

Training and Professional Development Needs Assessment for State Agency Child Nutrition Professionals Who Work Primarily with School Nutrition Programs

2020

Applied Research Division
The University of Southern Mississippi
1-800-321-3054

Training and Professional Development Needs Assessment for State Agency Child Nutrition Professionals Who Work Primarily with School Nutrition Programs

PROJECT COORDINATOR

Keith Rushing, PhD, RD Director, Applied Research Division

RESEARCHER CONSULTANTS

James T. Johnson, PhD

Sandra Curwood, PhD, RDN

Jeannie Sneed, PhD, RD, CP-FS

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Dr. Aleshia Hall-Campbell, PhD, MPH



Institute of Child Nutrition

The University of Mississippi

The Institute of Child Nutrition was authorized by Congress in 1989 and established in 1990 at The University of Mississippi in Oxford and is operated in collaboration with The University of Southern Mississippi in Hattiesburg. The Institute operates under a grant agreement with the United States Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the Institute of Child Nutrition is to improve the operation of child nutrition programs through research, education and training, and information dissemination.

MISSION

The mission of the Institute of Child Nutrition is to provide information and services that promote the continuous improvement of child nutrition programs.

VISION

The vision of the Institute of Child Nutrition is to be the leader in providing education, research, and resources to promote excellence in child nutrition programs.

This project was funded using U.S. Department of Agriculture grant funds. The USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer and lender.

The University of Mississippi is an EEO/AATitle VI/Title IX/Section 504/ADA/ADEA employer.

For more information and the nondiscrimination statement in other languages: https://www.fns.usda.gov/cr/fns-nondiscrimination-statement

Except as provided below, you may freely use the text and information contained in this document for non-profit or educational use with no cost to the participant for the training providing the following credit is included. These materials may not be incorporated into other websites or textbooks and may not be sold.

Suggested Reference Citation:

Institute of Child Nutrition. (2020). *Training and Professional Development Needs Assessment for State Agency Child Nutrition Professionals Who Work Primarily with School Nutrition Programs*. University, MS: Rushing, K, Johnson, J.T., Curwood, S., & Sneed, J.

The photographs and images in this document may be owned by third parties and used by the University of Mississippi under a licensing agreement. The University cannot, therefore, grant permission to use these images. Please contact helpdesk@theicn.org for more information.

© 2020, Institute of Child Nutrition, The University of Mississippi, School of Applied Sciences

For more information, please contact helpdesk@theicn.org

10/08/2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	7
BACKGROUND	10
METHODS	14
Research Plan	14
Phase I: Development	14
Phase II: Validation	15
Phase III: Implementation	15
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	16
Description of Participants	16
Training Needs	18
Financial Management	20
Procurement	21
Conducting Reviews	21
Program Administration	23
Training, Curriculum Development, and Delivery	23
Other Training Need Content Areas	25
Preferences for Training	26
Time of Year	26
Length of Training	27
Format for Training	28

Use of Resources	30
United States Department of Agriculture Resources	30
Institute of Child Nutrition Resources	31
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	32
Conclusions	32
Recommendations	32
REFERENCES	34
APPENDIX A: EXPERT WORK GROUP AGENDA	36
APPENDIX B: GUIDED REVIEW FORM	39
APPENDIX C: TRAINING NEEDS ASSESSMENT – STATE AGENCY PROFES	SSIONALS
WHO WORK WITH SCHOOL MEALS PROGRAMS	41

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Descriptive Characteristics of Study Participants	17
Table 2: Perceived Training Needs of State Agency School Meal Professionals For Five Content Areas	19
Table 3: Perceived Level of Training Needed by State Agency School Meal Professionals for Five Content Areas	19
Table 4: Perceived Need for Training on Financial Management	20
Table 5: Perceived Need for Training on Procurement	22
Table 6: Perceived Need for Training on Topics Related to Conducting Reviews	23
Table 7: Perceived Need for Training on Program Administration Topics	24
Table 8: Perceived Need for Training on Topics Related to Training, Curriculum Development, and Delivery	25
Table 9: Perceived Training Needs of State Agency School Meal Professionals for Four "Other" Content Areas	26
Table 10: Ideal Month to Participate in Training	27
Table 11: Optimal Length of Time for Training	28
Table 12: Rankings for Training Formats for Each of Five Content Areas	29

TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT FOR STATE AGENCY CHILD NUTRITION PROFESSIONALS WHO WORK PRIMARILY WITH SCHOOL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

Executive Summary

State agencies play a vital role in administering the many programs that fall under Child Nutrition Programs. State agency staff have a variety of responsibilities, and these responsibilities vary from state to state. Professional standards for school nutrition professionals, established by the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act (HHFKA) of 2010, were developed for State agency directors but not for other staff members. It is clear that these staff members require ongoing professional development.

The Institute for Child Nutrition (ICN) published a study in 2014 that explored the competencies, knowledge, and skills required for State agency professionals. Because the roles of State agency staff continue to evolve, a current needs assessment was needed. The purpose of this study was to identify and prioritize training needs and to determine preferences for training formats, delivery methods, length of training, and best time of year for training. The study also examined the use of U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and ICN educational resources and the reasons they were or were not used.

A rigorous 3-phase research approach was used. The content was developed in Phase I using a comprehensive review of the literature and an expert work group comprised of State agency staff members to develop a draft survey. The survey was validated in Phase II using State agency staff representing nine states and five USDA Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) regions. In Phase III, data were collected using the Qualtrics online survey platform and analyzed using Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS) software.

Results of this study indicate that State agency staff perceive a need for training in a variety of topics, at both basic and advanced levels. For the five key content areas explored (conducting reviews, financial management, program administration, procurement, and training curriculum and delivery), financial management and procurement were rated highest in need for training. However, there were needs in all five content areas. Other topics, such as grant writing and management, farm-to-school, professional standards, and Team Nutrition, were explored and there was some need for training related to those topics.

It is observed that there is a great variety among states that may impact training, including differences in roles and responsibilities, job titles, approaches to providing training, and state laws and regulations. These differences complicate providing training across all State agencies, but provide opportunities for exploring different approaches.

When exploring preferences for training, respondents prefer training in the summer months (June, July, and August) when school meals programs are not operating. While about 80% of respondents prefer one to two days training, shorter lengths of time are optimal for about 20% of respondents. Face-to-face training is by far the preferred format, while online formats are second choices. Manuals and other hard copy documents are least preferred.

Most respondents reported using training resources from both USDA (75%) and ICN (83%). One main reason given by respondents for not using USDA and ICN resources is that State agency staff were not aware of them. Others noted that the websites are sometimes difficult to use. Some respondents indicated that their state developed training and they used that, sometimes citing differences in state laws as necessitating development.

Conclusions to this study indicate that there are opportunities to provide training and to remove barriers to use of existing resources. Many of these recommendations can be done with existing resources. Several recommendations for action are made based on the conclusions in this study, including:

- 1. Develop and test a multi-format approach to teaching a content area such as financial management specifically for State agency staff. This format might begin with a Zoom meeting/instruction to meet the instructor/students and outline goals and objectives for the course. Periodic webinars might be provided and students could have self-paced work. Periodically, Zoom meetings could be used to allow discussion among participants.
- 2. Explore interactive instructional software to determine training options that might be effective for training State agencies and other staff.
- 3. Include both a participant and an instructor evaluation for any new training approaches to capture what was effective and changes that would be needed for future training.
- 4. Divide training topics into small, focused areas that can be completed in a short (1-2 hours) amount of time. For example, one training could focus on understanding and utilizing basic financial statement, the financial management topic rated as highest need for training.
- 5. Explore different methods of presentation, such as live webinars or recorded webinars for which instructor contact information is provided for questions.
- 6. Consider developing advanced-level training, especially related to financial management and procurement. The content for the training may be in existing materials but more advanced concepts could be developed using case study approaches.
- 7. Plan training programs for State agency personnel for summer months.
- 8. Develop a 1-hour webinar focused on educational resources available from USDA and ICN. A 1-page handout that provides key web links could be developed to accompany the webinar.
- 9. Recommend that State agency directors encourage all new employees to watch the educational resources webinar as part of their new employee orientation.
- 10. Include the educational resources webinar as part of New Director Orientation.

Training and Professional Development Needs Assessment for State Agency Child Nutrition Professionals
Who Work Primarily with School Nutrition Programs

- 11. Focus on a different educational resource each month and email a description of the resource to State agency personnel. Include a link to the resource so that it is easy to find on the website.
- 12. Use text notification and email blasts to market training opportunities or new materials

Background

State agencies administers the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) as authorized by the 1946 National School Lunch Act. Subsequent legislation established several other child nutrition programs (CNP), including the School Breakfast Program (SBP), the Afterschool Snack Program, the Special Milk Program, the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP), the Food Distribution Program, and the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP). In addition, multiple Federal grant programs are administered by the State agencies. Each program and grant administered by State agencies has specific regulations, and in some cases originates from multiple Federal codes. USDA Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) utilizes State agencies to administer the Federal CNPs, to serve as the conduit for communicating and interpreting policy and guidance to the local school food authorities (SFAs), ensure program accountability and integrity, and ensure program access to the children.

State agencies administer these programs in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. territories of American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. In most states, the Department of Education administers the program; however, in a few states, the Department of Agriculture administers the program, and in one state, the Department of Human Services directs the program. Several states have multiple agencies managing one or more programs.

Oversight of these CNPs by the respective State agency occurs in over 13,000 school food authorities (SFA), with 100,000 public, private, and residential child care institution schools participating in the NSLP (United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service [USDA, ERS], 2019). State agencies conduct Federal program monitoring, professional development, and technical assistance for each of the participating school districts and process their claims for meal reimbursement. In the 2018 school year, an estimated 29.7 million student lunches were served daily, and approximately \$13.8 billion in Federal reimbursement were generated (USDA, ERS, 2019). Therefore, the volume and program value is substantial and warrants adequate oversight.

The number of schools in each school district ranges from one school to about 1,700 (USDA, ERS, 2019). Each SFA is monitored by the respective State agency. Considering the number of school districts, the number of child nutrition professionals, and the complex nature of program requirements, these programs require the State agency staff to have ample knowledge to administer these programs for accountability and integrity.

State agency administrative responsibilities can include both mandatory and discretionary activities. Mandatory activities are articulated in the permanent agreement between the USDA, FNS and the State agency (USDA, FNS Form FNS-74), as well as those established by each respective State. Discretionary responsibilities may include those the State agency determines in the State Administrative Expense (SAE) plan or as determined by additional state requirements. Mandatory elements for State agencies administering CNPs include:

- Complying with program statutes and regulations;
- Monitoring compliance for all programs aligned with Federal regulations and state requirements;
- Interpreting and communicating Federal regulations, policy memoranda, USDA, FNS instructions, and other written directives;
- Collecting program data and processing Federal meals claims for reimbursement;
- Collecting and reporting of required data elements, such as the verification report, food safety inspections, school-level data including the number and percentage of free and reduced-price eligible students; and
- Providing professional development, training, and technical assistance to program sponsors.

Discretionary responsibilities that may not be explicitly detailed in the permanent agreement, but are generally accepted, include:

- Maintaining communication;
- Providing leadership;
- Utilizing Federal competitive grant opportunities to support program activities, such as the Farm-to-School and the Team Nutrition training grants;
- Collaborating with stakeholders within government and external groups such as non-profit and quasi-governmental organizations;
- Conducting analyses of proposed state legislation; and
- Engaging in promotions and events.

Compliance monitoring is a significant responsibility of the State agency to ensure that program accountability and integrity are maintained by the SFA. The HHFKA required SFAs participating in the NSLP and the SBP to be monitored by the administering State agency by conducting Federal Program Administrative Reviews (FPARs) on each SFA every three years. Some State agencies requested and received waiver approval to extend this timeline to four or five-year cycles using a risk-based approach. State agencies utilize the annually updated USDA Administrative Review Manual and requisite forms to conduct the FPARs, and most State agencies have integrated this process into a software system to conduct the program reviews. Prior to the implementation of this requirement under HHFKA of 2010, every five years, State agencies conducted a coordinated review effort (CRE) and a review of the School Meal Initiative (SMI) for Healthy Children (Martin, 2006).

The comprehensive FPAR consolidated and replaced the two CRE and SMI reviews. The FPAR process includes critical standards of performance areas where fiscal action can be assessed, and includes certification and benefit issuance the process used to determine student's eligibility for meal benefits, and meal counting and claiming to ensure only reimbursable meals are claimed for reimbursement. Additional functional review areas include an offsite portion to review the provided documentation of policies and procedures; onsite visits to the central office for record review; and school site visits including meal observations, Buy American practices, and safety and sanitation inspections. Functional areas of the review include dietary

specifications and nutrient analysis, Civil Rights, local school wellness policy, smart snacks, professional standards, school breakfast, and SFSP outreach. Additionally, resource management includes a review of the nonprofit school foodservice account, paid lunch equity, and revenue from nonprogram funds (USDA, FNS, 2016a).

In 2016, FNS added procurement reviews as a distinct task to State agency responsibility due to the complex and multiple authorities involved in the procurement process. An additional review tool for this process was provided (USDA, FNS, 2016b). FNS regional offices conducted train-the-trainer professional development to select State agency staff. The State agencies were tasked with training other State agency program staff and conducting concurrent local school district procurement training. In 2013, ICN developed a procurement training resource "Procurement in the 21st Century" (NFSMI, 2013) and conducted SFA professional development collaboratively with the State agencies.

The FNS provides periodic topical training and resources for State agency staff, and ICN training provides targeted specific training for local program sponsors across all programs. However, the skill-building for newer State agency staff and the capacity building to transition staff to State agency management roles, which are essential to maintain and support optimal organizational effectiveness, is not readily available. The provision of training and professional development is integral for thoughtful succession planning in this process for program continuity.

State agency staff roles and responsibilities vary from state to state and depend on several factors, such as programs administered, organizational design, additional State requirements, and resources available. The FNS utilizes an established formula to determine the administrative funds available, and each State agency develops its SAE plan to allocate resources to their plan of work. State agencies can distribute the workload differently. For example, the workload can be distributed by the program (NSLP, SFSP, CACFP) or functional unit (sponsor applications and technical assistance as one unit and compliance monitoring as another).

Professional standards for school nutrition professionals were established by the HHFKA of 2010. The March 2, 2015, final published rule minimum hiring standards and minimum annual training hours for State agency directors, as well as local SFA directors and child nutrition program staff (USDA FNS, 2015). State agency directors of CNPs are required to have a bachelor's degree in foodservice, nutrition, culinary arts, or a related field, with extensive knowledge and experience in these areas, including management experience, and skills and abilities to lead and direct staff to conduct the activities required of the programs (USDA, FNS, 2015). A *Guide to Professional Standards for School Nutrition Programs* (USDA, FNS 2016c) provides all requirements. The Hiring Flexibility Under Professional Standards rule (84 FR 6953, March 1, 2019) "allows a director to have a bachelor's, master's or doctorate degree in food and nutrition, food service management, dietetics, family and consumer sciences, nutrition education, culinary arts, business, or a related field. USDA prefers a director to have both a bachelor's degree and a master's or doctorate degree with one of the specifically identified academic majors listed above" (USDA, 2020).

Professional standards do not extend to State agency staff. State agency staff's hiring requirements are established within the individual State or by agency guidelines. Beyond the

Training and Professional Development Needs Assessment for State Agency Child Nutrition Professionals
Who Work Primarily with School Nutrition Programs

State director, the professional standards do not specify hiring standards or training requirements. State agency child nutrition program staff positions consist of titles such as program specialists, finance staff, operational staff, and administrative support professionals.

Prior to these new initiatives, research conducted for ICN by Cross and Nettles (2013) identified competencies, knowledge, and skills for State agency CNP staff associated with the responsibilities and duties of administering the CNPs. The competencies, knowledge, and skills are foundational for State agency staff, with a multitude of responsibilities and ever-changing regulations and guidance. The expansion of the type and volume of responsibilities has demonstrated the need for well-trained and knowledgeable State agency staff.

The 2014 ICN study, "Competencies, Knowledge, and Skills for State Agency Child Nutrition Professionals in the 21st Century," identified six functional areas as categories of job responsibilities for State agency staff. The six functional areas are Financial Management, Personnel Management, Program Management, Program and Regulatory Compliance, Technology and Data Management, and Training, Technical Assistance, and Outreach. Identified competencies, knowledge statements, and skills align with each of the functional areas. The 2014 study concluded that the development of training modules aligned with the functional areas would be beneficial for State agencies.

Because the roles of State agency personnel continue to evolve, a current training needs assessment was needed. The purpose of this study was to identify and prioritize training needs and to determine preferences for training formats, delivery modes, length of training, and best time of year for training. The study also examined the use of USDA and ICN educational resources and reasons they were and were not used.

Methods

Research Plan

Three phases were used in the development and implementation of this project. The content was developed in Phase I, the content was validated in Phase II, and data were collected and analyzed in Phase III. Each of these phases will be described in detail for purposes of replication.

Phase I: Development

Phase I began with a literature review to guide the project and facilitate the planned face-to-face expert work group that would aid in the development of the draft needs assessment survey. The literature review included an investigation of *Competencies, Knowledge, and Skills for State Agency Child Nutrition Professionals in the 21st Century* (ICN, 2013) and a review of current regulations regarding the management and application of federally funded CNPs.

An expert work group was formed to assist in developing the content for the needs assessment. All State agency directors were sent an email asking them to recommend two to three staff members who had two or more years of State agency experience working with school nutrition programs to participate in the expert work group. Based on these recommendations, eight State agency child nutrition professionals (two directors and six State agency staff) representing eight states and all seven USDA, FNS regions were invited to participate in the work group.

A face-to-face expert work group meeting was conducted at the ICN's Applied Research Division (ARD) in Hattiesburg, MS. The group met for one and a half days during which the facilitated group discussed critical issues facing school nutrition programs, critical issues facing State agency staff, preferences for training format and delivery mode, length of training and time of year for training, and research needed to support State agencies in working with school nutrition professionals. The Delphi technique, which included a 3-round iterative process, was used to identify and confirm questions for the needs assessment. A copy of the agenda for the meeting is provided in Appendix A.

After the expert work group met, ARD researchers compiled detailed notes, identified questions to be included in the needs assessment, and drafted a survey. The draft survey was sent electronically to work group participants, and they were asked to review the draft and provide comments. Based on feedback, the needs assessment was revised.

Phase II: Validation

The draft needs assessment was validated by an electronic review panel in Phase II. Twelve State agency professionals (two directors, two assistant directors, and eight State agency staff members) representing nine states and five FNS regions (the Mid-West and Mid-Atlantic were not represented) served as review panel members. Review panel members evaluated the draft needs assessment for completeness, accuracy, clarity, and suitability for the end user using a Guided Review Form (see Appendix B). The draft needs assessment was revised and finalized based on review panel feedback.

The final draft of the online needs assessment (Appendix C) was comprised of 48 questions divided into four sections: Training needs of State agency professionals who work with School Meals Programs; Use of USDA, FNS resources and education materials; Use of ICN resources and education materials; and Demographics. The training needs section focused on six topic areas: (1) Conducting reviews; (2) Financial management; (3) Program administration; (4) Procurement; (5) Training, curriculum development and delivery; and (6) Other needs. Multiple-choice and ranking questions were used for each topic area to identify the level of need for training on the topic and the preferred methods for training. Qualtrics, an online survey platform, was used for formatting and delivering the survey.

Phase III: Implementation

Researchers emailed an invitation with a link to the needs assessment to every State agency CNP director (*N*=56). The invitation explained the purpose of the needs assessment, asked recipients to complete the survey, and asked them to share the survey link with all members of their staff who work with school meals programs. A follow-up invitation was sent to all State agency directors three weeks after the original to encourage participation. Responses to the survey were compiled and analyzed using SPSS. Qualitative responses (open-ended questions) were tallied when appropriate and summarized, and examples of statements were provided when needed to provide a sense of respondents' comments.

Results and Discussion

Description of Participants

A total of 143 individuals responded to the needs assessment survey. All responses were included even if the entire survey was not complete in order to capture as much information as possible. Twenty-six of the 56 State agency directors completed the survey. Because staff members were asked to participate by the directors, the actual number solicited is unknown.

Descriptive characteristics of participants are summarized in Table 1. State agency CNP staff comprised the highest percentage of respondents (58%) while 18% were State agency directors. Respondents represented child nutrition work experience ranging from less than one year to more than 20, with the highest percentage having 6-10 years of work experience (29.4%). The majority (42.7%) had been in their current position from 1-5 years.

The highest percentage of respondents (43.4%) had completed a Master's degree, and 82% had a Bachelor's degree or higher. A high percentage (44.6%) was credentialed as a Registered Dietitian or Registered Nutritionist. Respondents could indicate other credentials or certifications, and responses included teaching licenses, Certified Dietary Manager, Certified Food Protection Manager, ServSafe, and Certified Culinarian (Chef).

Respondents were asked to indicate the USDA, FNS region in which they worked. There was good representation across the seven regions. The highest number of respondents represented the Mountain Plains region (n=30), and the smallest number was from the Northeast region (n=12).

Table 1Descriptive Characteristics of Study Participants (N=143)

Descriptive	n	%
Job Title		
CNP Director	26	18.2
State Agency Management staff member	24	16.8
State Agency CNP staff member	83	58.0
No Response	10	7.0
Years of Experience in Child Nutrition		
Less than 1 year	8	5.6
1-5 years	31	21.7
6-10 years	42	29.4
11-15 years	18	12.6
16-20 years	12	8.4
More than 20 years	23	16.1
No Response	9	6.3
Years in Current Position		
Less than 1 year	19	13.3
1-5 years	61	42.7
6-10 years	32	22.4
11-15 years	12	8.4
16-20 years	4	2.8
More than 20 years	6	4.2
No Response	9	6.3
Education		
High School Diploma/GED	6	4.2
Associate's Degree	8	5.6
Bachelor's Degree	48	33.6
Master's Degree	62	43.4
Doctoral Degree	8	5.6
No Response	11	7.7
•		

Table 1 continues

(Table 1 continued)

Descriptive Characteristics of Study Participants (N=143)

Descriptive	n	%
Professional Credentials/Certification		
Registered Dietitian/Nutritionist (RD/RDN)	50	44.6
Licensed Dietitian	24	21.4
School Nutrition Association (SNA) Certified	16	14.3
School Nutrition Specialist (SNS) Certified	30	26.8
Other	44	39.3
USDA, FNS Region Represented		
Mid-Atlantic (DC, DE, MD, NJ, PA, PR, VA, WV)	23	16.1
Midwest (IA, IL, IN, MI, MN, OH, WI)	14	9.8
Mountain Plains (CO, KS, MO, MT, NE, ND, SD, WY)	30	21.0
Northeast (CT, MA, ME, NH, NY, RI, VI, VT)	12	8.4
Southeast (AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, NC, SC, TN)	20	14.0
Southwest (AR, AZ, LA, OK, NM, TX, UT)	22	15.4
Western (AK, AS, CA, CN, MI, GUAM, HI, ID, NV, OR, WA)	13	9.1
No Response	9	6.3

Training Needs

Training needs related to five content areas were explored: Conducting Reviews; Financial Management; Program Administration; Procurement; and Training, curriculum development, and delivery. Respondents also could indicate other areas for which training was needed. The highest need areas identified were for financial management and procurement. Table 2 provides a summary of perceived training needs related to each area. There were no differences in perceived training needs based on job title, education, or FNS region.

Table 2Perceived Training Needs of State Agency School Meal Professionals for Five Content Areas (N=143)

Content Areas	Frequency (%)					
	High Need	Moderate Need	Low Need	No Need	No Response	
Financial Management	93 (65)	40 (28)	7 (5)	3 (2)	0 (0)	
Procurement	91 (64)	37 (26)	8 (6)	0 (0)	7 (5)	
Conducting Reviews	73 (51)	50 (35)	19 (13)	1 (1)	0 (0)	
Program Administration	52 (36)	56 (39)	32 (22)	1 (1)	2 (2)	
Training, Curriculum Development, and Delivery	52 (36)	55 (39)	26 (18)	3 (2)	7 (5)	

NOTE: Percentages of respondents were rounded to the nearest whole number.

Respondents' perceived need for both basic and advanced training also was highest for financial management and procurement. Considering both need and level of training needed, program administration was rated as the third highest need area. Results for perceived level of training are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3Perceived Level of Training Needed by State Agency School Meal Professionals for Five Content Areas (N=143)

Content Area	Basic n(%)	Advanced n(%)	Basic and Advanced n(%)
Financial Management	17 (11.9)	24 (16.8)	97 (67.8)
Procurement	17 (11.9)	24 (16.5)	89 (62.2)
Program Administration	15 (10.5)	36 (25.2)	84 (58.7)
Conducting Reviews	7 (4.9)	42 (29.4)	79 (55.2)
Training, Curriculum Development, and Delivery	19 (13.3)	42 (29.4)	57 (39.9)

NOTE: Content areas are presented from high to low ratings based on need for both basic and advanced training.

Findings for each of the five content areas will be discussed individually. Both quantitative and qualitative responses will be summarized to describe training needs in each area.

Financial Management

Financial management was consistently rated as the highest need for training with 93 respondents indicating that it was a high training need area, and 97 indicated that they need both basic and advanced training. A few of the respondents added comments that explain their responses, such as: "Currently, basic is probably our actual level, but hopefully, we would need advanced in the future!"; "Most of our review team members are generalists – with no financial experience in their backgrounds"; "Some in the office are good at this part. I don't feel that I am."; and "The ICN Financial Management for Directors/Managers is a good resource for an introduction to this topic (basic training)."

Respondents were asked about their perceived training needs for several topics within the financial management content area. Table 4 summarizes the level of training needs for each topic. Understanding and utilizing basic financial statements was the topic rated as the highest need for training, followed by budget development, justification, and implementation, and utilizing key performance indicators for decision making and program evaluation. Each of these areas was rated as high by over half of the respondents.

Table 4Perceived Need for Training on Financial Management Topics (N=143)

Topic	High n(%)	Moderate n(%)	Low n(%)	None <i>n</i> (%)
Understanding and utilizing basic financial statements (i.e., statement of revenue and expenditures, balance sheet).	78	49	10	1
	(54.5)	(34.3)	(7.0)	(0.7)
Budget development, justification, and implementation	74	46	17	1
	(51.7)	(32.2)	(11.9)	(0.7)
Using key performance indicators (i.e., meals per labor hour, inventory turnover rate) for decision making and program evaluation.	73 (51.0)	49 (34.3)	14 (9.8)	2 (1.4)
Basic accounting principles	62 (43.4)	57 (39.9)	19 (13.3)	0 (0)
Federal and State guidelines for pricing meals and food items	61	55	20	2
	(42.7)	(38.5)	(14.0)	(1.4)

Procurement

Procurement was the second highest rated content area for which State agency personnel perceived to need training. Within that content area, respondents were asked to rate the level of need for eight procurement topics. Ratings for procurement topics are summarized in Table 5. Just over half (54%) indicated a need for training related to competitive purchasing, which was the highest rated topic. All other topics were rated as a high need by less than 50%. When you combine the high to moderate need percentages, 85% or more identified need for training in four of the eight topics. Comments provided by respondents help explain the ratings. Two indicated that they don't conduct procurement reviews, one indicated that their state had been doing procurement reviews for a really long time, and another indicated that there was one person in the office who handled all procurement. One respondent reported that procurement reviews were contracted out. A couple of written comments noted that USDA Foods is managed by another agency. Some comments reflected that the complexity of procurement necessitated continued learning. It also was mentioned that procurement tools for schools were in high demand.

In 2016, procurement reviews were added to the responsibilities of State agency staff (USDA, FNS, 2016b). This new responsibility most likely impacted respondents' ratings for the need for procurement training. Further, this is a complex area where Federal and state laws must be considered, which may be intimidating when conducting procurement reviews.

Conducting Reviews

The need for training related to conducting reviews was rated third among the five content areas with 51% of respondents indicating that they had a high need for training. Ratings for training needs related to conducting reviews are summarized in Table 6. Sixty-one percent of respondents indicated that they had a high need for training on conducting procurement reviews, the highest rating for the five topics in this content area. This need is reflected above in that procurement training was rated second high for the five content areas explored. This overlap indicates that respondents understand that they must have knowledge of procurement in order to conduct reviews.

Table 5Perceived Need for Training on Procurement Topics (N=143)

Topic	High <i>n</i> (%)	Moderate n(%)	Low n(%)	None <i>n</i> (%)
Competitive procurement	77 (53.8)	42 (29.4)	10 (7.0)	1 (0.7)
Principles of good procurement	64	46	17	2
	(44.8)	(32.2)	(11.9)	(1.4)
Non-competitive procurement	64	45	18	2
	(44.8)	(31.5)	(12.6)	(1.4)
Procuring local foods/farm-to-school	60	54	13	3
	(42.0)	(37.8)	(9.1)	(2.1)
Procurement ethics	52	43	34	1
	(36.4)	(30.1)	(23.8)	(0.7)
USDA Foods	46	47	29	8
	(32.2)	(32.9)	(20.3)	(5.6)
Department of Defense Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program	41	54	32	3
	(28.7)	(37.8)	(22.4)	(2.1)
Food Buying Guide	37	47	41	6
	(25.9)	(32.9)	(28.7)	(4.2)

Table 6Perceived Need for Training on Topics Related to Conducting Reviews (N=143)

Topic	High $n(\%)$	Moderate n(%)	Low <i>n</i> (%)	None <i>n</i> (%)
Competitive procurement reviews	87	33	16	5
	(60.8)	(23.1)	(11.2)	(3.5)
Conducting reviews of foodservice management company contracts	81	33	20	7
	(56.6)	(23.1)	(14.0)	(4.9)
Developing and administering fiscal actions	72	48	20	1
	(50.3)	(33.6)	(14.0)	(0.7)
Developing and monitoring corrective action plans	66	47	24	4
	(46.2)	(32.9)	(16.8)	(2.8)
Conducting administrative reviews	61	51	26	3
	(42.7)	(35.7)	(18.2)	(2.1)

Program Administration

While only 36% of respondents rated program administration as a high training need area, 45% indicated that administration of food service management companies was a high need. About a third rated management evaluations and special requirements for non-traditional sponsors as high need areas. Ratings for training needs related to program administration are summarized in Table 7. For 10 topics, less than 25% rated the topic as a high need for training. This may reflect the routine nature of the topic or the comfort level of the topic based on educational backgrounds in nutrition.

Training, Curriculum Development, and Delivery

The content area with the lowest ratings for training need was training, curriculum development, and delivery. Only 36% rated this area as a high need, while another 38% rated it as a moderate need. Five individual topics in this content area were rated, and results are summarized in Table 8. It is noted that the highest need for training was in the area of principles and techniques of effective communication, but only 38% rated it as a high need. When high and moderate need for training were combined, all five topics had ratings between 60 and 70%.

Table 7 Perceived Need for Training on Program Administration Topics¹ (N=143)

Topic	High n(%)	Moderate n(%)	Low n(%)	None n(%)
Administration of food service management companies (contracts, bids, etc.)	64	48	18	1
	(44.8)	(33.6)	(12.6)	(0.7)
Management evaluations	54	46	32	3
	(37.8)	(32.2)	(22.4)	(2.1)
Special requirements for non-traditional sponsors (RCCIs, Charter schools, etc.)	51	51	22	6
	(35.7)	(35.7)	(15.4)	(4.2)
Special provisions (2, 3, 3, community eligibility provision, etc.)	41	56	29	9
	(28.7)	(39.2)	(20.3)	(6.3)
Accommodating students with special dietary needs	34	66	27	4
	(23.8)	(46.2)	(18.9)	(2.8)
Meal patterns/menu planning	37	44	48	6
	(25.9)	(30.8)	(33.6)	(4.2)
State revenue matching of Federal funds	33	45	46	11
	(23.1)	(31.5)	(32.2)	(7.7)
Meal counting and claiming	32	44	48	6
	(23.1)	(30.8)	(33.6)	(4.2)
Offer vs. Serve	32	42	50	11
	(22.4)	(29.4)	(35.0)	(7.7)
Local school wellness policies	32	45	51	3
	(22.4)	(31.5)	(35.7)	(2.1)
6-cent ² certification	31	44	47	13
	(21.7)	(30.8)	(32.9)	(9.1)
Food safety plans and inspection reporting	30	42	49	10
	(21.0)	(29.4)	(34.3)	(7.0)
Direct certification	23	50	51	11
	(16.1)	(35.0)	(35.7)	(7.7)
Civil Rights compliance	34	36	55	10
	(23.8)	(25.2)	(38.5)	(7.0)

¹Topics were listed from high to low based on the percentage of high and moderate ratings ²This number varies based on current policies; it was 7 cents at the time the report was written

Table 8 $Perceived \ Need \ for \ Training \ on \ Topics \ Related \ to \ Training, \ Curriculum \ Development, \ and \ Delivery \ (N=143)$

Topic	High n(%)	Moderate n(%)	Low n(%)	None <i>n</i> (%)
Principals and techniques of effective communications	54	46	22	4
	(37.8)	(32.2)	(15.4)	(2.8)
Teaching adult learners/adult learning principles	53	48	22	3
	(37.1)	(33.6)	(15.4)	(2.1)
Developing train-the-trainer programs	51	48	23	4
	(35.7)	(33.6)	(16.1)	(2.8)
Conducting training	50	44	28	4
	(35.0)	(30.8)	(19.6)	(2.8)
Using technology	38	48	34	6
	(26.6)	(33.6)	(23.8)	(4.2)

Other Training Need Content Areas

Participants were asked to rate their level of need for training in four other content areas: farm-to-school; grant writing, management, and equipment grants; professional standards; and Team Nutrition/nutrition education. Results are summarized in Table 9.

Table 9Perceived Need for Training on Topics Related to Training, Curriculum Development, and Delivery (N=143)

Content Area	High	Moderate	Low	No
	Need	Need	Need	Need
	n(%)	n(%)	n(%)	n(%)
Grant Writing, Management, USDA Equipment Grants	35	49	32	6
	(25)	(34)	(22)	(4)
Farm-to-School	30	54	30	8
	(21)	(38)	(21)	(6)
Professional Standards	25	46	46	5
	(18)	(32)	(32)	(4)
Team Nutrition/Nutrition Education	25	38	53	6
	(18)	(27)	(37)	(4)

NOTE: Percentages of respondents were rounded to the nearest whole number. There was no response from 21 individuals for each content area.

Preferences for Training

Questions were included to determine preferences for training, including time of year, length of training, and format for training to help in planning and delivering training. These questions were asked for each of the five content areas. Responses for each of these areas will be presented.

Time of Year

June and August were identified as the most ideal months for training by the highest number of participants, followed by July. November and December were identified as the least ideal months for training. Responses are summarized in Table 10.

Table 10 *Ideal Month to Participate in Training (N=143)*

Month*	Financial Management	Procurement	Conducting Reviews	Program Administration	Training, Curriculum Development, and Delivery
	<u>n</u> (%)	<u>n</u> (%)	<u>n</u> (%)	<u>n</u> (%)	<u>n</u> (%)
January	24(17.5%)	29(22.8%)	21(14.9%)	21(15.9%)	31(25.2%)
February	23(16.8%)	23(18.1%)	13(9.2%)	18(13.6%)	27(22.0%)
March	20(14.6%)	25(19.7%)	16(11.3%)	20(15.2%)	23(18.7%)
April	22(16.1%)	27(21.3%)	19(13.5%)	28(21.2%)	26(21.1%)
May	37(27.0%)	33(26.0%)	28(19.9%)	42(31.8%)	38(30.9%)
June	60(43.8%)	54(42.5%)	58(41.1%)	56(42.4%)	53(43.1%)
July	44(32.1%)	46(36.2%)	47(33.3%)	50(37.9%)	33(26.8%)
August	52(38.0%)	52(40.9%)	57(40.4%)	49(37.1%)	37(30.1%)
September	42(30.7%)	39(30.7%)	44(31.2%)	42(31.8%)	38(30.9%)
October	27(19.7%)	27(21.3%)	19(13.5%)	27(20.5%)	25(20.3%)
November	16(11.7%)	16(12.6%)	17(12.1%)	17(12.9%)	21(17.1%)
December	18(13.1%)	16(12.6%)	17(12.1%)	20(15.2%)	20(16.3%)

Length of Training

The choices for optimal length of time for training ranged from short trainings (15-30 minutes) to multiple day (two day). Responses are summarized in Table 11. For four of the content areas, one day training was preferred. A 4-hour training was most preferred for training, curriculum development and delivery. Very short training (15-30 minutes) were least preferred. Otherwise, there seems to be a place for all lengths of training as no clear preferences emerged.

Table 11Optimal Length of Time for Training (N=143)

Length of Time	Financial Management	Procurement	Conducting Reviews	Program Administration	Training Curriculum Development and Delivery
	n ¹ (%)	n ¹ (%)	n ¹ (%)	n ¹ (%)	n ¹ (%)
15–30 min	3(2.1%)	5(3.5%)	5(3.5%)	6(4.2%)	4(2.8%)
45 min – 1 hr	22(15.4%)	27(18.9%)	26(18.2%)	26(18.2%)	22(15.4%)
2 hours	26(18.2%)	19(13.3%)	17(11.9%)	24(16.8%)	24(16.8%)
4 hours	27(18.9%)	18(12.6%)	19(13.3%)	23(16.1%)	36(25.2%)
1 day	31(21.7%)	34(23.8%)	34(23.8%)	31(21.7%)	24(16.8%)
2 days	27(18.9%)	26(18.2%)	39(27.3%)	22(15.4%)	14(9.8%)

¹n= all lengths of training as not the topic based on educational backgrounds in nutrition

Format for Training

Preferences for four formats for training were explored. Results are summarized in Table 12. The clear preference is for face-to-face training. Online options, both live and self-paced, received a fairly large number indicating that it was a first or second choice for training. Traditional hard copy documents to be studied at one's own pace was clearly the least preferred method.

Because of limited travel budgets and other travel limitations, there is a need to explore how these training methods and formats might be modified to meet the needs of state agency staff. For example, a course might be developed that starts with a Zoom session (which meets preferences for face-to-face) followed by self-paced instruction through webinars and written materials. Periodically, a Zoom session could provide follow-up with an instructor

Table 12Rankings for Training Formats for Each of Five Content Areas (N=143)

	Financial Management	Procurement	Conducting Reviews	Program Administration	Training
Face-to-face					
1	87	85	82	74	83
2	5	5	8	3	1
3	1	1	1	0	1
4	0	1	0	0	0
Online, Live (i.e., webinar)					
1	22	20	23	32	20
2	32	32	26	34	34
3	1	3	2	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	1
Online, Self-paced					
1	19	13	17	14	13
2	19	19	21	20	16
3	11	7	6	10	8
4	1	1	1	0	0
Hard copy document/Manual, self-paced					
1	4	4	8	2	1
2	16	13	15	13	9
3	7	7	3	9	7
4	4	4	3	7	4

NOTE: Rankings were from most preferred (1) to least preferred (4).

Use of Resources

United States Department of Agriculture Resources

There are a multitude of training resources provided on the USDA, FNS website. These resources cover general topics such as professional standards and specific topics such as meal planning.

Thirty-six percent of respondents indicated that they use the USDA Professional Standards Training Database (https://fns.usda.gov/professional-standards), while 57% did not. The resource mentioned most often (n=12) was the Professional Standards Training Tracker Tool 2.0 (https://pstrainingtracker.fns.usda.gov). The database was reported to be used to look for free resource materials, webinars, suggestions for food safety and financial management training, guidance materials, as a guide for sponsors/SFAs, and to obtain learning codes.

For those respondents who did not use the database, 14 indicated that they did not know about the database. Another 14 indicated that they used a state database system and state-developed materials that are specific to the regulations in their state. Other comments included use of another tracker, having difficulties using the database, having enough educational opportunities from other sources, rely on getting email notices of training opportunities, the database is overwhelming, the database is not up to date, and training is not part of their role.

When asked if they use the Professional Standards Training Tracker Tool (PSTT-2) to track their own training or that of their staff, only four indicated that they used it. Respondents were asked to provide comments as to why they do not use the tracker tool. Three individuals indicated that they did not know about this resource. Seventeen respondents indicated that they used an internal, state developed tracking system. Six indicated that they used self-tracking, and that sometimes was associated with tracking necessary for other credentials or licenses such as the RD credential or a teaching license. Five respondents indicated that they use other ways/resources to track training. Six indicated that they did not need or were not required to track training. Five indicated that the tracking tool was cumbersome or difficult to use. Related to ease of use, one individual noted that "it was unwieldy at the beginning and we chose an alternate method of tracking." Another stated that "version 1 was awful. Version 2 is good but I had already found a suitable method before it was released." Three noted access issues, including need for a special login. Three respondents indicated that they used SNA's tracking tool.

About 75% reported that they use USDA resources for training. When asked to identify USDA resources used, five indicated that they use all resources on the USDA website— "anything we can get our hands on." Another respondent said "we use the majority of the resources on the USDA website. There are really too many to list." Another respondent indicated that they use USDA resources to develop State agency training. Specific resources/documents most noted included Team Nutrition resources (*n*=14), *Food Buying Guide* (*n*=10), and USDA Recipes for Schools (*n*=3). Other topics for training materials included farm-to-school, food safety, food defense, smart snacks, whole grains, accommodating children with special needs, and offer vs. serve. The MyPlate resource was mentioned by a few respondents.

Included in written comments were formats for information used. Guidance/Policy memos were mentioned by 16 respondents, handbooks and manuals were mentioned by 11 respondents, and USDA fact sheets mentioned by five respondents. Other formats mentioned in written comments include webinars (n=10), website (n=7), infographics (n=4), and USDA PowerPoint presentations (n=3). Eight respondents indicated that they use ICN training and resources.

There were few responses to the question of why USDA resources are not used. Responses indicated that individuals were new to the team, were not aware of the USDA resources, or had other options available. Three respondents mentioned usability issues, including the following quotes: "The USDA website is not the most user friendly;" "Difficult to find sometimes", and "Not easy to use." Someone mentioned that the resources are "usually too complicated" so there is a need to simplify resources and training. Someone mentioned concern for adherence to state laws.

Institute of Child Nutrition Resources

The ICN develops and delivers training for personnel providing all of the programs in Child Nutrition. ICN, funded by USDA, has been in existence for about 30 years.

About 83% of respondents indicated that they used ICN resources for training and education. Resources most used were for topics related to food safety/HACCP, financial management, and procurement. Other topic areas listed included menu planning, meal patterns, allergies, new director training, Healthy Cuisine for Kids, produce, Civil Rights, new manager training, and marketing. Someone stated that they use "various training resources as needed—too many to list."

Written comments also provided insight into the training format used. Twenty-four respondents indicated that they had used online courses/e-learning. In-person training was mentioned by 12 respondents, and multiple respondents mentioned webinars and PowerPoint presentations.

One person noted that ICN resources are used when state training programs are developed. Several indicated that they refer sponsors to the ICN website. One respondent said that she/he "use in-person and online trainings for various topics and would like to see more variety and advanced level topics."

Responses to why ICN resources are not used primarily fit into the following categories: no need for resources; unaware of these resources; and create our own resources. One individual indicated that there were very specific state regulations so there is not familiarity with ICN resources.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

Results of this study indicate that State agency staff perceive a need for training in a variety of topics, at both basic and advanced levels. For the five content areas explored, financial management and procurement were rated highest in need for training. However, there were needs in all five content areas.

It is observed that there is a great variety among states that may impact training, including differences in roles and responsibilities, job titles, approaches to providing training, and state laws and regulations. These differences complicate providing training across all State agencies.

When exploring preferences for training, respondents prefer training in the summer months (June, July, and August) when school meals programs are not operating. While they prefer one to two days training, shorter lengths of time are optimal for about 20% of respondents. Face-to-face training is by far the preferred format, while online formats are second choices. Manuals and other hard copy documents are least preferred.

One main reason given by respondents for not using USDA and ICN resources is that State agency staff were not aware of them. Others noted that the websites are sometimes difficult to use.

Recommendations

Conclusions to this study indicate that there are opportunities to provide training and to remove barriers to use of existing resources. Many of these recommendations can be done with existing resources. Several recommendations for action are made based on the conclusions in this study, including:

- 1. Develop and test a multi-format approach to teaching a content area such as financial management specifically for State agency staff. This format might begin with a Zoom meeting/instruction to meet the instructor/students and outline goals and objectives for the course. Periodic webinars might be provided, and students could have self-paced work. Periodically, Zoom meetings could be used to allow discussion among participants.
- 2. Explore interactive instructional software to determine training options that might be effective for training State agencies and other staff.

- 3. Include both a participant and an instructor evaluation for any new training approaches to capture what was effective and changes that would be needed for future training.
- 4. Divide training topics into small, focused areas that can be completed in a short (1-2 hours) amount of time. For example, one training could focus on understanding and utilizing basic financial statements, the financial management topic rated as highest need for training.
- 5. Explore different methods of presentation, such as live webinars or recorded webinars, for which instructor contact information is provided for questions.
- 6. Consider developing advanced-level training, especially related to financial management and procurement. The content for the training may be in existing materials, but more advanced concepts could be developed using case study approaches.
- 7. Plan training programs for State agency personnel for summer months.
- 8. Develop a 1-hour webinar focused on educational resources available from USDA and ICN. A 1-page handout, which provides key web links, could be developed to accompany the webinar.
- 9. Recommend that State agency directors encourage all new employees to watch the educational resources webinar as part of their new employee orientation.
- 10. Include the educational resources webinar as part of New Director Orientation.
- 11. Focus on a different educational resource each month and email a description of the resource to State agency personnel. Include a link to the resource so that it is easy to find on the website.
- 12. Use text notifications and email blasts to market training opportunities or new materials.

References

- Gunderson, G. W. (1971). *The national school lunch program: Background and development*. www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/Lunch/AboutLunch?NSLP-Program%20History.pdf
- Martin, D. (1997). NF97-315 Overview of the USDA School Meals Initiative for Healthy Children. University, NE: University of Nebraska, Lincoln.
- Martin, J. (2008). Overview of Federal Child Nutrition Legislation. In J. Martin & C. Oakley (Eds). *Managing child nutrition programs: Leadership for excellence*. Boston: Jones and Bartlett Publishers, Inc.
- National Food Service Management Institute. (2010). *Investigation of the job functions and training needs of state agency child nutrition professionals*. University, MS: Author.
- National Food Service Management Institute. (2013). *Job functions and training needs of state agency child nutrition professionals*. University, MS: Author.
- National Food Service Management Institute. (2014). *Technical report: Competencies, knowledge, and skills needed for state agency child nutrition professionals in the 21st century.* University, MS: Author.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. (2019). *National school lunch program*. www.ers.usda.gov/topics/food-nutrition-assistance/child-nutrition-programs/national-school-lunch-program.aspx
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Services. (2020, Jan 14). Questions & answers regarding professional standards for state and local School Nutrition Program personnel. fns-prod.azureedge.net/sites/default/files/resource-files/SP05-2020os.pdf#page=2
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Services. (2012). *National school lunch program: coordinated review effort (CRE)*. childnutrition.ncpublicschools.gov/regulations-policies/usda-policy-memos/2013/sp-04-2013a.pdf
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Services. (2016a). *National school lunch program: Administrative review manual, forms, and tools.*www.fns.usda.gov/nslp/administrative-review-manual-forms-and-tools
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Services. (2016b). *Local agency procurement review tool*. www.fns.usda.gov/cn/updated-local-agency-procurement-review-tool-school-food-authorities

- Training and Professional Development Needs Assessment for State Agency Child Nutrition Professionals
 Who Work Primarily with School Nutrition Programs
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Services. (2016c). Guide to professional standards for school nutrition. fns-prod.azureedge.net/sites/default/files/resource-files/ps_guide-highres.pdf
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Services. (2015). *FNS-486 professional standards flyer*. fns prod.azureedge.net/sites/default/files/cn/profstandards_flyer.pdf

Training and Professional Development Needs Ass	sessment for State Agency Child	Nutrition Professionals
	Who Work Primarily with Sch	ool Nutrition Programs

Appendix A: Expert Work Group Agenda

Institute for Child Nutrition, Applied Research Division

The University of Southern Mississippi

Needs Assessment – State Agency Child Nutrition Program Professionals

Expert Panel: October 3-4, 2018

Agenda

8:00 am	Welcome, Overview of Project, Agenda Review and Ice Breaker			
8:30 am	Discussion			
	1. Critical issues facing the school nutrition (SN) programs you support			
	2. Critical issues facing State agency SN professionals			
	3. State agency SN professionals' preferences regarding training format and delivery mode			
	4. Length of training and time of year preferred for each training mode			
	5. Research needed to support State agency SN professionals			
10:30 am	Break			
10:45 am	Activity 1: Group Brainstorming – Identify Section Headings			
11:15 am	Activity 2: Clean-up & Confirmation – Section Headings			
11:30 am	Activity 3: Rapid-Fire Brainstorming – Identify Question Stems (Breakout			
	Group)			
11:30 pm	Working Lunch (provided)			
12:00 pm	Activity 4: Breakout Group – Create Questions & Answer Choices			
2:00 pm	Break			

2:15 pm Activity 5: Large Group – Confirm Questions & Answer Choices

4:45 pm Closing Remarks and Adjourn

Thursday, October 4, 2018

8:00 am	Goals for Today
8:15 am	Review Draft Needs Assessment
10:00 am	Break
10:15 am	Activity 6: Identify Personal and Program Information to Capture

10:45 am Closure and Adjourn

Appendix B: Guided Review Form

Guided Review Form

Instructions: Please evaluate the statements or questions in each section of th agreement level (<i>Strongly Disagree</i> to <i>Strongly Agree</i>). Cells th answers or type your comments and/or suggestions.				0.0
SURVEY SECTION (1)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
The instructions for completing this section of the needs assessment survey were clear.		□ D	☐ A	☐ SA
The questions in this section accurately pertain to the topic area	□SD	D	□ A	☐ SA
The terminology in this section is appropriate.		\square D	\square A	☐ SA
Were there questions in this section that you would exclude? If yes, indicate the question number(s) to exclude in the space provided.	_	umber(s) to e		tions.
Were there questions in this section that you would revise? If yes, indicate question number(s) and the recommended revisions in the space provided.	_	umber(s) to r revision(s):	revise:	
Were there additional questions that you would include in this section? If yes, indicate the question(s) to add in the space provided.	Question(s) to add:		
Recommendations for Improvement				
OVERALL	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
The needs assessment survey is organized in a logical sequence.		D	□ A	☐ SA
The needs assessment survey uses language that is familiar to				

State agency school nutrition professionals.

The format of the survey is easy to use and understand.

 \square SD

 \square SD

 \square D

 \square D

 \square A

 \square A

 \square SA

 \square SA

Training and Professional Development Needs Assessment for State Agency Child Nutrition Professionals
Who Work Primarily with School Nutrition Programs

Appendix C: Training Needs Assessment – State Agency Professionals Who Work with School Meals Programs

Training Needs Assessment – State Agency Professionals Who Work with School Meals Programs

We know your time is valuable! Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey!

IMPORTANT INFORMATION

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- Only complete this survey if you are a State agency child nutrition program director or staff member who works with school meal programs.
- This survey should take approximately 30 minutes. Once you begin, your responses will be saved. You can leave the survey and return anytime using the same link to continue where you left off. (This will only be possible if you return to the survey on the same computer, with the same web browser, and the browser cookies have not been cleared.)

SURVEY NAVIGATION

- To progress to the next question, click on the green button at the bottom of the page marked "Go to the next question →."
- Once you have progressed, it is possible to go back to previous pages to check or change a response by clicking on the "— Go to the previous question" button at the bottom of each page.
- The blue progress bar at the bottom of each page indicates the percentage of the survey that has been completed and the percentage remaining.

SURVEY FLOW

This survey contains the following 4 sections:

- Training Needs State agency Professionals Who Work with School Meal Programs
- Your Usage of USDA, FNS Resources and Education Materials
- Your Usage of ICN Resources and Education Materials
- Demographics

Section 1, Training Needs State Agency Professionals Who Work with School Meal Programs, is divided into the following 6 topic areas:

- 1. Conducting Reviews
- 2. Financial Management
- 3. Program Administration
- 4. Procurement
- 5. Training, Curriculum Development and Delivery
- 6. Miscellaneous Topics

Within each topic area in Section 1, respondents are asked a series of multiple choice and ranking questions to identify the level of need for State agency professional who work with school meal programs to receive trainings on the topic and subtopic areas and the best methods for trainings on the topics to be offered.

ACRONYMS

Please note the usage of the following acronyms in this survey:

- Child Nutrition Program CNP
- Institute of Child Nutrition ICN
- Institutional Review Board IRB
- State agency Professionals who work with School Meal Programs SA-SMP
- School Food Authorities SFAs
- School Meal Programs SMPs
- United States Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service USDA, FNS

INFORMED CONSENT

The University of Southern Mississippi Office of Research Integrity IRB

Project Title: Training Needs Assessment of SA-SMPs

Principle Investigator: Keith Rushing

Phone: 601-266-6970

Email: Keith.Rushing@USM.EDU

College: College of Education and Human Sciences **Department:** ICN, Applied Research Division

Purpose: The purpose of this survey is to determine the training needs of SA-SMPs. The specific objectives are to identify the need for training activities aimed at improving SA-SMPs' knowledge and ability regarding the following areas:

- interpretation of Federal, State and local regulations related to the administration government funded school meal programs;
- provision of guidance and oversight to SFAs regarding financial management, program administration and procurement;
- ability to develop and conduct training activities for SFAs; and
- provision of guidance to SFAs participating in farm-to-school activities, writing for and managing grants, complying with professional standards regulations for school nutrition professionals, and utilizing Team Nutrition—nutrition education resources.

Description of Study: This study consists of completing an online survey that should take approximately 30 minutes. Your participation in this study is strictly voluntary.

Benefits: The results of the needs assessment will be used to make recommendations for future ICN training, resources, and research projects to support the trainings and professional development needs of SA-SMPs nationwide.

Risks: There are no known risks associated with participating in this study.

Confidentiality: The information that you provide on this survey will not be linked to you individually. Information gathered during this survey will be stored in a secure location and only the researchers will have access to these records. Three years after the completion of the study, the data collected will be destroyed.

Alternate Procedure: Not applicable

Participant's Assurance: This project has been reviewed by the IRB at The University of Southern Mississippi (USM), which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow Federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research participant should be directed to the Chair of the IRB at 601-266-5997. Participation in this project is completely voluntary, and participants may withdraw from this study at any time without penalty, prejudice, or loss of benefits. Any questions about the research should be directed to the Principal Investigator using the contact information provided above.

Participant Consent: By completing this survey, you acknowledge your consent to participate in this study, and you agree with the following Statement: I hereby consent to participate in this research project. I received information about all expected benefits, risks, inconveniences, or discomforts. I understand my participation in the project is completely voluntary and that I may withdraw from the project at any time without penalty, prejudice, or loss of benefits. I understand the extent to which my personal information will be kept confidential. Questions concerning the research, at any time during or after the project, should be directed to the Principal Investigator with the contact information provided above. This project and this consent form have been reviewed by USM's Institutional Review Board, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow Federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research participant should be directed to the Chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5116, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001, 601-266-5997.

QUESTION 1: For the first question in receive training on Con		rate the level of need for ct only one answer.	SA-SMPs (you and y	our colleagues) to
HighModerateLowNone				
If NONE is selected, the	e survey skips to quest	ion 7		
associated with Conduc	cting Reviews. A comr	your colleagues) to receive the second provide the second		
	High	Moderate	Low	None
Conducting Administrative Reviews	0	0	0	0
Developing and Monitoring Corrective Action Plans	0	0	0	0
Developing and Administering Fiscal Actions	0	\circ	0	0
Conducting Procurement Reviews	0	0	0	0
Conducting Review of Food Service Management Company Contracts	0	0	0	0

Comments:

QUESTION 3:

	onducting Reviews should be offered to so you would like to explain your answer.	SA-SMPs (you and your colleagues)?
O Basic O Advanced O Basic and Advanced		
Comments:		
(you and your colleagues) to receive to	as either High, Moderate or Low) based or raining on Conducting Reviews. Drag an has been provided below the answer choi	nd drop the answer choices into the
High	Moderate	Low
Face-to-Face	Face-to-Face	Face-to-Face
Online–Live (i.e., Webinar)	Online–Live (i.e., Webinar)	Online–Live (i.e., Webinar)
Online–Self-Paced	Online–Self-Paced	Online–Self-Paced
Hard Copy Document / Manual, Self-Paced	Hard Copy Document / Manual, Self-Paced	Hard Copy Document / Manual, Self-Paced
Comments:		
	training on Conducting Reviews for SAw the answer choices if you would like to	

QUESTION 6:
Please select the ideal month(s) of the year for SA-SMPs (you and your colleagues) to receive training on
Conducting Reviews (Select all that apply). A comment box has been provided below the answer choices if you would like to explain your answer.
January
February A 1
March
O April
O May
○ June
O July
August
September
October
November
O December
Comments:
The training topic area for the next set of questions is Financial Management. The objective of this training would
be to improve training participants' knowledge and ability to provide financial management guidance and oversight
to SFAs regarding Federal, State, and local guidelines regulations (i.e., accounting and financial management
processes related to food service operations and Federal and State guidelines for pricing meals and food items).
QUESTION 7:
For the first question in this topic area, please rate the level of need for SA-SMPs (you and your colleagues) to
receive training on Financial Management . Select only one answer.
O High
O Moderate
O Low
O None

If NONE is selected, the survey skips to question 13

48

QUESTION 8:

Rate the level of need for SA-SMPs (you and your colleagues) to receive training on each of the subtopics associated with Financial Management. A comment box has been provided below the answer choices if you would like to explain your answer or to provide additional subtopics needed.

	High	Moderate	Low	None
Basic Accounting Principles	0	0	0	0
Budget Development, Justification, and Implementation	0	0	0	0
Federal and State Guidelines for Pricing Meals and Food Items	0	0	0	0
Understanding and Utilizing Basic Financial Statements (i.e., Statement of Revenue and Expenditures and Balance Sheet)	0	0	0	0
Utilizing Key Performance Indicators (i.e., Meals Per Labor Hour, Inventory Turnover Rate, etc.) for Decision Making and Program Evaluation	0	0		0
Comments:	 			
		ial Management should be ided below the answer cho		
Basic Advanced Basic and Advance	d			
Comments:				

\cap I	JE.	C7	ГΤ	\cap	N	1	U	ŀ

Rank the following formats (as either High, Moderate or Low) based on preference for SA-SMPs (you and your colleagues) to receive training on **Financial Management.** Drag and drop the answer choices into the box(es) you choose. A comment box has been provided below the answer choices if you would like to explain your answer.

High	Moderate	Low
Face-to-Face	Face-to-Face	Face-to-Face
Online-Live (i.e., Webinar)	Online–Live (i.e., Webinar)	Online–Live (i.e., Webinar)
Online-Self-Paced	Online_Self-Paced	Online_Self-Paced
Hard Copy Document / Manual, Self-Paced	Hard Copy Document / Manual, Self-Paced	Hard Copy Document / Manual, Self-Paced
Comments:		
	SA-SMPs (you and your colleagues) to been provided below the answer choices if	
Comments:		
	year for SA-SMPs (you and your colleag A comment box has been provided below	
February		
March		
O April		
O May		
June		
O July		
August		
September		
October		
O November		
O December		
2 December		
Comments:		

The training topic area for the next set of questions is **Program Administration**. The objective of this training would be to improve training participants' knowledge and ability to provide guidance and oversight to SFAs regarding the operation federally funded SMPs (i.e., At-Risk Afterschool Meal Program National School Lunch Program [NSLP], NSLP Afterschool Snack Program, School Breakfast Program [SBP] and Alternative Service Models and Summer Food Service Program [SFSP]).

	ST		

For the first question in this topic area, please rate the level of need for SA-SMPs (you and your colleagues) to receive training on Program Administration . Select only one answer.
High Moderate Low None

If NONE is selected, the survey skips to question 19

QUESTION 14:

Rate the level of need for SA-SMPs (you and your colleagues) to receive training on each of the subtopics associated with **Program Administration**. A comment box has been provided below. The answer choices if you would like to explain your answer or to provide additional subtopics needed.

	High	Moderate	Low	None
6-Cent Certification	0	0	0	0
Accommodating Students with Special Dietary Needs	0	\circ	\bigcirc	\circ
Administration of Food Service Management Company (Contracts, Bids, etc.)	0	\circ	0	0
Civil Rights Compliance	0	\circ	\bigcirc	\circ
Direct Certification	0	\circ	\circ	\circ
Food Safety Plans and Inspection Reporting	0	\circ	\circ	\circ
Household Income Verification	0	\circ	\circ	\circ
Local School Wellness Policies	0	\circ	\circ	\circ
Management Evaluations	0	\circ	\circ	\circ
Meal Counting and Claiming	0	\circ	\circ	\circ
Meal Patterns/Menu Planning	0	\circ	\circ	\circ
Offer Versus Serve (OVS)	0	\circ	\bigcirc	\circ
Specific Requirements for Non-Traditional Sponsors (Residential Child Care Institutions [RCCIs], Charter Schools, etc.)	0	\circ	\circ	0
Special Provisions (1, 2, 3, Community Eligibility Provision, etc.)	0	\circ	\bigcirc	\circ
State Revenue Matching of Federal Funds	0	\circ	\bigcirc	\circ
Comments:				
QUESTION 15: What level of training pertaining to SA-SMPs (you and your colleagues)? A conthe answer choices if you would like to explain your answer. Basic Advanced Basic and Advanced	nment bo	ox has been p	orovidec	l below

colleagues) to receive training on Prog choose. A comment box has been prov	High, Moderate or Low) based on prefere ram Administration. Drag and drop the ided below the answer choices if you wo	e answer choices into the box(es) you ould like to explain your answer.
High	Moderate	Low
Face-to-Face	Face-to-Face	Face-to-Face
Online–Live (i.e., Webinar)	Online–Live (i.e., Webinar)	Online–Live (i.e., Webinar)
Online–Self-Paced	Online–Self-Paced	Online–Self-Paced
Hard Copy Document / Manual, Self-Paced	Hard Copy Document / Manual, Self-Paced	Hard Copy Document / Manual, Self-Paced
Comments:	I	
	SA-SMPs (you and your colleagues) to research provided below the answer choices	
	ear for SA-SMPs (you and your colleag A comment box has been provided belo	
O December		

The training topic area for the next set of questions is **Procurement**. The objective of this training would be to improve training participants' knowledge and ability to provide guidance and oversight to SFAs regarding procurement for Federally funded SMPs (i.e., At-Risk Afterschool Meal Program National School Lunch Program [NSLP], NSLP Afterschool Snack Program, School Breakfast Program [SBP] and Alternative Service Models and Summer Food Service Program [SFSP]).

For	the first question in this topic area, please rate the level of need for SA-SMPs (you and your colleagues) to eive training on Procurement . Select only one answer.
\bigcirc	High
\bigcirc	Moderate
	Low

If NONE is selected, the survey skips to question 25

QUESTION 20:

O None

QUESTION 19:

Rate the level of need for SA-SMPs (you and your colleagues) to receive training on each of the subtopics associated with **Procurement**. A comment box has been provided below the answer choices if you would like to explain your answer or to provide additional subtopics needed.

	High	Moderate	Low	None
Food Buying Guide	0	\circ	\circ	\circ
Competitive Procurement	0	\circ	\circ	\circ
Department of Defense (DOD) Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program (FFVP)	0	0	0	
Procurement Ethics	0	\circ	\circ	\circ
Non-Competitive Procurement	0	\circ	0	\circ
Principles of Good Procurement	0	0	0	\circ
Procuring Local Foods / Farm to School	0	0	0	0
USDA Foods	0	\circ	\circ	\bigcirc
Comments:	I			

	v the answer choices if you would like to	
BasicAdvancedBasic and AdvancedNone		
Comments:		
colleagues) to receive training on Pro comment box has been provided below	High, Moderate or Low) based on prefer curement. Drag and drop the answer chow the answer choices if you would like to Moderate	pices into the box(es) you choose. A explain your answer.
High	Woderate	Low
Face-to-Face	Face-to-Face	Face-to-Face
Online–Live (i.e., Webinar)	Online–Live (i.e., Webinar)	Online–Live (i.e., Webinar)
Online-Self-Paced	Online–Self-Paced	Online–Self-Paced
Hard Copy Document / Manual, Self-Paced	Hard Copy Document / Manual, Self-Paced	Hard Copy Document / Manual, Self-Paced
Comments:		
	SA-SMPs (you and your colleagues) to w the answer choices if you would like to	
15-30 minutes 45 minutes – 1 hour 2 hours 4 hours 1 day 2 days		
Comments:		

QUESTION 24:
Please select the ideal month(s) of the year for SA-SMPs (you and your colleagues) to receive training on
Procurement (Select all that apply). A comment box has been provided below the answer choices if you would like
to explain your answer.
January
February
March
O April
O May
O June
O July
O August
O September
October
O November
O December
Comments:
The training topic area for the next set of questions is Training , Curriculum Development , and Delivery . The objective of this training would be to improve training participants' ability to develop and conduct trainings for the SFAs they support by providing education and resources on several topics (i.e., developing train-the-trainer programs, teaching adult learners, group facilitating skills, effective communication skills and using technology).
QUESTION 25: For the first question in this topic area, please rate the level of need for SA-SMPs (you and your colleagues) to receive training on Training , Curriculum Development , and Delivery . Select only one answer.
O High
O Moderate
O Low
O None

If NONE is selected, the survey skips to question 31

56

QUESTION 26:

Rate the level of need SA-SMPs (you and your colleagues) for to receive training on the following topics pertaining to **Training, Curriculum Development, and Delivery.** A comment box has been provided below the answer choices if you would like to explain your answer or to provide additional subtopics needed.

	High	Moderate	Low	None
Developing Train- the-Trainer Programs	0	0	0	0
Teaching Adult Learners/Adult Learning Principles	0	0	0	0
Conducting Training (Group Facilitation Skills, etc.)	0	0	0	0
Principles and Techniques of Effective Communication (i.e., Public Speaking, Writing, Coaching, etc.)	0	0	0	0
Using Technology (PowerPoint, Webinars, Learning Management Systems, etc.)	0	0	0	0
		Curriculum Development box has been provided if		
Basic Advanced Basic and Advance	d			
Comments:				

UEST	つ 0.

Rank the following formats (as either High, Moderate or Low) based on preference for SA-SMPs (you and your colleagues) to receive training on **Training, Curriculum Development, and Delivery.** Drag and drop the answer choices into the box(es) you choose. A comment box has been provided below the answer choices if you would like to explain your answer.

High	Moderate	Low
Face-to-Face	Face-to-Face	Face-to-Face
Online–Live (i.e., Webinar)	Online–Live (i.e., Webinar)	Online–Live (i.e., Webinar)
Online—Self-Paced	Online–Self-Paced	Online_Self-Paced
Hard Copy Document / Manual, Self-Paced	Hard Copy Document / Manual, Self-Paced	Hard Copy Document / Manual, Self-Paced
Comments:		
	SA-SMPs (you and your colleagues) to revery. A comment box has been provided	
15-30 minutes		
○ 45 minutes – 1 hour		
O 2 hours		
4 hours		
O 1 day		
O 2 days		
Comments:		
	year for SA-SMPs (you and your colleag very (Select all that apply). A comment b	
O January	.F) - 11- 11- 11- 11- 11- 11- 11- 11	
February		
March		
O April		
O May		
June		
O July		
August		
September		
October		
October November		
December		
December		

Comments:

QUESTION 31: For the next question, please rate the level of need for SA-SMPs (you and your colleagues) to receive training on variety of different topic areas. The objective of this training would be to improve training participants' knowledge and ability to provide guidance and oversight to SFAs regarding each of the topic areas. A comment box has been provided below the answer choices if you would like to explain your answers.				
	High	Moderate	Low	None
Farm to School	0	0	\circ	0
Grant Writing/Management, USDA Equipment Grants	0	0	0	0
Professional Standards	0	0	\circ	\circ
Team Nutrition – Nutrition Education	0	0	0	\circ
Comments:				

Section 2: Your Usage of USDA, FNS Resources and Education Materials

The next set of questions pertains to your usage of **USDA**, **FNS's** resources and education materials.

QUESTION 32: For the first question in this set, please indicate whether or not you use the USDA's Professional Standards Training Database as a resource for your training and education needs or to access professional development activities? Select only one answer .
○ Yes ○ No
If NO is selected, the survey skips to question 34
QUESTION 33: Please identify which of the resources on the USDA's Professional Standards Training Database you use. Type your answer in the text box below.
The survey skips to question 35 after this question.
QUESTION 34: Please explain why you do not use the USDA's Professional Standards Training Database . Type your answer in the text box below.
QUESTION 35: Do you use the USDA's Professional Standards Training Database to track your own training and education needs and/or those of your staff? Select only one answer .
○ Yes ○ No
If NO is selected, the survey skips to question 37
QUESTION 36: Please explain why you do not use the USDA's Professional Standards Training Database to track your own training and education needs and/or those of your staff? Type your answer in the text box below.
QUESTION 37: Do you use other USDA resources for your training and education needs? <u>Select only one answer</u> .
○ Yes○ No
If NO is selected, the survey skips to question 39
QUESTION 38:
Please identify which USDA resources you use. Type your answer in the text box below.

The survey skips to question 40 after this question.

Section 3: Your Usage of ICN Resources and Education Materials

Section 4: Demographics

The next set of questions provide researchers with information about you and the child nutrition program where you work. Please know that the results of this survey are completely anonymous. The information gathered here will not be linked to you, your program or the State where your program is located. The results of this survey will only by analyzed by USDA region and not by individual States.

QUESTION 43:

For the	e first question, please select the phrase that best describes your job title? Select only one answer .
O CI	NP Director
O St	ate Agency CNP Management Staff
	ate Agency CNP Staff
	TION 44: nany years of child nutrition experience do you have? Select only one answer.
0 <1	l year
O 1-	5 years
O 6-	10 years
\bigcirc 11	-15 years
\bigcirc 16	5-20 years
O 20	O or more years
	TION 45: nany years have you been in your current position? Select only one answer.
O <1	l year
O 1-	5 years
0 6-	10 years
\bigcirc 11	-15 years
\bigcirc 16	5-20 years
0 20	or more years
_	TION 46: s your highest level of education? Select only one answer.
Он	igh School Diploma/GED
O As	ssociate's Degree
○ Ba	achelor's Degree
\circ M	aster's Degree
O Do	octorate Degree
	TION 47: s your certification/credential status? Select all that apply.
O Re	egistered Dietitian Nutritionist (RD/RDN)
O Li	censed Dietitian
\bigcirc Sc	chool Nutrition Association (SNA) Certified

School Nutrition Specialist (SNS) Certified	
Other (Please list)	
QUESTION 48:	
In which USDA, FNS region are you located? Select only one answer.	
Mid-Atlantic (DC, DE, MD, NJ, PA, PR, VA, & WV)	
Midwest (IA, IL, IN, MI, MN, OH, & WI)	
Mountain Plains (CO, KS, MO, MT, NE, ND, SD, & WY)	
O Northeast (CT, MA, ME, NH, NY, RI, VI, & VT)	
O Southeast (AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, NC, SC, & TN)	
O Southwest (AR, AZ, LA, OK, NM, TX, & UT)	
Western (AK, AS, CA, CNMI, GUAM, HI, ID, NV, OR, & WA)	

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey! Please see the link below to access USDA, FNS's Team Nutrition and ICN training and education materials. https://www.fns.usda.gov/tn

https://theicn.org/



The University of Mississippi School of Applied Sciences 800-321-3054 www.theicn.org