1	School and meal characteristics associated with plate waste in K-12 cafeterias in the United
2	States
3	
4	Eunice S. Adjapong ¹ , Kathryn E. Bender ² , Sophia Schaefer ² , Brian E. Roe ^{3*}
5 6 7 8	¹ Department of Economics, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, United States of America
9 10 11	² Department of Economics, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware, United States of America
12 13	³ Department of Agricultural, Environmental & Development Economics, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, United States of American
14	* Corresponding author
15	E-mail: roe.30@osu.edu (BER)
16	
17	

18

Abstract

Food wasted in primary and secondary education institutions creates nutritional losses, financial 19 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 states as part of the World Wildlife Fund's Food Waste Warriors project and identify how plate 24 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 76% less milk waste than those reliant upon individual milk cartons while schools that implement 27 28 at least one non-curricular intervention (e.g., a table where students can share unopened) report significantly less produce waste than other schools. We confirm several patterns observed or 29 hypothesized in the literature, including more waste generated by younger students and during the 30 earliest and shortest lunch periods. We document several novel associations including more plate 31 waste at smaller schools, during winter months and in the Northeast region. We find several 32 nuanced patterns of waste related to the prevalence of free and reduced meal service and whether 33 all meal elements are offered versus served. While this study cannot support rigorous evaluation 34 of intervention effectiveness, it provides insights into school and program characteristics that may 35 pose challenges for schools interested in reducing student plate waste. 36

37

39 Introduction

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

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

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

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

79

80 Materials and Methods

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

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

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

provided many audits (up to 27 in one case) and, hence, the average number of audits per school

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

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

¹¹⁰ (N=456), and other liquid waste (N=328).

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

122 [Figure 1 here]

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

126

127 Results

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

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

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 R ² 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.

- [Figure 2 here] 146
- Figure 2. Scatter Plot of Plate Waste from Produce and Non-produce Foods (N=448). Axis 147 148 truncated for purposes of visualization, omitting two observations with larger values.
- 149

50	Table 2. Average Plate and Beverage Was	ste by Age Grou	ıp (lbs./stude	nt/meal).
	Variables	Elementary	All Other	
	Total Plate + Beverage Waste	0.343	0.226	n=490
		(0.008)	(0.014)	<i>p</i> < 0.001
	Produce waste	0.113	0.085	n=450
		(0.004)	(0.007)	<i>p</i> <0.001
	Non-produce food waste	0.123	0.092	n=480
		(0.005)	(0.011)	p = 0.008
	Milk waste	0.111	0.058	n=456
		(0.0040	(0.003)	<i>p</i> <0.001

, . . 15

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. *p*-values are for the *t*-test statistics of the null hypothesis 151 of equality between the column figures. All Other schools include middle schools, high schools 152

and schools that did not report grade level. No significant differences were identified between 153

middle and high school averages other than for milk: middle school's reported 0.064 vs. 0.032 154 lbs./student for high schools (p < 0.001). 155

156

157

158

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

160 Table 3. Total Plate and Beverage Waste Regression Results

(1) All (0.107) 0.0026	(2) Elementary School	(3) Middle & High School ^a
All (0.107)	Elementary School	Middle & High School ^a
All (0.107)	School	High School ^a
(0.107)	$(0 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1)$	
0.0024	(0.114)	(0.258)
-0.0930	-0.140	-0.316
(0.125)	(0.116)	(0.608)
0.0364	0.0549	-0.0228
(0.0707)	(0.0852)	(0.110)
-0.101	-0.0894	-0.221
(0.0822)	(0.103)	(0.157)
-0.270**	-0.0397	-0.663
(0.107)	(0.0695)	(0.424)
-0.0362	-0.160	0.113
(0.130)	(0.151)	(0.261)
-0.718**	-0.883***	-0.234
(0.288)	(0.310)	(0.609)
-0.0723	-0.0459	-0.284
(0.135)	(0.144)	(0.617)
× ,	~ /	~ /
-0.0379	-0.101	0.219*
(0.216)	(0.250)	(0.115)
0.125	-0.0571	0.343**
(0.0893)	(0.105)	(0.154)
0.192***	0.159***	0.223**
(0.0565)	(0.0569)	(0.103)
()	()	()
-0.205*	-0.00434	-1.106***
(0.118)	(0.158)	(0.243)
-0.321**	-0.0495	-1.188***
(0.128)	(0.149)	(0.260)
0.0966	0.0570	-0.810**
(0.137)	(0.176)	(0.320)
0.0286*	-0.00183	0 0273
(0.0155)	(0.0182)	(0.0243)
-0.00195	-0.00119	0.00910
(0.00195)	(0.00711)	(0.00737)
-1 103***	-0 817***	-0 782
(0.208)	(0.264)	(0.697)
(0.200)	(0.204)	(0.077)
489	268	221
0 522	0 382	0 585
	$\begin{array}{c} (0.125) \\ 0.0364 \\ (0.0707) \\ -0.101 \\ (0.0822) \\ -0.270^{**} \\ (0.107) \\ -0.0362 \\ (0.130) \\ \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} -0.718^{**} \\ (0.288) \\ -0.0723 \\ (0.135) \\ \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} -0.0379 \\ (0.216) \\ 0.125 \\ (0.0893) \\ 0.192^{***} \\ (0.0565) \\ \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} -0.205^{*} \\ (0.118) \\ -0.321^{**} \\ (0.128) \\ 0.0966 \\ (0.137) \\ 0.0286^{*} \\ (0.0155) \\ -0.00195 \\ (0.00445) \\ -1.103^{***} \\ (0.208) \\ \end{array}$	(0.125) (0.116) 0.0364 0.0549 (0.0707) (0.0852) -0.101 -0.0894 (0.0822) (0.103) -0.270^{**} -0.0397 (0.107) (0.0695) -0.362 -0.160 (0.130) (0.151) -0.718^{**} -0.883^{***} (0.288) (0.310) -0.0723 -0.0459 (0.135) (0.144) -0.0379 -0.101 (0.216) (0.250) 0.125 -0.0571 (0.0893) (0.105) 0.192^{***} 0.159^{***} (0.0565) (0.0569) -0.205^{*} -0.00434 (0.118) (0.158) -0.321^{**} -0.0495 (0.128) (0.149) 0.0966 0.0570 (0.137) (0.176) 0.0286^{*} -0.00183 (0.0155) (0.00711) -1.103^{***} -0.817^{***} (0.208) (0.264) 489 268 0.522 0.382

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.

• • •	(1)	(2)	(2)
VARIABIES	(1) Non-produce	(2) Produce	(3) Mille
Lunch Start Time (~ 11 am amittad)	11011-produce	Troduce	
Lunch Start Third (> 11 and Offlited) 11.00 11.50	0 20/***	0.170	0 177*
11.00 - 11.39	-0.294	-0.179	-0.1/2
Neen on later	(0.100)	(0.128)	(0.0923)
Noon of later	-0.521^{+++}	-0.132	-0.2/0
Not non-onted	(0.11/)	(0.134)	(0.0933)
Not reported	-0.300^{+++}	-0.309^{+++}	-0.383^{+++}
	(0.129)	(0.149)	(0.125)
Length of Lunch (< 30 mins omitted)	0.107	0 122	0.0405
30 mins	0.10/	0.133	-0.0495
× 20	(0.120)	(0.124)	(0.107)
> 30 mins	0.105	-0.194	0.103
	(0.189)	(0.190)	(0.183)
Not reported	-0.0511	0.0592	-0.310***
	(0.130)	(0.116)	(0.116)
Offer vs. Serve (serve omitted)	0.510444	0.405++++	0.0540
Offer	0.512***	0.425***	0.0540
	(0.108)	(0.109)	(0.115)
Not reported	0.205	0.0514	-0.0800
	(0.170)	(0.191)	(0.190)
Free & Reduced Lunch (<25% omitted)			
25-49%	0.0960	0.415***	0.109
	(0.126)	(0.120)	(0.113)
50-74%	0.0261	0.629***	0.147
	(0.120)	(0.134)	(0.127)
75% or more	-0.234**	0.241**	0.228**
	(0.0978)	(0.0974)	(0.0974)
Not reported	0.177	0.297**	0.195
	(0.133)	(0.141)	(0.225)
Grades Served (elementary omitted)			
Middle & high school	-0.354***	-0.461***	-0.688***
	(0.0799)	(0.0825)	(0.0829)
Not reported	0.334	-0.271*	. ,
	(0.271)	(0.151)	
School Size (<500 students omitted)	× /	` '	
500 – 999 students	-0.709***	-0.992***	-0.611***
	(0.204)	(0.142)	(0.203)
1000 or more students	0.269	-0.910***	-0.814***
	(0.404)	(0.245)	(0.309)
Milk Service Method (in cartons omitted)	()	()	()
By dispenser or jug	-0.301**	-0.135	-1.413***
J T JO	(0.125)	(0.144)	(0.178)
Not reported	0 448***	0 261	0 321
1.00 Teporton	(0.177)	(0.138)	(0.138)
Not reported	(0.125) 0.448^{***} (0.177)	(0.144) 0.261 (0.138)	(0.178) 0.321 (0.138)

164 Table 4. Waste by Food Type Regression Results.

	(1)	(2)	(3)
VARIABLES	Non-produce	Produce	Milk
School in WWF Program	0 0448	0.0640	-0 139
School III w wr i Togram	(0.135)	(0.173)	(0.13)
Interventions Implemented (none omitted)	(0.155)	(0.175)	(0.200)
1 intervention (curricular)	-0.0205	0.0120	0 0396
	(0.107)	(0.0937)	(0.116)
> 1 intervention (curricular + other)	-0 207	-0 295***	-0.0201
	(0.140)	(0.101)	(0.108)
1 intervention (non-curricular)	-0 214	-0 365***	-0 200
i intervention (non currentia)	(0.144)	(0.134)	(0.155)
> 1 intervention (non-curricular)	0.150	-0.282*	0.0299
	(0.209)	(0.155)	(0.244)
Time Period (pre-COVID omitted)	(0.20))	(0.122)	(0.211)
During COVID (Autum '20 – Spring '21)	-0 463*	0.611	0.121
During CO (ID (Rutuin 20 Spring 21)	(0.281)	(0.405)	(0.281)
Post COVID (Summer '21 or later)	-0.0177	0 418**	-0.185
	(0.199)	(0.164)	(0.163)
Season (Spring omitted)	(0.199)	(0.101)	(0.105)
Summer	-0 471*	-0.337	0.0662
Summer	(0.262)	(0.472)	(0.368)
Autumn	0 370***	-0.0919	0 357**
	(0.123)	(0.127)	(0.138)
Winter	0 317***	0.0415	0 230***
	(0.0788)	(0.0847)	(0.0829)
Region (Northeast omitted)	(0.0700)	(0.0017)	(0.002)
West	-0.666***	0.406	-0.0429
	(0.144)	(0.255)	(0.204)
Midwest	-0.847***	0.0729	-0.303
	(0.157)	(0.259)	(0.210)
South	-0.347*	0.879***	-0.0121
	(0.194)	(0.252)	(0.208)
Number of entrees served	0.00892	0.0365	0.0318
	(0.0240)	(0.0224)	(0.0219)
Number of previous audits	0.00618	-0.00708	0.00503
1	(0.00624)	(0.00795)	(0.00666
Constant	-1.965***	-3.307***	-1.986**
	(0.292)	(0.338)	(0.296)
Observations	482	445	427
R-squared	0.399	0.376	0.486

168 School Meal Service Characteristics

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

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.

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

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

194 [Figure 3 here]

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

198

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

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

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

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

216 School and Student Characteristics

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

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

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

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

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

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

258 Discussion

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

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

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

- Several of our results are consistent with suggestions proffered in the literature for schools to reduce plate waste. For example, Buzby and Guthrie (2002) suggest that very early or very late lunch periods may increase waste, and our results confirm that waste was greatest for meals served prior to 11 am with the difference being statistically significant from waste observed during meals served between 12 noon and 1 pm. Also, the waste created during meals between 11 and 12 is significantly greater than those during the noon hour (p=0.033).
- Buzby and Guthrie (2002) and Cohen et al. (2021) find evidence that very short lunch periods exacerbate plate waste. We find this to hold among elementary students in our sample who are given less than 30 minutes to consume lunch rather than 30 minutes or more (Table 3, column 2), but not to hold for older students (Table 3, column 3). Figure 3 juxtaposes these two factors and suggests that combination of lunch periods that are short in duration (< 30 m) and early in the day (before 11 am) yield the largest reports of per student waste in our sample.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

371 repeated measurement and waste levels in this sample should not discourage schools from372 engaging in measurement.

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

377

378 Conclusions

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

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

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

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

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

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

434

435

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
- 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.
- Capps, O., Ishdorj, A., Murano, P. S., Field, L., Hutto, A., & Storey, M. (2019). Waste Not Want
 Not. Choices, 34(1), 1-8.
- Chapman, L. E., Cohen, J., Canterberry, M., & Carton, T. W. (2017). Factors associated with
 school lunch consumption: Reverse recess and school "brunch". Journal of the Academy of
 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.
- Haas, J., Cunningham-Sabo, L., & Auld, G. (2014). Plate waste and attitudes among high school
 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.
- D., ... & Khan, N. A. (2019). School lunch timing and children's physical activity during recess:
 an exploratory study. Journal of nutrition education and behavior, 51(5), 616-622.
- Price, J., & Just, D. R. (2015). Lunch, recess and nutrition: Responding to time incentives in the
 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: <u>https://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/pub-details/?pubid=84339</u>
 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, Oceguera 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 <u>http://assets.worldwildlife.org/educators_toolkit_files/29/toolkit_files/original/Student_Food_Wa</u>
- 482 ste Audit FINAL 4-6-2017.pdf?1511297805& ga=2.261716109.1815262156.1691233805-
- 483 <u>929868070.1689533680</u> (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 <u>https://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/food-nutrition-assistance/child-nutrition-programs/national-</u>
- 491 <u>school-lunch-program/</u> (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 <u>https://www.worldwildlife.org/publications/the-business-case-for-transitioning-to-bulk-milk-</u>
- 497 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 <u>https://www.worldwildlife.org/teaching-resources/toolkits/be-a-food-waste-warrior</u> (accessed 5
- 500 August 2023).



Fig1



Fig2



Fig3