $= -24.9\%$, where -0.287 is the regression coefficient) during a lunch period scheduled between
174 noon and 1 pm than during the omitted category (before 11 am, $p < 0.01$). This is not significant
175 among older students (Table 3, column 3, $p > 0.10$) nor for produce waste (Table 4, column 2, $p >$
176 0.10). However, the duration of the lunch period had no significant net association with total waste
177 or any subcomponent, though lunch periods of 30 minutes yield about 17% less total waste among
178 elementary students than when lunch periods are shorter than this (Table 3, column 2, $p < 0.05$).
179 We note that the duration of a school's lunch period was not reported for the majority of
180 observations, providing us with less confidence in interpreting these results.

181 Student autonomy is another aspect of meal service that is postulated to affect waste. We
182 consider two types of autonomy variables observed in this data set: one that provides students with
183 autonomy over which lunch items are placed on their plates and one that permits additional
184 autonomy of the serving size of milk received.

185 In terms of item-level autonomy, schools may follow two general modes of service: 'Offer'
186 in which student may refuse some elements of a standard meal (e.g., take only a fruit or a
187 vegetable), or 'Serve' in which all five standard food elements (fruits, vegetables, grains, meat or
188 meat alternative, fluid milk) are provided to every student. Most high schools are required by rule
189 to operate under the 'offer' mode of service while it is optional for other grades. In our data, eleven
190 high schools report 'serve' mode, which may reflect that the schools are an exception, which can

191 be granted due to insufficient service flexibility, or may reflect schools that have students from
192 both high school and younger grades and the ‘serve’ mode captures service for younger students,
193 or may simply be a miscoding by school volunteers who entered the data.

194 [Figure 3 here]

195 **Figure 3.** Total Plate and Beverage Waste per Student by Duration and Starting Time of Lunch
196 Period. NR = not reported. The starting time refers to a school’s earliest lunch period for schools
197 with multiple lunch periods. (N=490)

198

199 One would expect that schools implementing an ‘Offer’ mode of service will report less
200 waste as individual autonomy increases permitting students to, e.g., not take a vegetable they are
201 unlikely to consume. However, we find 38% more waste reported in ‘Offer’ schools (coefficient
202 = 0.323, $p < 0.01$) with the overall result being driven by middle and high schools (Table 3, columns
203 1 and 3) with elementary schools having nearly identical waste levels regardless of offer versus
204 serve. These results hold for both categories of food (produce and other solid foods) but not for
205 milk (Table 4).

206 Shifting to autonomy in the amount of milk served, we find that providing students
207 autonomy to select the amount of milk is associated with 39% reduction in total waste (coefficient
208 = -0.496, $p < 0.01$, Table 3, column 1). While the results are greatest for milk (Table 4, column 3,
209 coefficient = -1.413 or -75.7%, $p < 0.01$) there is also a significant negative association with non-
210 produce solid food waste (26% less).

211 While each school lunch served must include an entrée to be eligible for federal
212 reimbursement (even if the school adopts the ‘offer’ mode), the school can provide more student
213 autonomy by providing more choices about the entrées selected. Schools that provided more entrée

214 options are marginally significantly associated with more overall waste (~3% more waste per
215 entrée offered) though the association with each key component listed in Table 4 is insignificant.

216 *School and Student Characteristics*

217 Young children are associated with greater waste levels than older children with meals at
218 elementary schools yielding about 37% more waste per student than middle or high school students
219 (Table 3, column 1, coefficient = -0.354, $p < 0.01$), where this significant association carries over
220 to each of the three waste components listed in Table 4 with milk waste having the greatest
221 differential across age groups.

222 Other facets of a school were also observed to significantly correlate to waste per student.
223 School size was one of the largest factors ($p < 0.001$) with schools that served between 500 and
224 1000 students reporting about 54% less waste than smaller schools, where the association was
225 strongest among schools with older students and carried over to each of the major meal
226 components. The very largest schools (1000+ students served), while not significantly associated
227 with less overall waste, reported significantly less milk and produce waste than the smallest
228 schools.

229 Schools where approximately half of the school's population was eligible for free or
230 reduced lunch (25% - 75%) were significantly associated with more total waste than schools with
231 fewer or more students eligible for such benefits. Among meal components the pattern was
232 particularly distinct for produce where schools with the smallest percentage of eligible students
233 had significantly less waste than all other schools (Table 4, column 2). Non-produce waste (e.g.,
234 entrees and non-produce sides) were wasted the least in schools with more than 75% of students
235 eligible for free or reduced priced meals.

236 School region was also significantly correlated with total waste with schools from the
237 Midwest reporting more than 28% less waste per student than those in the Northeast (Table 3
238 coefficient = -0.321, $p < 0.01$). Among older students, the Northeast reported significantly more
239 waste than all other regions (Table 3, column 3). Regional trends were also significant across meal
240 components (Table 4) with entrée waste being significantly greater in the Northeast than all other
241 regions and produce waste being greatest in the South.

242 The timing of the audit was also significantly associated with waste levels with both timing
243 relative to the onset of the COVID pandemic ($p = 0.05$) and season ($p < 0.001$) implicated. The
244 least waste occurred during the 2020/21 school year (about 51% less than earlier), which coincided
245 with the restart of many schools under restrictive post-COVID meals service routines. In terms of
246 seasons, winter observations yielded about 21% more total waste than spring while entrée and side
247 waste and milk waste was also highest in Fall and Winter. We were also able to document the
248 number of times a school undertook an audit, though the number of previous audits undertaken at
249 that school was not significantly associated with waste level.

250 The number and type of interventions undertaken at the participating schools revealed
251 some significant association patterns. Compared to the omitted group of schools that undertook no
252 systematic interventions, significantly less waste was observed at schools who undertook a single
253 non-curricular intervention (e.g., focused on behaviors such as sharing uneaten and opened food
254 via share tables, recycling or utensil re-use). However, when considering just produce waste, any
255 intervention that involved at least one non-curricular action was associated with significantly less
256 waste (Table 4, column 2).

257

258 Discussion

259 Our study yields data collected from 134 schools in 24 states that feature a range of uptake
260 of free and reduced-price meals, different age groups and different meal service models (offer
261 versus serve), and different administrative organization (public, private and charter). Audits were
262 conducted during all seasons and both before and after the onset of COVID. While the data used
263 in this study should not be mistaken for a nationally representative sample, as we rely upon self-
264 reported data from a self-selected set of schools, it does provide a distinct view of plate and
265 beverage waste across a diverse group of U.S. schools. Outside of data collected as part of USDA's
266 efforts (e.g., School Nutrition Dietary Assessments, see Potamites and Gordon 2010 and Buzby
267 and Guthrie 2002, and the School Nutrition and Meal Cost Study, see USDA 2019), which follow
268 strict sampling protocol and yield nationally representative estimates of plate waste, most other
269 studies of U.S. cafeteria plate waste rely upon observations from cooperating schools collected in
270 a limited geographic region and during a limited time frame (Cohen et al. 2021).

271 Further, unlike the USDA administered studies, this study relies upon direct measurement
272 of waste amounts via scale rather than indirect measurements that yield the fraction of plated food
273 that remains unconsumed (Buzby and Guthrie 2002, Potamites and Gordon 2010, USDA 2019).
274 While estimates of the proportion of plated food that is wasted are useful, estimates of the physical
275 weight of plate waste can provide useful information for waste management decisions. For
276 example, our estimates suggest that the average elementary student discards 0.236 lbs. of solid
277 food per lunch meal served (Table 4), permitting projections for, e.g., the capacity and throughput
278 requirements of physical infrastructure needed daily should a school consider instituting a
279 composting program. Table 2 also verifies few differences between average per student plate waste
280 amounts created in middle and high schools (see table's footnote – only milk waste is greater in

281 middle than high schools), though this may be due to limited statistical power, as more
282 comprehensive studies have found differences in the percent of food left on plates between middle
283 and high school students for whole grains, proteins, empty calories as well as milk (USDA 2019,
284 Fig. 5.2).

285 Several of our results are consistent with suggestions proffered in the literature for schools
286 to reduce plate waste. For example, Buzby and Guthrie (2002) suggest that very early or very late
287 lunch periods may increase waste, and our results confirm that waste was greatest for meals served
288 prior to 11 am with the difference being statistically significant from waste observed during meals
289 served between 12 noon and 1 pm. Also, the waste created during meals between 11 and 12 is
290 significantly greater than those during the noon hour ($p=0.033$).

291 Buzby and Guthrie (2002) and Cohen et al. (2021) find evidence that very short lunch
292 periods exacerbate plate waste. We find this to hold among elementary students in our sample who
293 are given less than 30 minutes to consume lunch rather than 30 minutes or more (Table 3, column
294 2), but not to hold for older students (Table 3, column 3). Figure 3 juxtaposes these two factors
295 and suggests that combination of lunch periods that are short in duration (< 30 m) and early in the
296 day (before 11 am) yield the largest reports of per student waste in our sample.

297 The literature also documents that the timing of lunch periods relative to student recess
298 periods is also a driver of plate waste (Chapman et al. 2017, McLoughlin et al. 2019, Price and
299 Just 2015, Cohen et al. 2021). We note that there was no information provided about the relative
300 order of lunch period and recess, which prohibits us from assessing past research findings of
301 reduced waste during lunch periods that immediately follow periods of physical activity.

302 We also find results that are partially consistent with the received literature. For example,
303 we find that reported total waste is highest in schools where a moderate fraction of students (25%-
304 75%) receive free or reduced-price lunches and that milk waste is highest in schools where 75%
305 or more of students receive such benefits. The literature is also mixed on this point with results
306 from USDA's third School Nutrition Dietary Assessment revealing no significant association for
307 overall waste though significantly more milk waste among marginally food secure students
308 (Potamites and Gordon, pg. 84). USDA's School Nutrition and Meal Cost Study reveals
309 significantly more waste of both total calories and milk in schools that offered universal free meals
310 versus other schools. Hence, while our results align with the received literature concerning more
311 milk waste in schools with the greatest concentrations of students receiving free and reduced-price
312 meals, we do not align with respect to overall waste. In particular, we find less waste of the main
313 entrée in schools with 75% participation in free and reduced-price meals.

314 We also find evidence this is distinct from extant studies: schools in our sample that
315 implement the 'offer' service mode, in which students need not take all reimbursable meal
316 elements, report more plate waste per student. In contrast, USDA (2019, Table F.15) found lower
317 rates of plate waste for all calories and produce at 'offer' elementary schools (but not middle
318 schools) though 'offer' middle schools in the USDA study did waste a greater percent of milk than
319 'serve' middle schools. Our results show no significant difference for elementary schools and the
320 opposite pattern of plate waste among schools with older children, i.e., more waste at middle and
321 high schools with 'offer' rather than 'serve.'

322 There are multiple possible reasons for this discrepancy. First, we rely on absolute levels
323 of waste rather than on the percent of food wasted, opening the door to the possibility that students
324 in offer schools systematically take more total food than those in serve schools and, even though

325 they waste a similar or smaller fraction of food, yield larger absolute waste figures. Second, we
326 rely on a smaller, self-selected sample of schools, where ‘offer’ schools with larger levels of plate
327 waste may have been disproportionately attracted to participate in the study. Third, we are unable
328 to assess offer versus serve status for nearly 12% of the sample, which could alter relative
329 assessments if the unknown schools were correctly assigned to their offer versus serve group.
330 Finally, there is the possibility that patterns have changed in the years since the USDA sample
331 collection ended (2014-15) and our sample collection began (2018-2023). Further research to
332 understand if there is a legitimate driver of more waste in schools using the ‘offer’ service mode
333 is a high priority, as this is a popular option with virtually all high schools and more than 80% of
334 elementary and middle schools operating under this mode (USDA 2019).

335 Other aspects of meal service that promote student autonomy have mixed associations with
336 waste. Schools in this study that installed dispensers that permit students to select their preferred
337 amount of milk rather than being forced to take an entire carton of milk report 76% less milk waste.
338 While such an outcome is expected and documented in small-scale case studies (WWF 2022), to
339 our knowledge, this is the first documentation in the literature that confirms and calibrates this
340 association. On the other hand, schools that offer more choices of main entrees trend toward more
341 rather than less waste. The literature suggests that providing students more options for individual
342 meal elements is generally associated with less plate waste, as students are more likely to find an
343 option that suits their palate. However, most other studies focus on increasing the number of
344 options available for fruits and vegetables rather than for the main entrée (Cohen et al. 2021).

345 We also document patterns of waste across schools that, to our knowledge, have not been
346 addressed in previous studies. For example, we find waste is lower in mid-sized schools (500 –
347 999 students) than in larger or smaller schools, suggesting there may be particular challenges with

348 limiting plate waste for schools operating at the ends of the scale spectrum. Also, we document
349 patterns with respect to seasonality and regionality of plate waste with winter and Northeastern
350 schools associated with significantly greater reported amounts, and with produce waste posing a
351 particular challenge in the South. While the data do not support identifying root causes for such
352 patterns, awareness of these patterns may permit others to identify and address challenges facing
353 schools in different regions and seasons.

354 Our study is also unique in that schools report any interventions that they have undertaken
355 in their schools to address food waste. Nearly 30% of the observations were taken at schools that
356 had implemented some type of intervention. While we lack the ability to make valid assessments
357 of these interventions, as we do not possess pre- and post-intervention waste levels, we can observe
358 correlations that may be indicative of possible efficacy and warrant further evaluation in more
359 rigorous data settings. For example, we find schools that permit students to portion their own
360 amounts of milk via deployment of a commercial milk dispenser or through self-pouring from jugs
361 report 76% less milk waste than those reliant upon individual milk cartons. Outside of the milk
362 dispenser intervention, schools that implement at least one non-curricular intervention (e.g., a table
363 where students can share unopened, uneaten food items) report significantly less produce waste
364 than schools that either have no interventions or a single curricular intervention. We do not find
365 the act of repeatedly undertaking measurement to be – in and of itself – associated with any more
366 or less plate waste. However, most schools with repeated measurement in our sample tend to have
367 the measurement clustered into a single season, which does not permit much time to respond to
368 any insights the schools may have generated from the act of measurement. Given that measurement
369 is a critical antecedent of action through its ability to diagnose school-level issues and motivate
370 student and staff action, and critical to intervention evaluation, the lack of correlation between

371 repeated measurement and waste levels in this sample should not discourage schools from
372 engaging in measurement.

373 In general, we lack sufficient detail on the types and intensiveness of the undertaken
374 interventions. When coupled with a lack of data concerning the waste levels before the
375 interventions were deployed, it points to the need for more research to rigorously evaluate the
376 efficacy of different classes of interventions.

377

378 **Conclusions**

379 Nearly 7 billion meals reimbursed by the Federal government were served to students in
380 the United States during 2023 (School Nutrition Association 2024). Food from these meals that
381 becomes plate waste represents an opportunity to wield scarce funds more efficiently and support
382 child growth and development more robustly. We analyze data on plate waste from reimbursable
383 lunches recently reported by 134 schools across 24 states to assess commonalities and patterns that
384 might inform efforts to reduce these waste levels. We find the average lunch resulted in 0.34
385 pounds of uneaten food and beverage per elementary student and 0.23 pounds for other students,
386 suggesting scope for interventions to reduce plate waste, particularly at the elementary level.

387 Our results are consistent with patterns previously established in the literature, such as
388 greater total waste among younger students and greater milk waste in schools where most students
389 receive free and reduced-price lunches, while inconsistent with some previous work (e.g., we find
390 the most total plate waste among schools with moderate levels of free and reduce-price lunch
391 service rather than the highest levels of such service). We also document patterns not previously
392 explored in the literature, such as higher levels of total waste reported among the smallest and

393 largest schools, schools from the Northeast, and meals served during the winter. While our data is
394 insufficient to assess the root cause of such patterns, this provides guidance for future research that
395 might validate and identify the causal pathways that lead to such patterns.

396 Our study's correlative results are also consistent with previously recommended
397 interventions to reduce plate waste, including suggestions to avoid lunch periods that are short and
398 held before standard lunch hours (before 11 am). We also document a significant negative
399 association between providing students autonomy to select their desired amount of milk and the
400 amount of milk that is wasted. While this relationship has been previously hypothesized to hold
401 and documented in small-scale cases studies, we are the first to substantiate this association in a
402 larger sample and calibrate the effect size by finding about a 76% reduction in milk waste.

403 In some cases, however, we find results that contrast with the received literature, including
404 our finding of that schools with older students operating under the offer versus serve model
405 (permitting students to decline some elements of a reimbursable meal) are associated with more
406 waste despite the additional autonomy this provides to students. As this is an observational study
407 that does not include measurements before and after a school switches modes of service, we
408 caution against drawing causal inferences, but highlight the need to conduct further research to
409 rule out any type of unexpected waste reaction among students in 'offer' schools given the
410 prevalence of this mode of service. We also document that other school-initiated waste reduction
411 interventions, particularly those that involve non-curricular activities, are associated with less
412 produce waste. While encouraging, we reiterate the need for more rigorous causal evaluation of
413 such interventions to validate the correlative findings provided by our observational (non-
414 randomized) study.

415 In addition to the previously mentioned observational nature of the study, we highlight
416 several additional limitations. First, the data set features coverage from only about half of the states
417 in the U.S., and these schools were not randomly selected, but rather represent a group of schools
418 with the motivation and resources to conduct an audit of the waste created in their cafeterias. The
419 data are also lacking information on several key characteristics of the school and meal setting that
420 can inform patterns of cafeteria plate waste, such as the presence of competitive foods (e.g.,
421 vending machines or nearby off-campus fast food), whether the school permits students to leave
422 campus for lunch, when recess or other opportunities for physical activity are scheduled relative
423 lunch, and objective measures of the quality of the cafeteria food itself. Future work would benefit
424 from the addition of such variables to the data set.

425

426 **Acknowledgements**

427 The authors thank the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) for sharing the data used in this study and Mary Jane
428 Chandler, Alex Nichols-Vinueza, and Pete Pearson of the WWF for helpful conversations concerning the
429 data and initial results and acknowledge the numerous school staff and volunteers who undertook the
430 school food waste audits that constitute the data analyzed in this study. Adjapong recognizes support from
431 the Big 10 Summer Research Opportunities Program and Roe recognizes support from USDA-NIFA
432 (project OHOA-01546) and the National Science Foundation (Grant #2115405). All remaining errors are
433 those of the authors.

434

435

436

437 **References**

- 438 Blondin, S., Djang, H., Metayer, N., Anzman-Frasca, S., & Economos, C. (2015). ‘It’s just so
439 much waste.’ A qualitative investigation of food waste in a universal free School Breakfast
440 Program. *Public Health Nutrition*, 18(9), 1565-1577. Doi:10.1017/S1368980014002948
- 441 Burg, X., Metcalfe, J. J., Ellison, B., & Prescott, M. P. (2021). Effects of Longer Seated Lunch
442 Time on Food Consumption and Waste in Elementary and Middle School-age Children: A
443 Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA network open*, 4(6), e2114148-e2114148.
- 444 Buzby, J.C. & J.F. Guthrie. (2002). Plate Waste in School Nutrition Programs: Final Report to
445 Congress. Electronic Publications from the Food Assistance & Nutrition Research Program, E-
446 FAN-02, USDA-Economic Research Service, March. Available online at:
447 <https://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/pub-details/?pubid=43132> (accessed 17 January 2024).
- 448 Byker Shanks, C., Stenberg, M., Bark, K., Izumi, B., Hoff, C., & Parks, C. A. (2023). School
449 Lunch Advisory Councils’ use of behavioural economics influences vegetable selection and waste.
450 *Health Education Journal*, 00178969231172727.
- 451 Capps, O., Ishdorj, A., Murano, P. S., Field, L., Hutto, A., & Storey, M. (2019). Waste Not Want
452 Not. *Choices*, 34(1), 1-8.
- 453 Chapman, L. E., Cohen, J., Canterbury, M., & Carton, T. W. (2017). Factors associated with
454 school lunch consumption: Reverse recess and school “brunch”. *Journal of the Academy of*
455 *Nutrition and Dietetics*, 117(9), 1413-1418.

456 Cohen JFW, Hecht AA, Hager ER, Turner L, Burkholder K, Schwartz MB. Strategies to Improve
457 School Meal Consumption: A Systematic Review. *Nutrients*. 2021; 13(10):3520.
458 <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu13103520>.

459 Hakim, S.M., & Meissen, G. (2013). Increasing Consumption of Fruits and Vegetables in the
460 School Cafeteria: The Influence of Active Choice. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and*
461 *Underserved* 24(2), 145-157. Doi:10.1353/hpu.2013.0109.

462 Haas, J., Cunningham-Sabo, L., & Auld, G. (2014). Plate waste and attitudes among high school
463 lunch program participants. *J Child Nutr Manag*, 38(1), n1.

464 McLoughlin, G. M., Edwards, C. G., Jones, A., Chojnacki, M. R., Baumgartner, N. W., Walk, A.
465 D., ... & Khan, N. A. (2019). School lunch timing and children's physical activity during recess:
466 an exploratory study. *Journal of nutrition education and behavior*, 51(5), 616-622.

467 Price, J., & Just, D. R. (2015). Lunch, recess and nutrition: Responding to time incentives in the
468 cafeteria. *Preventive Medicine*, 71, 27-30.

469 Potamites, E., & Gordon, A. (2010). Children's food security and intakes from school meals.
470 Contractor and Cooperator Report No. 2239-2019-2875. United States Department of Agriculture,
471 May. Available online at: <https://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/pub-details/?pubid=84339>
472 (accessed 4 August 2023).

473 School Nutrition Association (2024). School meal statistics. Available online at:
474 <https://schoolnutrition.org/about-school-meals/school-meal-statistics/> (accessed on 17 January
475 2024).

476 Sharma S, Marshall A, Chow J, Ranjit N, Bounds G, Hearne K, Cramer N, Ocegüera A, Farhat A,
477 Markham C. (2019). Impact of a pilot school-based nutrition intervention on fruit and vegetable
478 waste at school lunches. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior*. Nov 1;51(10):1202-10.

479 USDA, EPA and University of Arkansas. (undated). “Guide to Conducting Student Food Waste
480 Audits: A Resource for Schools.” Available online at:
481 [http://assets.worldwildlife.org/educators_toolkit_files/29/toolkit_files/original/Student_Food_Wa](http://assets.worldwildlife.org/educators_toolkit_files/29/toolkit_files/original/Student_Food_Waste_Audit_FINAL_4-6-2017.pdf?1511297805&_ga=2.261716109.1815262156.1691233805-929868070.1689533680)
482 [ste_Audit_FINAL_4-6-2017.pdf?1511297805&_ga=2.261716109.1815262156.1691233805-](http://assets.worldwildlife.org/educators_toolkit_files/29/toolkit_files/original/Student_Food_Waste_Audit_FINAL_4-6-2017.pdf?1511297805&_ga=2.261716109.1815262156.1691233805-929868070.1689533680)
483 [929868070.1689533680](http://assets.worldwildlife.org/educators_toolkit_files/29/toolkit_files/original/Student_Food_Waste_Audit_FINAL_4-6-2017.pdf?1511297805&_ga=2.261716109.1815262156.1691233805-929868070.1689533680) (accessed 5 August 2023).

484 USDA (2019). *School Nutrition and Meal Cost Study, Final Report Volume 4: Student*
485 *Participation, Satisfaction, Plate Waste, and Dietary Intakes* by Mary Kay Fox, Elizabeth Gearan,
486 Charlotte Cabili, Dallas Dotter, Katherine Niland, Liana Washburn, Nora Paxton, Lauren Olsho,
487 Lindsay LeClair, and Vinh Tran. Food and Nutrition Service, Office of Policy Support, Project
488 Officer: John Endahl. Alexandria, VA: April 2019.

489 USDA. (2023). National School Lunch Program. Website. Available online at:
490 [https://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/food-nutrition-assistance/child-nutrition-programs/national-](https://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/food-nutrition-assistance/child-nutrition-programs/national-school-lunch-program/)
491 [school-lunch-program/](https://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/food-nutrition-assistance/child-nutrition-programs/national-school-lunch-program/) (accessed 4 August 2023).

492 Wilkie, A. C., Graunke, R. E., & Cornejo, C. (2015). Food waste auditing at three Florida schools.
493 *Sustainability*, 7(2), 1370-1387.

494 WWF (World Wildlife Fund) (2022). “The Business Case for Transitioning to Bulk Milk
495 Dispensers from Single-Use Milk Cartons in K-12 Schools,” December 5. Available online at:
496 [https://www.worldwildlife.org/publications/the-business-case-for-transitioning-to-bulk-milk-](https://www.worldwildlife.org/publications/the-business-case-for-transitioning-to-bulk-milk-dispensers-from-single-use-milk-cartons-in-k-12-schools)
497 [dispensers-from-single-use-milk-cartons-in-k-12-schools](https://www.worldwildlife.org/publications/the-business-case-for-transitioning-to-bulk-milk-dispensers-from-single-use-milk-cartons-in-k-12-schools) (accessed 27 January 2024).

498 WWF (World Wildlife Fund) (2023). “Be a Food Waste Warrior” Website. Available online at:
499 <https://www.worldwildlife.org/teaching-resources/toolkits/be-a-food-waste-warrior> (accessed 5
500 August 2023).




Fig 1




Fig2




Fig 3