

Cafeteria Supervision

Denise J. Uitto

Ashland University

Abstract

Cafeteria supervision is a non-glamorous, unwanted aspect of the elementary principal's role in the public schools. Supervision of the cafeteria practices in order to decrease the budget deficits in one elementary school in North central Ohio was the focus of this study. Changes in the monitoring practices of the paraprofessional staff members, changes in procedures within the lunchroom, and changes in the lunches offered to students were made within the course of the first year. Maintenance of the practices was critical to the continued success of the cafeteria supervision project and occurred during the second year. Progress was noted through increased number of lunches served, decrease of funds borrowed to support the cafeteria budget, and improved monitoring practices of the lunchroom by staff.

Cafeteria supervision

The rationale for studying the climate of the lunchroom relates to its effects upon the students and their learning in the classrooms. Although specific research on the climate of the cafeteria or the lunchroom programs is lacking, staff and parents commented about the need to develop a lunchroom that allows students to eat their lunch in a quiet, relaxed environment.

Freiberg (1998) believes the school climate ranges from the quality of interactions between staff and students to the noise levels in the cafeteria. "A healthy school climate contributes to effective teaching and learning" (p. 22). The climate can be developed by the occurrences in the classroom and hallways, on the playground, and in the cafeteria. Therefore, the lunchroom and playground climates can have an adverse effect or a positive effect on the achievement levels of students in their classrooms.

The noise levels in the cafeteria may have a relationship to the stress of students. “Often, it is believed that student behavior is a healthy response to an unhealthy situation” (Freiberg, 1998, p. 25). The noise in the lunchroom may be a contributing factor to the discipline issues in the cafeteria or on the playground.

Albert (1992) states a change in thinking is needed from control to cooperation and from intimidation to encouragement. Students need to be permitted to exercise some control of their environment. Their cooperation, rather than control exerted by adults, will assist them in developing responsibility for choosing appropriate behaviors when given the opportunity. This means that the type of interactions and means of rewarding or providing consequences for inappropriate actions needs to be modified when supervision is controlling of students’ behaviors. Punitive measures and threats need to be changed to reinforcement of student manners and socially appropriate interactions with adults and each other.

The study by Freiberg (1992) on lunchroom climates indicates that small changes in the lunchroom could affect student learning. This project focused upon solutions to the current lunchroom practices that would create a quiet, relaxed environment for students to eat their lunch. The solutions included a modification of procedures, training for the lunchroom monitors on supervision and discipline practices with large groups of students, and gathering ideas from students to improve the lunchroom environment. While the practices in the cafeteria were the main focus for improvement, the lunch program was closely tied to the playground practices because the monitors who assisted in the cafeteria also supervised the recess program. Therefore the playground practices including the supervision of students became a secondary, yet important focus for this project.

Method

This qualitative research study was completed in an elementary school building of 465 students from kindergarten to grade 6 in North central Ohio. It was performed in order to improve the services to students in the lunchroom and during recess and to reduce the cafeteria budget deficits. Interviews of the lunchroom/playground monitors and the

cafeteria director were used, as well as surveys and discussions with students. The elementary principal and cafeteria monitor completed structured observations of the cafeteria practices. Professional development experiences were offered to the lunchroom monitors based upon insights from observations and interviews. A committee at Ashland University approved the human subjects review form.

Participants

The participants included four monitors who served both as lunchroom and playground supervisors, one cafeteria director, one elementary principal, students selected by their individual teachers from grades 3 – 6, and classrooms of students in grades 3 – 6. The small groups of students were selected to participate in a student committee designed to provide ideas for student responsibility for the lunchroom and playground practices.

Data collection methods

Structured observations

The initial assessment from structured observations of the lunchroom climate provided a means for the lunchroom monitor to rate aspects of routines, conversations, cleanup, and student behaviors. The principal rated these same aspects and differences were noted creating some initial conflict for the reasons procedural changes were needed. The monitors provided their input on an indoor recess survey during the winter months.

Lunch counts

The cafeteria director maintained daily lunch counts that were recorded into a monthly report. In addition to the number of lunches sold, including free and reduced price lunches supported through Federal government subsidies, the director recorded the funds collected each month for a report to the district treasurer.

Interviews

Structured interviews were held with the four lunchroom/playground monitors. I met with each of them individually or in pairs, depending upon our time limitations. The questions posed to them include the following.

1. What would you want for a cafeteria lunch program for your own children?
List some of the things you would see happening and some of the comments

you would hear from your children and adults who supervise the lunch program that you envision.

2. What steps would be needed in order to create your vision of a cafeteria lunch program at O.H. Somers Elementary School? List the resources needed to create and maintain your vision.
3. How may I assist you with the creation and maintenance of this vision?
4. Other comments that you have?

In addition, I discussed my observations and plans for surveys or interviews with the cafeteria director. As I did this, we held informal conversations with information integrated into the results of the study.

Student committee work

Casual student input was initially gathered because students began to seek my attention for concerns they had on the playground. A plan was developed to hold informal student discussions within the fifth grade classrooms. These students were the most vocal about concerns. After listening to their ideas, student committees were formed. The classroom teachers in grades 3 -6 selected one student from the class to be a representative on a student committee. The students met during their lunch period and gave ideas for consequences for behaviors in the lunchroom and on the playground. They also suggested games and formulated rules for games on the playground. These students provided input for a survey to assess indoor recess practices.

Student lunch discussions

As I gained insights from students on the playground practices, I asked the cafeteria director to join me in discussions with students about the lunchroom program. These discussions were short in duration, approximately 15 – 20 minutes in length and occurred in grades 3 – 6. We decided to focus upon these students because our concerns and the concerns reported to us were from the older age groups. We developed these five questions to ask students during full class discussions.

- How many of you have never eaten a cafeteria lunch? Why?
- What are the best and worst things about the school cafeteria?
- If you could change three things about the cafeteria, what would they be and how would you do this?

- How can you help to create a calm, quiet place so you can enjoy eating your lunch?
- What privileges or rewards would you like if a quiet cafeteria was maintained?

Student surveys

A final aspect of student input was gathered through surveys of the students. Two paper-pencil surveys were requested from students to gather ideas about favorite foods, foods to add to or remove from the current school menu, and one item the students wanted to change about the lunch program. A copy of the student food questionnaire appears in Appendix A.

Results

Structured observations

Observations of the lunchroom procedures and the lunchroom staff showed students and staff walking throughout the lunch period, supervision maintained from a corner spot in the cafeteria, and a traffic light blaring when the noise level was loud. Punitive discipline tended to be the only form of interaction with the students. When students waited in lengthy lines or were reprimanded repeatedly, the cafeteria director did not believe they would be likely to purchase a lunch.

The lunchroom monitors arrived at 11:15 a.m. daily for their duties as lunchroom and playground supervisors. They sauntered through the building to the office. They signed their time sheets and gathered the packs they wore with band-aids for recess duty. When they walked to the cafeteria, two of them consistently ate lunch while waiting for the students. This time prior to the students' arrival gave me an opportunity to talk with them about their duties and their perspectives on the lunchroom and playground practices.

The students entered the lunchroom in groups of two grade levels. First/second, third/fourth, and fifth/sixth grade students entered at three scheduled times. The lunch schedule began at 11:40a.m. for the first and second grade students, 12:05p.m. for the third and fourth grade students, and 12:30p.m. for the fifth and sixth grade students. Through a record of time intervals, it was noted that it took ten minutes for all students to receive

their individual lunch tray. Therefore, the students who were last served in the lunch line had ten minutes to eat lunch prior to the monitors sending them outside for recess. Students were either rushing to eat or staying late to finish eating. The monitors reminded students they had to eat and not talk so they could finish their lunch and go outside to recess. The students who had money to buy ice cream or a cookie were often denied the opportunity because they had not finished eating their lunch and were rushed to go to recess. The students who finished eating were throwing away their trash and taking their trays to the dishwashing station throughout the lunch period. Often they chatted to other students along the way. Due to the building facilities, students returning their trays to the dishwashing station used the same hallway as students entering the cafeteria with their lunch tray. Younger students tried to manage their silverware and tray while picking up a milk carton from the large refrigerated ice chest. Spilled trays of food resulted from collisions or tiny hands not being able to hold onto the multiple items.

Several years previously a traffic light complete with a loud buzzer was purchased to manage the noise level in the cafeteria. The buzzer sounded and students quieted for a few seconds, then returned to their conversations. Students learned to trigger the buzzer by talking loud while waiting in the lunch line. The buzzer went off on a fairly regular basis for the third/fourth and fifth/sixth grades.

The lunchroom monitors randomly walked around the cafeteria, chatted to one another or assisted a student who needed help opening a food container. They typically collected themselves at the front of the cafeteria. Students talked, traded food items, threw away small pieces of trash several times, and took their tray to the dishwashing section during their lunchtime. As the project observer, the cafeteria looked like a noisy space filled with confusion where students were herded like animals through a scheduled part of their day.

During the first month of school, the form "How's It Going?" was completed by one lunchroom monitor and myself as the project observer for each lunchroom period (Novak & Strohmer, 1998). This lunchroom monitor consistently stayed in the lunchroom for monitoring the students while the other three monitors went to the playground for recess

supervision. During our four days of observation, the traffic light buzzer never rang for the first/second grades. It rang four times during the third/fourth grade lunch when hot dogs were served and one time on two observed days for the fifth/sixth grades. The results of our observations are listed below.

1. Children entered the lunchroom in a boisterous manner for a rating of 1 or courteous manner for a rating of 5.

| | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| First/Second Grades - Average of 4.5 by the lunchroom monitor | Average of 2.5 by the principal |
| <i>Third/Fourth Grades – Average of 3.5 by the lunchroom monitor</i> | Average of 2.0 by the principal |
| Fifth/Sixth Grades – Average of 3.9 by the lunchroom monitor | Average of 2.5 by the principal |

2. Routines for getting lunches were time-consuming for a rating of 1 or smooth and efficient for a rating of 5.

| | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| First/Second Grades – Average of 4.7 by the lunchroom monitor | Average of 2.0 by the principal |
| Third/Fourth Grades – Average of 4.0 by the lunchroom monitor | Average of 2.0 by the principal |
| Fifth/Sixth Grades – Average of 4.0 by the lunchroom monitor | Average of 2.0 by the principal |

3. Conversations levels of children were loud and unpleasant for a rating of 1 or pleasant and reasonable for a rating of 5.

| | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| First/Second Grades – Average of 3.2 by the lunchroom monitor | Average of 3.0 by the principal |
| Third/Fourth Grades – Average of 2.5 by the lunchroom monitor | Average of 2.0 by the principal |
| Fifth/Sixth Grades – Average of 3.2 by the lunchroom monitor | Average of 2.0 by the principal |

4. The table manners of children were poor and inappropriate for a rating of 1 or polite and appropriate for a rating of 5.

| | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| First/Second Grades – Average of 3.2 by the lunchroom monitor | Average of 3.0 by the principal |
| Third/Fourth Grades – Average of 2.5 by the lunchroom monitor | Average of 2.0 by the principal |
| Fifth/Sixth Grades – Average of 2.7 by the lunchroom monitor | Average of 2.0 by the principal |

5. During cleanup time, children were rowdy for a rating of 1 or cooperative for a rating of 5.

| | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| First/Second Grades – Average of 2.5 by the lunchroom monitor | Average of 2.0 by the principal |
| Third/Fourth Grades – Average of 2.5 by the lunchroom monitor | Average of 2.0 by the principal |
| Fifth/Sixth Grades – Average of 3.5 by the lunchroom monitor | Average of 2.0 by the principal |

6. The condition of the lunchroom after children left was messy for a rating of 1 or cooperative for a rating of 5.

| | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| First/Second Grades – Average of 3.2 by the lunchroom monitor | Average of 3.0 by the principal |
| Third/Fourth Grades – Average of 2.2 by the lunchroom monitor | Average of 2.0 by the principal |
| Fifth/Sixth Grades – Average of 3.0 by the lunchroom monitor | Average of 3.0 by the principal |

7. Children left the lunchroom in a disorderly manner for a rating of 1 or an orderly manner for a rating of 5.

| | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| First/Second Grades – Average of 3.2 by the lunchroom monitor | Average of 2.5 by the principal |
| Third/Fourth Grades – Average of 3.9 by the lunchroom monitor | Average of 2.0 by the principal |
| Fifth/Sixth Grades – Average of 3.2 by the lunchroom monitor | Average of 3.0 by the principal |

I consistently rated the lunchroom practices equal to or lower than the rating given by the lunchroom monitor. The monitor indicated that these ratings were typical of the lunchroom program. My expectations for a quiet cafeteria with procedures to follow rather than students and monitors randomly walking around seemed to be higher than the monitors.

Lunch counts

In addition to the concerns found through observations of the lunchroom, the number of student meals served in November of the first year ranged from a low of 168 to a high of 248 for a total of 3769, an average daily lunch count of 209. The cafeteria budget began with approximately \$20,000 being supported through the general fund from the school system. The goal for the cafeteria services program was to reduce the amount of board supported funding.

The current lunch count ranges from a low of 230 to a high of 287 for a total lunch count. In addition, the cafeteria budget began the current year with approximately \$13,000 being supported through the general fund from the school system, approximately \$7000.00 less than the previous school year. The cafeteria budget, although expenditures are not equal to revenue, is becoming more balanced. Except for carryover funds from the previous school year, the cafeteria budget has not been supported at all by the general funds during the second year of implementation. The goal to reduce the board-supported funds for operating the food services program was met.

Interviews

Conversations with the cafeteria supervisor indicated concern with the climate of the lunchroom, specifically due to the lunchroom monitors' interactions with students. The students in grade 5 expressed their thoughts on the lack of supervision for the behaviors of students and the lack of consequences when students disobeyed the rules or hurt another student. These students wanted more activities to play during recess time and wanted to have fair consequences given to students who misbehaved. The concerns expressed by the students provided me with a deeper understanding of the problem I was facing with personnel issues. As the cafeteria supervisor and I had originally stated the monitors set the climate in the lunchroom, they were setting the climate on the playground too. The focus on personnel was an appropriate point to begin.

Information gathered from the lunchroom/playground monitors provided a clear picture of the direction of the study. Targeting the human resources and their professional needs to understand how to supervise students became an aspect of the process necessary to reduce the budget concerns. The cafeteria director and I noted the impact these individuals made upon the climate of the lunchroom and the student services provided therein. How to initiate changes in their behaviors was critical to the success of the project. A copy of the responses by the monitors to the initial interview questions is presented in Appendix B.

Student committee work

Throughout the winter months, students talked with me during their lunch and sometimes, their recess times. We discussed rules for the playground, activities and rules for these activities, and disciplinary consequences. The students created a schedule for playing games such as basketball, dodge ball, kickball, flag football, volleyball, and soccer. In addition, they identified how many players on a team to create safe, friendly games rather than competitive games.

We talked about the concerns they had from the lack of supervision or if they brought a problem to the monitors, how they were ignored and the problem not solved. Students

were asked to share ideas from the committee with their classmates and I included the decisions from the committee into the staff memos. I maintained communication with the monitors so they knew what the student committee decided and the concerns being expressed by the students. Ultimately, the playground practices were modified to include new games to play with limited number of students on a team and rules to monitor the games.

During the winter months, indoor recess was a common practice. Students expressed their concerns with the lack of games or activities to play during the indoor recess times. I surveyed both the monitors and the students on the committee and found great discrepancy with perceptions on the indoor recess practices. The monitors indicated that the current state of the indoor recess practices was “super” for all six assessment questions prior to the introduction of games. The students in grades three/four and five/six indicated that before the introduction of games, the practices were between “poor” and “acceptable.” Once indoor recess games were available, the students indicated that the practices were between “acceptable” and “super” for four of the six assessment questions. The students in grades three and four indicated that they did not have a quiet area to read/play and the monitors did not use effective methods to reduce the noise levels. The results from the students are in Appendix C.

Student Lunch discussions

After the cafeteria director and I went into classrooms and listened to the students present their ideas, we made notes to ourselves of other items that needed to be considered for change. Students liked the ice cream and cookies being sold as snacks, conversations with friends, and beanie baby give-aways. They did not like the traffic light, loud conversations, silent lunches as a consequence of loud conversations, the long lines waiting for lunch causing shortened time to eat, same food choices being offered repeatedly, and the change in procedures so they cannot throw trash away or chat with friends when they chose.

The most desired changes were taking away the traffic light, having “free seating” to sit next to friends not with their classmates, larger variety of food choices and dressings for salads, more time to eat and play at recess, rewards for quiet lunch behaviors, and consequences for specific students who are loud. The students overwhelmingly stated that they needed to talk softly and remind others to talk quietly in order to create a calm place to eat lunch. The rewards or privileges requested by the students included “free seating,” ice cream or cookie treats, and special activities like movies at lunchtime or extra recess.

Student surveys

Based upon the results of the first survey of food items, the cafeteria director and I planned new menu items and ways to address the changes most needed in the lunchroom. The survey reinforced the need to address the monitors and their supervision strategies. It was also noted that the traffic light needed to be taken out of the cafeteria. The students wanted to try new salad dressings and they were given the option to choose their dressing at the condiments table located within the lunchroom. The results of the food survey are included in Appendix D.

At the end of the school year, the cafeteria supervisor and I asked the students for their opinion of the changes that occurred in the lunchroom and on the playground. When using seventy percent as an indicator of the students liking a given change, the students agreed to these changes being implemented: removing the traffic light; introducing new food items; utilizing Ranch and Italian dressings; banners on the cafeteria walls; free seating for students in grades five and six; eating lunch on the picnic table; providing new activities for recess; changing supervision strategies at recess; providing rewards for quiet lunch; offering dip for celery and carrots; and giving salsa for walking taco meals. The students, primarily because of the type of music offered, did not enjoy the introduction of music at lunch.

Professional Development

Based upon the observations of the monitors in the lunchroom and at recess, plus the comments from parents, students, and teachers about the action of the monitors during the

first semester of school, a plan to address professional development needs was written. The monitors were asked what questions/concerns they had to be able to address their needs. Funding to cover their additional time was budgeted from the building budget and a schedule was developed with the district's director of instruction. The focus of this professional development plan was on discipline of students including supervision practices for managing large groups of children. Four sessions of staff development were offered to the four monitors during the first year of implementation.

The first session focused upon the reasons for the trainings and the reasons students misbehave. Supervision, punishment, positive reinforcement, and consistency were discussed during the second session. During the third session, the monitors wrote a discipline report, discussed difficult situations, and role-played situations. The last session was geared to cafeteria management, rules, and consequences.

The monitors were reminded to supervise specific areas of the playground and walk continually to observe students and watch for concerns. A cellular telephone and megaphone have been provided to the monitors for gathering students and addressing any safety issues. The monitors were reminded to use the discipline reports so that tracking of reports permitting the follow-up of disciplinary problems. The monitors seemed to appreciate the opportunity to gain different insights into the behaviors of students and requested ideas about managing students on the playground. The monitors requested first aid training, which was provided by our school nurse. The evaluation forms indicated that the monitors felt involved in the discussions, liked the training on playground rules, and appreciated the director of instruction as their presenter.

Discussion

Conclusions

Ultimately the cafeteria supervision study provided data to support the need for professional development for classified staff members, specifically lunchroom/playground monitors supervising large groups of students. The involvement of monitors and the students while gathering data and then as part of the decisions made to improve the

lunchroom and playground practices served to empower personnel and create ownership for the practices designed. Leadership “is working with and through other people to achieve organizational goals” (Owens, 2001, p. 239). Students became involved with the improvement of the lunchroom and playground practices. Their personal commitment to the effort was obvious through their attendance and the agreement on decisions they reached. Students had not been previously asked for their input in decisions that impacted them and letters were sent to the principal in appreciation of the new equipment and permitting the students to have a voice in the lunchroom and recess practices.

Changes in the procedures being used in the lunchroom were noted as effective by the monitors. The procedures instituted included giving the first and second grade students their milk on the tray; maintaining all students in their seats until recess begins therefore decreasing the number of students walking around in the cafeteria; changing the lunch schedule to permit five minutes between grade levels; and assigning specific sections of the lunchroom and playground for the monitors to supervise. The monitors use the new discipline reports and offer immediate consequences for misbehavior.

The procedures that were changed in the lunchroom and supervision practices, the professional development provided as training for the monitors on supervision and discipline for large groups of students, and the ideas from students for improving the lunch and playground programs were the focus of this project. The leadership strategies used and fostered within others in conjunction with the understanding of school climate and the change process permitted the overall improvement of the lunchroom program for the benefit of students.

The current climate of the lunchroom provides students with time to eat without being rushed due to a revised schedule, procedures for disposing of trash and emptying trays being maintained in order to reduce confusion and noise levels, and students with a quieter environment to enjoy conversations with peers. The lunchroom monitors interact with the students and utilize disciplinary consequences reflective of the issue rather than yelling or punitive measures. The monitors are creative in thinking of new activities for students or

changing the activities for them to play. They also discuss practices to ensure students are properly supervised. Additional opportunities for professional development sessions are met with enthusiasm as a time to discuss their concern and develop new strategies for working with the students.

The lunchroom one year ago was a chaotic place with students standing in long lines and rushed to eat their lunches and the playground held few activities for students and discipline concerns were frequent. The monitors agree that twelve of their original fifteen statements about what they wanted for a cafeteria lunch program had been accomplished. The students and monitors follow procedures designed to create a relaxed, quieter environment. The discipline problems have significantly lessened on the playground with few parent complaints being given within the second school year.

The monitors were the key to the implementation and accomplishment of this project, which speaks to human resources being the most valuable asset a school system has to accomplish its mission.

Implications

Based upon a general pedagogical knowledge model for classroom teachers, the professional development plan for the monitors addressed their roles as supervisors of the lunchroom and playground, their knowledge of students' development, and the implementation of management techniques appropriate to the varying ages of the students (Borko and Putnam, 1995). Based upon the premise that adult learning is problem-oriented, the impetus for the four two-hour sessions came from the monitors' stated need to address the issues of student behaviors (Smylie, 1995).

Finding an "optimal mix" of professional development activities (Guskey, 1995) was important. The needs of the lunchroom monitors had to be addressed while facilitating change in organizational processes. I was able to utilize the fifteen-minute meetings prior to the monitors beginning their duties with students to discuss procedural changes and

small issues of daily importance. The two-hour meetings with the director of instruction balanced more intensive aspects of professional development.

Burns (as cited in Owens, 2001) discussed the result of transformational leader as being a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation to convert followers into leaders. The development of a shared vision, the implementation of professional development practices, and the reflection of the monitors and students directly impacted by the lunchroom and playground practices. The commitment by the principal to changing a lunchroom climate to one that is safe and quiet promoted the basis for the followers to become leaders. The monitors currently make decisions on discipline, discuss ideas for strategies for supervising students, and suggest returning to the students for further ideas on what needs to occur for the lunchroom to remain a quiet environment. As conflicts ensue, they are discussing how to resolve issues and request help to solve problems. The monitors request time to talk and seem to be enjoying the interactions with students and each other as part of their daily work.

As Sergiovanni (as cited in Owens, 2001) reported in his research on teachers, teachers want to achieve feelings of competence and respect. Job security or salaries do not motivate them. Within this school climate, the monitors have not requested tangible rewards or payment. They have demonstrated competence in their daily work and do not complain about a lack of respect, as they once did. The educational leader or principal for this project played an important role in the monitor's motivation and the facilitative approach utilized to support the monitors as they grew in their roles as supervisors for the lunchroom and playground practices.

As defined by Getzels-Guba model (as cited in Owens, 2001), the behaviors of individuals are equal to the function to the interaction of people and the environment. The roles of the monitors, the climate created, and the personalities of the monitors have interacted to create the organizational behaviors most conducive to a quiet, relaxed environment for students to enjoy their lunch and be safe while playing on the playground.

Recommendations

The future of this project will be dependent upon the maintenance of procedures, the continuation of strategies developed to interact with students, and purchasing of equipment to promote activities with students on the playground. Continued discussions for disciplinary actions and on-going professional development programs are necessary to solidify the changes in behaviors by the monitors and provide new strategies for addressing student activities.

References

- Albert, L. (1992). *An administrator's guide to cooperative discipline: Strategies for schoolwide implementation*. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Services, Inc.
- Borko, H. & Putnam, R.T. (1995). Expanding a teacher's knowledge base: A cognitive psychological perspective on professional development. In T.R. Guskey & M. Huberman (Eds.), *Professional development in education: New paradigms and practices* (pp. 35-65). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Freiberg, H.J. (1998). Measuring school climate: Let me count the ways. *Educational Leadership*, 56, 22-26.
- Guskey, T.R. (1995). Professional development in education: In search of the optimal mix (pp. 114-131). In T.R. Guskey & M. Huberman (Eds.), *Professional development in education: New paradigms and practices*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Owens, R.G. (2001). *Organizational behavior in education: Instructional leadership and school reform* (7th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Smylie, M.A. (1995). Teacher learning in the workplace: Implications for school reform. In T.R. Guskey & M. Huberman (Eds.), *Professional development in education: New paradigms and practices* (pp. 92-113). New York: Teachers College Press.

Bibliography

Behavior management on the bus. Retrieved January 6, 2002, from Iowa Department of Education Web site:<http://www.state.ia.us/educate/programs/transportation/behavmod.html>

Flag football rules. Retrieved August 13, 2002, from Hyde Park Baptist Church Web site:
http://www.hpbc.org/rec/rules_football.html

Novak, D.E. (2000). *Help! It's an indoor recess day.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Novak, D.E. & Strohmer, J.C. (1998) *You don't have to dread cafeteria duty: A guide to surviving lunchroom, recess, bus, and "other assigned duties."* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Playground rules, tether ball rules & foursquare rules. Retrieved October 31, 2002, from Friendly Hills Elementary School Web site: <http://www.joshuatreevillage.com/555/play>

Strategies for increasing positive student behaviors. Retrieved December 5, 2001, from Project PARA Web site: <http://www.para.unl.edu/para/Behavior/lesson4.html>

Appendix A**Please complete this survey by yourself.**

Grade level _____

What is your favorite meal at home?

What is your favorite fruit? Favorite vegetable?

What is your favorite meal at school?

What kinds of food would you like to eat in the cafeteria?

What foods do you think could be added to the cafeteria menu?

What foods do you think could be taken off the cafeteria menu?

How do people treat each other in our cafeteria? What do you think of that?

What do you think about how our cafeteria looks? What would you change?

What kinds of soup would you like to eat in the cafeteria?

Do you like the salad dressing? If not, do you have another dressing you would like to have for your salads?

What is the most important thing to you that needs to be changed in the cafeteria?

Thank you for completing this survey.

Appendix B

Lunch Program Comments

October 15-18, 2001

I. What would you want for a cafeteria lunch program for your own children? List some of the things you would see happening and some of the comments you would hear from your children and adults who supervise the lunch program that you envision.

- Want a relaxed environment
- Students to talk quietly and have quiet conversations
- Students to sit in their seats
- Students to throw away trash when all finished and not throw away each piece of trash prior to finishing their meal
- Students to respect for adults and each other
- Students to use manners and clean up after themselves
- Students to ask to be excused from the tables
- Want quiet voices and need quiet for safety reasons
- Students to be released to go outside and be orderly as they leave
- Want one set of rules for taking lunch by class
- Want one set of rules for dismissing students to recess and what to do with lunchboxes as students go to recess, what to do with coats
- Want one set of rules for cafeteria and playground so teachers, monitors, students and parents all know the same rules
- Want a set of consequences for breaking the rules
- Students to stay in seat and not go to visit other students or other tables
- Want consistent set of rules between teachers and monitors for playground – use of toys and equipment, etc.

II. What steps would be needed in order to create your vision of a cafeteria lunch program at O.H.Somers Elementary Schools? List the resources needed to create and maintain your vision.

- Remind students of whose room was the quietest and had clean tables when they finished eating
- Provide reinforcers to students such as suckers or sticker; a reinforcer for a week of quiet and having a clean table such as popcorn or pizza after one month
- Kids are beginning to ask about who has the quietest table
- Re-teach students manners such as: no pushing, no stomping on feet, sitting in order they come through the line and not saving seats, and quiet conversations
- Request teachers to remind students about coats and lunchboxes
- Quiet lunch line assisted by monitors
- Talk with the students about what they like to eat and choices for good behavior
- Give students choices
- Silent lunch period works for third and fourth grade students- who decides what the consequence should be?

- Quietest line gets a sticker or sucker, candy, popcorn, gum or free Homework pass for older students
- Note to parents about the rules
- Request a different time to hand out the stickers for buyers – try to hand out in the classroom, older students put the stickers on others and the younger students lose their stickers or coupons; giving out stickers in the lunch line takes time and slows the lunch line down
- Rewards – on Friday, students can sit in a different spot if they have displayed good behaviors all week
- Teachers and monitors to remind students to get their money or ticket ready – unroll their dollars, take money out of their wallets
- Assist students to get through the line quicker
- Remind the students that they need to know what they want and they will get through the line quicker
- Ask students what their most favorite meal is – maybe teachers can do this
- Cafeteria staff can help classes understand nutrition and the lunch menu nutritional aspects and how these fit into the health curriculum
- Ask students why they have never eaten a cafeteria lunch – discuss an incentive to try a lunch, possibly have a free cookie day
- Use free samples to encourage students to try a cafeteria lunch
- Have cooks go into the lunchroom and talk with the students
- Need quiet in the hallways to encourage quiet behavior in the lunchroom

III. **How may I assist you with the creation and maintenance of this vision?**

- Time, resources, funding after lunch to go and talk with students
- Reminder to staff that lunch count is important to monitor
- Request staff to put a note of how many extra items are requested by students to assure an accurate count-maybe use an extra ticket to know who requested the extra items

IV. **Other comments**

- Children use the traffic light as a challenge right now
- The earlier time for first and second grade student to go through the line helped
- Remind students to wear coats or tie around their waist, they cannot throw in a pile or return to classrooms
- What to do with kids who do not have coats in the cold weather?
- Students to be allowed to stay in for recess upon teacher request – how to know this?
- Need to explain the meaning of a choice lunch program to staff
- Sell cookies with a high school group at lunchtime to increase profits, split the cost of the cookies with the group sponsoring the project at the high school
- Students standing behind the line has helped with the congestion in the lunch line
- Lunch menu in the school bell is important to parents

Appendix C

Indoor Recess Assessment Student Survey

Indicate the extent to which each of the following is presently occurring. Use the following 3 point scale: 1 = poor; 3 = acceptable; 5 = super.

| Before Games being available | | After Games being available |
|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| 2.0 | We have a quiet area to read or play during indoor recess. | 3.0 |
| 2.0 | We have supplies for an art activity. | 3.3 |
| 1.6 | We have an adequate supply of indoor recess supplies. | 4.8 |
| 2.0 | We have agreed-on standards or rules of conduct for indoor recess. | 3.0 |
| 2.4 | We can get a drink or use the restroom by a procedure agreed-on by all. | 3.0 |
| 2.4 | Effective methods are used by the playground monitors for reducing noise levels. | 4.0 |

Appendix D

| Question | Grade 3 | Grade 4 | Grade 5 | Grade 6 |
|-----------------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|
| Favorite Fruit? | total 65 | total 52 | total 41 | total 47 |
| Peaches | 7 / 10.8% | 6 / 11.5% | 2/ 4.9% | 2/ 4.3% |
| Grapes | 11 / 16.9% | 4 / 7.7% | 2/ 4.9% | 7/ 14.9% |
| Pears | 6 / 9.2% | 3 / 5.8% | 2/ 4.9% | 7/ 14.9% |
| Apples | 19 / 29.2% | 20 / 38.5% | 17/ 41.5% | 7/ 14.9% |
| Oranges | 8 / 12.3% | 3 / 5.8% | 8/ 19.5% | 3/ 6.4% |
| Others | 14 / 21.6% | 16 / 30.7% | 10/ 24.4% | 21/ 44.7% |
| | | | | |
| Favorite Vegetable? | total 54 | total 45 | total 41 | total 39 |
| Corn | 10 / 18.5% | 6 / 13.3% | 7 / 17.1% | 8/ 20.5% |
| Carrots | 24 / 44.4% | 17 / 37.8% | 18/ 43.9% | 8. 20.5% |
| Celery | 5 / 9.3% | 1 / 2.2% | 3/ 7.37% | 7/ 17.9% |
| Green beans | 3/ 5% | 4 / 8.9% | 8 / 19.5% | 2/ 5.1% |
| Others | 15 / 27.8% | 17 / 37.8% | 5/ 12.2% | 14. 35.9% |
| | | | | |
| Favorite School Meal? | total 74 | total 50 | total 39 | total 45 |
| Hot dog | 15 / 20.2% | 12 / 24.0% | 15 / 38.5% | 3/ 6.7% |
| Mac & cheese | 8 / 10.8% | 4 / 8.0% | 0 / 0.0% | 2/ 4.4% |
| Chicken nuggets | 6 / 8.5% | 4 / 8.0% | 2 / 5.1% | 3/ 6.7% |
| Taco | 9 / 12.3% | 1 / 2.0% | 3 / 7.7% | 8/ 17.8% |
| Chicken soup | 8 / 10.8% | 5 / 10.0% | 0 / 0.0% | 4/ 8.9% |
| Pizza | 10 / 13.7% | 6 / 12.0% | 0 / 0.0% | 4/ 8.9% |
| Breakfast | 9 / 12.3% | 3 / 6.0% | 4 / 10.3% | 3/ 6.7% |
| Corn dogs | 0 / 0.0% | 5 / 10.0% | 4/ 10.3% | 0 / 0.0% |
| BBQ sandwich | 2/ 3% | 0 / 0.0% | 0 / 0.0% | 6/ 13.3% |
| Other | 9 / 12.3% | 10 / 20.0% | 15 / 38.5% | 13/ 28.9% |
| | | | | |
| Foods to add | total 56 | total 43 | total 30 | total 39 |
| Fish | 3 / 5.3% | 1 / 2.3% | 0 / 0.0% | 1/ 2.6% |
| Lazagna | 3 / 5.3% | 0 / 0.0% | 4 / 13.3% | 3. 7.7% |
| French fries | 3 / 5.3% | 5 / 11.6% | 2 / 6.7% | 6/ 15.4% |
| Papa John's pizza | 3 / 5.3% | 4 / 9.3% | 2 / 6.7% | 8/ 20.5% |
| Apple slices | 3 / 5.3% | 0 / 0.0% | 0 / 0.0% | 0 / 0.0% |
| Soft tacos | 4 / 7.1% | 13 / 30.3% | 1 / 3.3% | 0 / 0.0% |
| BBQ wings | 0 / 0.0% | 0 / 0.0% | 3 / 10.0% | 8/ 20.55 |
| Other | 37 / 66.4% | 20 / 46.5% | 18 / 60.0% | 13/ 33.3% |
| | | | | |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|
| How are you treated? | total 57 | total 48 | total 38 | total 43 |
| Nice | 24 / 42.1% | 21 / 43.8% | 12 / 31.1% | 16/ 37.2% |
| Okay | 8 / 14.0% | 10 / 20.8% | 10 / 26.3% | 14/ 32.6% |
| Badly | 25 / 43.9% | 17 / 35.4% | 16 / 42.1% | 13/ 30.2% |
| | | | | |
| Question | Grade 3 | Grade 4 | Grade 5 | Grade 6 |
| Foods to take off | total 85 | total 65 | total 41 | total 58 |
| Pizza | 18 / 21.2% | 27 / 41.6% | 18 / 43.9% | 8/ 13.8% |
| Mac & cheese | 12 / 14.2% | 9 / 13.8% | 8 / 19.5% | 10/ 17.2% |
| Hot dog | 11 / 12.9% | 3 / 4.6% | 0 / 0.0% | 10/ 17.2% |
| Sub sandwich | 7 / 8.2% | 3 / 4.6% | 1 / 2.4% | 1/ 1.7% |
| Beef burger | 5 / 5.9% | 2 / 3.0% | 1 / 2.4% | 3/ 5.2% |
| Chili | 0 / 0.0% | 11 / 16.9% | 1 / 2.4% | 15/ 25.9% |
| Other | 32 / 37.6% | 10/ 15.5% | 12 / 29.3% | 11/ 19.0% |
| | | | | |
| Cafeteria looks | total 39 | total 41 | total 30 | total 31 |
| Free seating | 4 / 10.3% | 1 / 2.3% | 2 / 6.7% | 0 / 0.0% |
| Traffic light | 11 / 28.2% | 27 / 65.9% | 10 / 33.3% | 8/ 25.8% |
| Wall color/decoration | 6 / 15.4% | 4 / 9.8% | 7 / 23.3% | 11/ 35.5% |
| Tables | 4 / 10.3% | 2 / 4.9% | 6 / 20.0% | 5/ 16.1% |
| Long line | 3 / 7.7% | 3 / 7.3% | 1 / 3.3% | 1/ 3.2% |
| Other | 11 / 28.1% | 4 / 9.8% | 4 / 13.3% | 6/ 19.4% |
| | | | | |
| Soups to add | total 39 | total 23 | total 19 | total 34 |
| Vegetable | 16 / 41.0% | 8 / 34.8% | 6 / 31.6% | 10/ 29.4% |
| Chicken & rice | 5 / 12.8% | 0 / 0.0% | 1 / 5.3% | 3/ 8.8% |
| Clam chowder | 6 / 15.4% | 5 / 21.7% | 2 / 10.5% | 5/ 14.7% |
| Potato | 3 / 7.7% | 2 / 8.7% | 3 / 15.8% | 3/ 8.8% |
| Other | 9 / 23.1% | 8 / 34.8% | 7 / 36.8% | 13/ 38.2% |
| | | | | |
| Salad Dressings | total 42 | total 30 | total 29 | total 21 |
| Ranch | 30 / 71.4% | 21 / 70.0% | 12 / 41.4% | 13/ 61.9% |
| Italian | 5 / 11.9% | 5 / 16.6% | 5 / 17.2% | 0 / 0.0% |
| French | 2 / 4.8% | 2 / 6.7% | 8 / 27.6% | 7/ 33.3% |
| Other | 5 / 11.9% | 2 / 6.7% | 4 / 13.8% | 1/ 4.8% |
| | | | | |
| Most important change | total 50 | total 56 | total 36 | total 53 |
| Quiet talking | 6 / 12.0% | 6 / 10.7% | 0 / 0.0% | 0 / 0.0% |
| Sit with friends | 6 / 12.0% | 2 / 3.6% | 2 / 5.6% | 21/ 39.6% |

| | | | | |
|----------------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|
| Traffic light | 12 / 24.0% | 31 / 55.3% | 13 / 36.1% | 13/ 24.5% |
| Long lines | 3 / 6.0% | 9 / 16.1% | 3 / 8.3% | 1/ 1.9% |
| Longer lunch periods | 5 / 10.0% | 0 / 0.0% | 2 / 5.6% | 2/ 3.8% |
| Other | 20 / 40.0% | 8 / 14.3% | 16 / 44.4% | 16/ 30.1% |