



Original Research

The National School Lunch Program in Rural Appalachian Tennessee – or Why Implementation of the Healthy, Hunger Free Kids Act of 2010 was Met with Challenges: A Brief Report

Southerland JL^{1*}, Dula TM¹, Dalton WT III², Schetzina K³ and Slawson DL¹

¹Department of Community and Behavioral Health, College of Public Health, East Tennessee State University, USA

²Department of Psychology, Brevard College, USA

³Department of Pediatrics, Quillen College of Medicine, East Tennessee State University, USA

Abstract

Purpose: The purpose of this study was to investigate challenges faced by high schools in rural Appalachia in implementing the Healthy, Hunger Free Kids Act of 2010 (HHFKA). **Methodology:** We used qualitative, secondary analysis to analyze a collection of thirteen focus groups and 22 interviews conducted in 2013-14 among parents, teachers, and high school students in six counties in rural Appalachian Tennessee (n=98). **Results:** Five basic themes were identified during the thematic analysis: poor food quality prior to implementation of the HHFKA school nutrition reforms; students' preference for low-nutrient energy-dense foods; low acceptance of healthier options after implementation of the HHFKA school nutrition reforms; HHFKA school nutrition reforms not tailored to unique needs of under-resourced communities; and students opting out of the National School Lunch Program after implementation of the HHFKA school nutrition reforms. Rural communities face multiple and intersecting challenges in implementing the HHFKA school nutrition reforms. **Conclusion:** As a result, schools in rural Appalachia may be less likely to derive benefits from these reforms. The ability of rural schools to take advantage of school nutrition reforms to improve student health may depend largely on factors unique to each community or school.

Keywords: Appalachia; Rural; School nutrition reform; Qualitative secondary analysis

Abbreviations

HHFKA: Healthy, Hunger Free Kids Act; NSLP: National School Lunch Program; QSA: Qualitative Secondary Analysis.

Introduction

Rural Appalachia faces a disproportionate burden of childhood obesity [1,2] and lower rates of fruit and vegetable consumption among children [3], compared with the U.S. The National School Lunch Program (NSLP) plays an integral role in promoting healthy nutrition in schools in this region [4-6]. Amid growing concerns over the prevalence of childhood obesity in the U.S., the United States Department of Agriculture updated the NSLP nutrition standards [7]. The first phase occurred in 2006 with the requirement that schools develop wellness policies to promote student health through focus on physical activity and nutrition. Then in 2012, the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 (HHFKA) was implemented [8]. The primary goal of this act was to enhance the nutritional quality of foods offered through the NSLP [9] by limiting caloric intake, portion size, and saturated fats and increasing consumption of fruits, vegetables, and whole grains [9-11].

Policy approaches, such as these, represent an important step towards addressing obesity and inadequate fruit and

vegetable intake among children in rural Appalachia. Yet, rural schools face unique challenges affecting their ability to implement school nutrition reform [12-15] in terms of fiscal and personnel constraints [16,17] remote location [17] and a less healthy food environment, compared with metropolitan schools [18-20].

According to Asada et al. [21] research among rural, socioeconomically disadvantaged populations is needed to elucidate contextual factors that may impact school nutrition reform.

Aim

The current study aims to fill this gap in the literature by conducting a qualitative secondary analysis (QSA) to explore challenges faced by high schools in rural Appalachia in implementing the HHFKA school nutrition reforms.

Materials and Methods

We used QSA to analyze a collection of thirteen focus groups and 22 interviews from the Boundaries and Bridges to Adolescent Obesity Prevention: Identifying Parental Engagement Strategies in High Schools in Southern Appalachia project, a qualitative study conducted in 2013-14 among parents, teachers, and high school students in six

Southerland JL, Dula TM, Dalton WT III, Schetzina K, Slawson DL (2018) The National School Lunch Program in Rural Appalachian Tennessee – or Why Implementation of the Healthy, Hunger Free Kids Act of 2010 was Met with Challenges: A Brief Report. *J Health Sci Educ* 2: 131.

counties in rural Appalachian Tennessee.

The focus groups and interviews were collected by experienced research staff using semi-structured interview techniques to identify factors contributing to adolescent obesity and the role of parents and schools in moderating risk. Participants were asked to discuss barriers and supports to physical activity and healthy eating in the home, school, and community. Probing questions were used to explore topics in further depth. For example, when asked about barriers and supports to healthy eating within the school, the interviewer used prompts or probes to elicit additional information about the NSLP if necessary [22]. Primary analysis subsequently revealed that challenges implementing the HHFKA school nutrition reforms was an important theme that warranted further investigation. As investigators on the original study, we were well positioned to return to the dataset and perform QSA to investigate this emerging theme [23,24].

Participant recruitment

Purposive sampling techniques were used to recruit participants [22,25]. Parents and teachers were recruited in high schools in five counties participating in the Team Up for Healthy Living project (control arm), a cluster-randomized clinical trial of a cross-peer obesity prevention program among adolescents in rural Appalachia [26].

To avoid biasing results among adolescents in the Team Up project, we recruited students from two high schools in a separate county in the region not currently participating in the project. Recruitment methods included distributing flyers at school-related events (e.g., parent-teacher conferences, school athletic events, school fairs, after-school programs, and community outreach events for low-income families) attended by the research staff and electronic invitation using email distribution lists obtained from school principals.

Data collection

Data collection methods were semi-structured focus groups and interviews [27]. Parents, teachers, and students participated in separate sessions to ensure group homogeneity [22]. Sessions lasted approximately 30 to 45 minutes and were led by a trained research staff. Participants received an honorarium at the conclusion of the sessions. Parental consent and child assent were obtained prior to study enrollment. A total of 39 parents, 38 teachers, and 21 students participated in the study. The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at East Tennessee State University (IRB# c0713.18s).

Data analysis

First, we read the 35 transcripts collected in the primary study [21]. Second, we re-read those transcripts to enhance our familiarity with the data [28]. Lastly, we used Thematic Network Analysis [29] to analyze the transcripts. The basic steps of this analysis include coding the material, identifying themes, constructing thematic networks, describing the thematic networks, and interpreting the findings within the context of the study purpose. The three (TD, JS, NW) analysts met regularly to discuss, review, and reach consensus

throughout the QSA and to develop a clear audit trail between the raw data and development of codes and themes. Parent, teacher, and student datasets were analyzed separately prior to a cross-comparative analysis to generate the thematic network. A similar approach has been used elsewhere [30,31]. Other details about participant recruitment and characteristics and methods used to enhance trustworthiness in the primary study are reported elsewhere (manuscript under review).

Results

Participants discussed a range of issues related to challenges implementing the HHFKA school nutrition reforms. These findings are summarized into five basic themes (Table 1).

Poor food quality prior to implementation of the HHFKA school nutrition reforms

Prior to implementation of the HHFKA school nutrition reforms, several participants stated that foods served during lunch were healthier than a decade ago, with more baked, whole wheat, and low-fat food options available. Yet, most participants described the food as unhealthy, low quality, and unsatisfactory in taste, texture, and appearance. A teacher described a typical lunch meal as consisting of “bread, mashed potatoes, and fried chicken nuggets”. Many participants stated there was limited access to fresh foods and typically “everything is heated up out of a can”. Pizza was a favorite among students; however, the pizza being served was not prepared healthy: “It’s like a waterfall of grease”.

Students’ preference for low-nutrient energy-dense foods

The majority of participants felt that students simply prefer low-nutrient energy-dense foods because these foods are familiar to them and are more widely available at home and school (e.g., vending machines or a la carte items). One parent stated: “She don’t like school lunch. So when she comes home she eats stuff like lasagna, mashed potatoes, corn”. Teachers and students expressed similar concerns. Many students felt that the new changes to the school lunch menu were “pushing them [sic] to go to McDonald’s®,” where they could eat hamburgers and fries.

Low acceptance of the healthier food options after implementation of the HHFKA school nutrition reforms

Many participants (primarily teachers) acknowledged that schools were doing the best they could to prepare lunches according to the new HHFKA meal standards. However, students expressed dislike of the new foods being served and referred to them as unpalatable, “not food at all,” at all and “not real meat”. Another stated “They try to feed us healthy, no they’re trying to kill us”. Parents and teachers who had eaten in the cafeteria also said the food was not very palatable. Words commonly associated with foods served at lunch included: terrible, awful, and unappealing.

Southerland JL, Dula TM, Dalton WT III, Schetzina K, Slawson DL (2018) The National School Lunch Program in Rural Appalachian Tennessee – or Why Implementation of the Healthy, Hunger Free Kids Act of 2010 was Met with Challenges: A Brief Report. *J Health Sci Educ* 2: 131.

HHFKA school nutrition reforms not tailored to unique needs of under-resourced communities

Several parents felt the HHFKA meal standards focused on “weight loss rather than nutrition”. Many teachers and students echoed these comments. Portion sizes were too small and fewer options were available, outcomes of the HHFKA school nutrition reforms. One parent had this to say about portion size: “You’ve got grown kids here. That might be okay for kindergarteners, but when they get older they gotta have a little more. And they just don’t provide them enough”. Another parent stated: “Mine are starved to death when they get home from eating regular lunch.” Some students felt they had “no choice” in terms of foods offered during lunch. Several items had been eliminated; but students were most frustrated over elimination of salad bars; although, some schools continued to offer pre-made salads.

Participants also argued that the HHFKA school nutrition reforms used a “one-size fits all” approach and therefore, failed to account for the unique needs of students and communities. Food insecurity among students was a primary concern for most participants. Participants mentioned several times that school lunch may be the child’s only meal. These two parent quotes highlight the seriousness of the issue in the region:

“This is the only place they get it [meals] and then they get here and there’s not enough. There’s not enough for somebody that does get it at home”.

“When that’s their only meal and then they’ve cut, reduced the food to almost half of what it used to be. The kitchen, they noticed the kids and how tired they would act and how hungry and they even say that they knew that some of the kids are hungry but they didn’t take food because the food wasn’t any good”.

Participants were also concerned that the new HHFKA meal standards did not account for differences in the caloric needs of students. They listed several reasons why students may need more calories during the school day: activity level, gender, age, body composition, and after-school activities.

At a community level, participants believed rural schools experienced greater burden in terms of implementing the HHFKA school nutrition reforms than urban schools in the region. Parents and teachers who had attended countywide school meetings learned that students in nearby urban schools had a greater selection of options to choose from during lunch. These options had been served in the past and were both appealing and palatable to students (e.g., fruit yogurt cups, and peanut butter and jelly sandwiches). Since rural schools had fewer resources in terms of personnel and finances, they would not derive the same benefits from the HHFKA reforms as urban schools in the region.

Students opting out of the NSLP after implementation of the HHFKA school nutrition reforms

Participants believed that roll out of the HHFKA school nutrition reforms had resulted in a noticeable drop in student participation in the NSLP. More students chose not to eat at school, while others chose to pack their lunch. One parent

who worked at a high school noted: “There’s not many students that eat lunch here anymore.” Another parent: “My daughter...she’s always ate the school lunch...She doesn’t eat this year.” Most students participating in the study did not eat school lunch; rather they waited until they arrived home. In some cases, but not all, lack of participation corresponded with roll out of the new nutrition standards. This quote from a student provides context for the issue: “The taste of the food is so bad that the people don’t eat it. So when they go home they raid the cabinets, the refrigerators, even the sink. Anything, anywhere they find food.” Students in the focus groups also provided two other explanations for lack of participation in the NSLP. According to them, some students have always brought a packed lunch and other students simply will not eat food served in the school cafeteria because they do not like it.

Discussion

This represents one of the first studies to assess challenges faced by high schools in rural Appalachia in implementing the HHFKA school nutrition reforms. Five basic themes were identified in the analysis: poor food quality prior to implementation of the HHFKA school nutrition reforms; students’ preference for low-nutrient energy-dense foods; low acceptance of healthier options after implementation of the HHFKA school nutrition reforms; HHFKA school nutrition reforms not tailored to unique needs of under-resourced communities; and students opting out of the National School Lunch Program after implementation of HHFKA school nutrition reforms.

Similar findings have been reported elsewhere [32,33]. For example, school food administrators across the U.S. have cited operational challenges implementing the HHFKA school nutrition reforms including cost, food preparation, staff training, participation, plate waste and preference [16,34,35]. Rural schools, in particular, have observed increased plate waste, declining NSLP participation and more student complaints post-implementation [16,33]. Nevertheless, findings to date are inconsistent [16,28,32-34,36,38] perhaps because of factors unique to each community or school.

The Special Nutrition Program Operations Study (SN-OPS) is a multi-year external evaluation of outcomes resulting from implementation of the HHFKA of 2010. Authorized by the USDA, this report collected data from a nationally representative sample of state-level and local school food directors across the U.S. [35]. Findings from our study are similar to findings from the 2013-14 SN-OPS data collection period. According to the SN-OPS report, more than half of schools reported “very” or “extreme” operational challenges in 2013-14 in terms of plate waste, participation, and acceptance of healthier options by students, parents, and staff [35].

In response to these particular findings, the USDA initiated a process to modify milk, whole grains, and sodium requirements. The goal of these modifications is multifaceted: 1) ease implementation burden on school food administrators; 2) provide greater local autonomy among schools to serve healthy meals that are appealing to students; and 3) provide additional technical assistance to school food administrators

Southerland JL, Dula TM, Dalton WT III, Schetzina K, Slawson DL (2018) The National School Lunch Program in Rural Appalachian Tennessee – or Why Implementation of the Healthy, Hunger Free Kids Act of 2010 was Met with Challenges: A Brief Report. *J Health Sci Educ* 2: 131.

[35,40,41]. The final rule, which is set to be published mid-2018 and then rolled out in the schools [42], will provide

opportunities for additional research in this area.

Table 1: Selected quotes from study participants.

Basic Theme	Parents	Teachers	Students
Poor food quality prior to implementation of the HHFKA school nutrition reforms	I'm not a fan of school lunches... They're not healthful at all. It's the poorest quality food I think you could possibly offer them.	The other day they had bread, mashed potatoes, and fried chicken nuggets. I mean high carbs.	I don't care if they serve healthy food or not. I just want them to serve real food. The corn should not be swimming in grease and taste disgusting.
Students' preference for low-nutrient energy-dense foods	Cheese, milk, bread, junk, cookies, that's where my buggy goes... We've just been trained, right?	They want their drug. Their drug is bad food. They want their junk.	I eat the snack machine. That's where I go.
Low acceptance of healthier options after implementation of the HHFKA school nutrition reforms	Tasteless, doesn't have any flavor. Tastes like straw.	If you would see what is served in the lunch line.	They make us eat that nasty wheat bread and our chicken ain't even chicken.
HHFKA school nutrition reforms not tailored to unique needs of under-resourced communities	I went to one meeting and I suggest have a peanut butter sandwich I mean that'd be better... I know the city school offers that and I said why can't the county?	There's something wrong. There's an obesity problem but you know you can't just cut off the portions to just you know happy meal size.	I think they give you such small portions if you actually want to eat actual food and not be hungry the rest of the day you have to get junk food out of the snack machine.
Students opting out of the National School Lunch Program after implementation of the HHFKA school nutrition reforms	My kids hate it... Our participation in school lunch has went way own.	But see they're losing money. Like they're in the red bad. Yeah, because kids aren't eating it.	I wait until I get home because half of the time the food is nasty.

Conclusion

Rural communities face multiple and intersecting challenges in implementing school nutrition reforms. The ability of rural schools to take advantage of school nutrition reforms to improve student health may depend largely on factors unique to each community or school. As a result, schools in rural Appalachia may be less likely to derive benefits from these reforms. Our findings, together with the literature, support the view that contextual factors are key considerations when developing school nutrition reforms in rural Appalachia [21,43].

Limitations

A major criticism of QSA is concern regarding the fit between the primary study and secondary analysis [23]. As

investigators on the original research project, we could assess 'fit' based on our familiarity with the primary data and the context in which it was collected [44]. Secondly, while the emergence of the topic "challenges implementing school nutrition reform" in the primary study is a noteworthy consideration, further research may be warranted to deepen our understanding of the conclusions drawn in the secondary analysis [45]. This limitation may have been partially addressed through use of semi-structured schedules in the primary study which are more likely to produce rich, nuanced datasets compatible with secondary analysis [23].

Lastly, researchers undertaking secondary analysis have no control over the selection of participants, thus potentially limiting depth of understanding on an issue [46]. In the primary study, recruitment efforts targeted groups of individuals who could provide information-rich insights. These efforts yielded a multi-group, multi-county sample of individuals (n=98) who were impacted directly by the school nutrition reforms.

Southerland JL, Dula TM, Dalton WT III, Schetzina K, Slawson DL (2018) The National School Lunch Program in Rural Appalachian Tennessee – or Why Implementation of the Healthy, Hunger Free Kids Act of 2010 was Met with Challenges: A Brief Report. *J Health Sci Educ* 2: 131.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Tennessee Board of Regents (TBR). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of TBR. TBR had no involvement in the study design, data collection, analysis or interpretation, in writing the report, or in any decisions regarding submission of the article for publication.

References

1. Ogden CL, Carroll MD, Kit BK, et al. (2014) Prevalence of childhood and adult obesity in the United States, 2011-2012. *JAMA* 311(8): 806-814.
2. Wang L, Slawson DL, Relyea G, et al. (2014) Prevalence and risk factors for adolescent obesity in southern Appalachia, 2012. *Prev Chronic Dis* 18(11): E222.
3. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (2013) State indicator report on fruit and vegetables, 2013.
4. Basch CE (2010) Healthier students are better learners: A missing link in school reforms to close the achievement gap. *J Sch Health* 81(10): 593-598.
5. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (2010) The association between school-based physical activity, including physical education, and academic performance. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Atlanta, USA.
6. MMWR Recomm Rep (2011) School health guidelines to promote healthy eating and physical activity. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 60(RR-5): 1-76.
7. Marcason W (2012) What are the new national school lunch and breakfast program nutrition standards? *J Acad Nutr Diet* 12(7): 1112.
8. United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) (2016b) The Healthy Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010, Pub. L. No. 111&296, 124 Stat. 3183.
9. United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) (2016a) National School Lunch Program (NSLP).
10. United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) (2015) NSLP: Total lunches served [Data file].
11. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (2012) Adolescent and school health: Local school wellness policy, 2012.
12. Belansky ES, Cutforth N, Delong E, et al. (2009) Early impact of the federally mandated local wellness policy on physical activity in rural, low income elementary schools. *J Public Health Policy* 30(S1): S141-S160.
13. Johnson J (2009) Why rural matters 2007: The realities of rural education.
14. Rose D, Hutchinson PL, Bodor JN, et al. (2009) Neighborhood food environments and body mass index: The importance of in-store contents. *Am J Prev Med* 37(3): 214-219.
15. Sturm R, Cohen DA (2009) Zoning for health? The year-old ban on new fast-food restaurants in South LA. *Health Aff (Millwood)* 28(6): w1088-w1097.
16. Cornish D, Askelson N, Golembiewski E (2016) "Reforms looked really good on paper": Rural food service responses to the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010. *J Sch Health* 86(2): 113-120.
17. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service (2016) Smarter lunchrooms.
18. Caspi CE, Davey C, Nelson TF, et al. (2015) Disparities persist in nutrition policies and practices in Minnesota Secondary Schools. *J Acad Nutr Diet* 15(3): 419-425.
19. Nanney MS, Davey CS, Kubik MY (2013) Rural disparities in the distribution of policies that support healthy eating in US secondary schools. *J Acad Nutr Diet* 13(8): 1062-1068.
20. Turner L, Ohri-Vachaspati P, Powell L, et al. (2016) Improvements and disparities in types of foods and milk beverages offered in elementary school lunches, 2006-2007 to 2013-2014. *Prev Chronic Dis* 13: E39.
21. Asada Y, Hughes A, Chriqui J (2017) Insights on the intersection of health equity and school nutrition policy implementation: An exploratory qualitative secondary analysis. *Health Educ Behav* 44(5): 685-693.
22. Ulin PR, Robinson ET, Tolley EE (2005) Qualitative methods in public health: A field guide to applied research. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
23. Heaton J (2008) Secondary analysis of qualitative data: An overview. *Historical Social Research* 33(3): 33-45.
24. Hinds PS, Vogel RJ, Clarke-Steffen L (1997) The possibilities and pitfalls of doing a secondary analysis of a qualitative data set. *Qualitative Health Research* 7(3): 408-424.
25. Mason J (2002) Qualitative researching. (2nd edn), Sage Publications, London.
26. Slawson DL, Dalton WT III, Dula TM, et al. (2015) College students as facilitators in reducing adolescent obesity disparity in Southern Appalachia: Team Up for Healthy Living. *Contemp Clin Trials* 43: 39-42.
27. Berg B, Lune H (2011) Qualitative research methods for the social sciences. (8th edn), Pearson Higher Education, Boston, MA.
28. Asada Y, Ziemann M, Zatz LY, et al. (2017) Successes and challenges in school meal reform: Qualitative insights from food services directors. *J Sch Health* 87(8): 608-615.
29. Attride-Stirling J (2001) Thematic networks: An analytic tool for qualitative research. *Qualitative Research* 1(3): 385-405.
30. Gellar L, Druker S, Osganian SK, et al. (2012) Exploratory research to design a school nurse-delivered intervention to treat adolescent overweight and obesity. *J Nutr Educ Behav* 44(1): 46-54.
31. Power TG, Bindler RC, Goetz S, et al. (2010) Obesity prevention in early adolescence: Student, parent, and teacher views. *J Sch Health* 80(1): 13-19.
32. Hill T, Thomas LN, Dollahite J. (2014) In wake of changes to national school lunch program, parents share concerns about children's food choices at school and at home. *J Nutr Educ Behav* 46: S159.
33. Turner L, Chaloupka FJ (2014) Perceived reactions of elementary school students to changes in school lunches after implementation of the United States Department of Agriculture's new meals standards: minimal backlash, but

Southerland JL, Dula TM, Dalton WT III, Schetzina K, Slawson DL (2018) The National School Lunch Program in Rural Appalachian Tennessee – or Why Implementation of the Healthy, Hunger Free Kids Act of 2010 was Met with Challenges: A Brief Report. *J Health Sci Educ* 2: 131.

rural and socioeconomic disparities exist. *Child Obes* 10(4): 349-356.

34. Byker CJ, Pinard CA, Yaroch AL, et al. (2013) New NSLP guidelines: Challenges and opportunities for nutrition education practitioners and researchers. *J Nutr Educ Behav* 45: 683-689.

35. Murdoch J, Campbell A, Condon E, et al. (2016) Special Nutrition Program Operations Study (SN-OPS). SY 2013-2014 Report. Food and Nutrition Service. Office of Policy Support. United States Department of Agriculture. 2M Research Services, LLC., Arlington, USA.

36. Byker CJ, Farris AR, Marcenelle M, et al. (2014) Food waste in a school nutrition program after implementation of new lunch program guidelines. *J Nutr Educ Behav* 46(5): 406-411.

37. Cohen JFW, Richardson S, Parker E, et al. (2014) Impact of the new U.S. Department of Agriculture school meal standards on food selection, consumption, and waste. *Am J Prev Med* 46(4): 388-394.

39. United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) (2017a) Ag Secretary Perdue Moves to Make School Meals Great Again, Release No. 0032.147. May 1, 2017. USDA, Leesburg, VA, USA.

41. United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) (2017b) USDA Commitment to School Meals. By Secretary of Agriculture of the United States of America. A Proclamation.

42. Federal Register (2017) Child Nutrition Programs: Flexibilities for Milk, Whole Grains, and Sodium Requirements. *The Daily Journal of the United States Government* 82(220): 56709-56723.

43. Graves A, Haughton B, Jahns L, et al. (2008) Biscuits, sausage, gravy, milk, and orange juice: School breakfast environment in 4 rural Appalachian schools. *J Sch Health* 78(4): 197-202.

44. Thorne S (1994) Secondary analysis in qualitative research: Issues and implications, Morse JM, *Critical Issues in Qualitative Research Methods*, Sage, London, pp: 263-279.

45. Heaton J (1998) Secondary analysis of qualitative data. *Social Research Update*, 22. University of Surrey, UK.

46. Rew L, Koniak-Griffin D, Lewis MA, et al. (2000) Secondary data analysis: New perspective for adolescent research. *Nurs Outlook* 48(5): 223-229.

***Corresponding author:** Jodi L Southerland, DrPH, Department of Community & Behavioral Health, College of Public Health, East Tennessee State University, PO Box 70674, Johnson City, TN 37614. USA; Email: southerlanjl@etsu.edu

Received date: February 15, 2018; **Accepted date:** March 26, 2018; **Published date:** March 28, 2018

Citation: Southerland JL, Dula TM, Dalton WT III, Schetzina K, Slawson DL (2018) The National School Lunch Program in Rural Appalachian Tennessee – or Why Implementation of the Healthy, Hunger Free Kids Act of 2010 was Met with Challenges: A Brief Report. *J Health Sci Educ* 2(2): 131.

Copyright: Southerland JL, Dula TM, Dalton WT III, Schetzina K, Slawson DL (2018) The National School Lunch Program in Rural Appalachian Tennessee – or Why Implementation of the Healthy, Hunger Free Kids Act of 2010 was Met with Challenges: A Brief Report. *J Health Sci Educ* 2(2): 131.