

A Content Analysis of Implementation Strategies Chosen by Virginia School Nutrition Directors

Rachel A. Nelson, MS
Kathleen J. Porter, PhD, RD
Kelly Shomo, MPH
Sandra Curwood, PhD, RDN
Sarah A. Misyak, PhD, MPH

Objective: School-based interventions are common approaches to address childhood obesity; however, there is little understanding of strategies that can foster their implementation into schools. In this study, we aimed to identify goals and the specific strategies selected by school nutrition directors (SNDs) in Virginia to execute school-based interventions. **Methods:** Between 2018 and 2019, SNDs in Virginia participated in Team Nutrition workshops through which they created action plans. We carried out a content analysis of 132 action plans collected from 100 school divisions. We developed codes deductively and inductively. The codes captured plan completion, goals, and strategies. Each plan was independently coded by 2 coders. **Results:** Action plans included 1.2 goals (SD = 0.54) and 3.9 strategies per goal (SD = 2.1). Goals were most commonly related to improving menus or increasing participation in the school meal programs. The strategies varied based on the goals. However, obtaining buy-in from school personnel and students was the most commonly included goal (64.4%) across plans. The level of action plan completion decreased with each subsequent section of the worksheet. **Conclusions:** Emerging patterns identified in this study suggest SNDs' strategy selection is based on goals and that trainings should be tailored to promote the development of skills required to execute optimal strategies.

Key words: school nutrition; school nutrition director; implementation strategies; content analysis; school food services; school health

Health Behav Policy Rev.TM 2021;8(6):585-595

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14485/HBPR.8.6.9>

Schools are an important setting for childhood obesity prevention interventions. Students spend an average of 6.64 hours per day in school for 180 days of the year.^{1,2} Additionally, meals consumed at school can account for up to half of a child's daily calorie consumption.³ Because of this, comprehensive programs may target different aspects of the school day and require school staff to collaborate. Common types of program components include didactic classroom sessions, hands-on cooking or gardening sessions, marketing campaigns, and changes to the school food environment.⁴

Effective implementation, which requires careful planning, is critical for the success of school-based nutrition education programs. Implementation strategies, the processes by which an intervention is integrated into a given setting,⁵ are vital for a program's successful adoption, implementation, and maintenance. An established list of 73 effective implementation strategies, has been adapted for school settings.⁶⁻⁸ Several implementation strategies from this list already have been shown to be effective in schools – providing central technical assistance at the state level, more available funding through grant programs, reduced barriers to

Rachel A. Nelson, PhD Student, Virginia Tech, Department of Human Nutrition, Foods, and Exercise, Blacksburg, VA, United States. Kathleen J. Porter, Assistant Professor of Research, University of Virginia, Department of Public Health Sciences, Christiansburg, VA, United States. Kelly Shomo, Training and Marketing Specialist and Sandra Curwood, Director, Office of School Nutrition Programs, Virginia Department of Education, Richmond, VA, United States. Sarah A. Misyak, Program Manager for Research and Evaluation, Virginia Cooperative Extension, Blacksburg, VA, United States.

Correspondence Ms Nelson; nelsonr2@vt.edu

student participation (such as grab-and-go lunch options), and increased marketing of school meal programs.^{6,9} Despite this literature, many school-based interventions do not use clear implementation strategies and, instead, use a “train and hope” approach.^{7,10} Without inclusion of implementation strategies reflecting best practices, interventions are less likely to be effective.^{7,10} Therefore, identifying potential implementation strategies should be an important planning step.

Team Nutrition is a school-based intervention developed by the United States Department of Agriculture in 1995 to support school foodservice staff to develop healthier menus containing more fruits and vegetables and less fat.¹¹ The 2 focal components of the Team Nutrition program are training for school nutrition personnel and nutrition education for students. Team Nutrition has been disseminated widely and has been implemented by nearly half of all schools that participate in the National School Lunch Program; however, little research has explored implementation strategies that support its execution in schools.¹²

The Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) received a Team Nutrition Training grant in 2017. It used a train-the-trainer approach that focused on building capacity to empower school nutrition personnel to serve healthier school meals.¹¹ There were 9 topics covered during at least one of the training workshops: (1) Menu Planning and Development, (2) Culinary Skills, (3) Community Outreach and Engagement, (4) Nutrition Education and Physical Activity Promotion, (5) Farm-to-School, (6) Strategic Planning, (7) Financial Management, (8) Procurement, and (9) Data-Driven Decision Making. During training workshops, school nutrition directors (SNDs) completed action plans that detailed their specific plans for improving their divisions’ school nutrition programs.

Previous research suggests a gap exists between the intention and behavior that can be reduced using planning techniques.¹³ Action planning (ie, creating an intended plan for implementation) is one technique that can increase implementation by improving motivation and facilitating the development of approaches to address potential barriers that may arise.¹⁴⁻¹⁶ Action plans outline the strategies the person plans to undertake to achieve their goal and consider alternative strategies to overcome expected barriers.¹³ The theoretical basis of action

planning highlights the importance of engagement in the planning process for intention to be translated into enactment.^{13,17}

The purpose of this study was to fill the gap in the current school-based nutrition literature related to action planning and implementation strategies identified by SNDs to inform the implementation of future school-based nutrition interventions in Virginia. Specifically, in this study, we sought to identify the goals selected by participants in the VDOE Team Nutrition trainings and the strategies selected to achieve the goals. We also describe completion rates of action plan worksheet sections to inform future action planning as part of the VDOE Team Nutrition Project.

METHODS

This study was a content analysis of action plans completed by SNDs during Team Nutrition training workshops offered by the VDOE Office of School Nutrition Programs in summer 2018 and fall 2019. There were 8 regional workshops in 2018 and 4 workshops, with 2 regions attending each, in 2019, all utilizing the same 2 facilitators for strategic planning. The strategic planning sessions averaged 60 minutes with 40 minutes for SNDs to develop their plans.

A total of 132 action plans from 100 school divisions (as some school divisions sent multiple representatives) in Virginia were included in the analysis. The 100 school divisions with completed action plans were representative of all 133 divisions in the state in terms of average number of schools per division, student race and ethnicity, percent of students receiving free or reduced lunch, student gender, and percent of absenteeism. Five schools were excluded from the analysis of representativeness due to incomplete data in the Virginia School Quality Profiles.¹⁸ The action plans from those schools were still analyzed.

Completing action plans was a central activity at both trainings. This activity was used to foster implementation of what SNDs implementing learned in the workshops in their school divisions through the development of plans with specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and time-bound (ie, SMART) goals and strategies for implementing each goal. The format and execution of the action plans are described below.

Table 1
List of Prompts Included in Each Section of the Action Planning Worksheet

Current Picture	What is going on in your school nutrition operation as it relates to balanced calendar? What are your main concerns?
	What new perspectives related to balanced calendar have you gained from participating in this workshop? Think about some of the best practices that were discussed.
	What areas of balanced calendar should you be working on? What issues, if handled well, will make real progress?
Preferred Picture	Ideally, what do you want instead of what you currently have? What do you want the future of balanced calendar to look like in your division?
	What do you really want and need? Which solutions are best? Set some S.M.A.R.T. goals for balanced calendar.
	What are the possible paths to your balanced calendar goals? Brainstorm strategies to achieve your goals. This is just a list of possibilities; not the final set of strategies for your action plan.
	What balanced calendar strategy or strategies are best? Which fit the resources available?
Action Plan	Goals
	Expected Outcomes
	Implementation Plan (What will you do to achieve the expected outcomes?)
	Goals
	Person Responsible
	Measure of Success
	Target Date
	Date Completed
	Resources
Follow Up/ To Do List	
Additional Ideas/Reflection	

Instrumentation

An action planning worksheet was developed by the VDOE's Office of School Nutrition. It was comprised of 3 sections: (1) Current Picture, (2) Preferred Picture, and (3) Plan. Table 1 contains descriptions of the prompts provided as part of each section.

Within the Current Picture section, 3 open-ended questions guided participants to think through the current situation in their division regarding the topic they selected, including relevant concerns. SNDs also identified new perspectives gained from the training workshop and the goal types they per-

ceived to be most important to target.

The Preferred Picture section consisted of 4 open-ended questions through which SNDs described the desired changes they wanted to make relevant to the selected topic. The first question asked SNDs to describe the ideal future of their school nutrition program relevant to the selected topic. The next 3 questions allowed participants to reflect on key aspects relevant to developing an action plan. They were asked to identify specific goals ("What do you really want and need? Which solutions are best? Set some SMART goals for [topic of plan]") and potential strategies to achieve each goal ("What are

Table 2
Definitions and Exemplar Quotes of Strategies Included in Action Plans Developed during the Team Nutrition Training Workshops

Code	Definition	Example
Secure Material Resources	Action plans includes needing to secure any material resources, including funding, supplies for the cafeteria, supplies for the development or maintenance school garden, and educational supplies. This does not include procuring produce.	<i>“Obtain grant funding for grab-and-go breakfast cart”</i>
Learn More Information	Action plan indicates that more information is needed before further steps can be taken. This information can be from sources inside the school, other divisions, VDOE, or the community. This also includes when a person indicates that they need to learn more about something (ie, grant opportunities) even if they don’t identify a specific source for the information.	<i>“Reach out to fellow directors for guidance on their procurement procedures, which will help me develop my own.”</i>
Obtain Buy-in or Engagement	Action plans include either specifically needing buy-in, engagement, or support from cafeteria staff, teachers, administration, school board, parents, the community, or any other co-worker or superior. Plans that do not explicitly include buy-in, engagement, or support, but do indicate needing to meet with one of the stakeholders listed above for approval of a project are also included under this code.	<i>“Engage not only managers, but employees, on their ideas and suggestions regarding what food items to offer (new or existing).”</i>
Develop Outside Relationships	Action plan indicates that the SND would like to reach out to an outside party to develop a long-term relationship. For example, needing to identify local farmers or vendors with produce available in their area. This does not include reaching out to an outside party, such as grant specialists or other SNDs, just for information.	<i>“Initially reach out to farmers and get a “feel” for their possible involvement.”</i>
Facilitate Staff Development	Action plan specifically includes efforts to develop skills of cafeteria staff. This can pertain to any part of working in the cafeteria, including cross-training on tasks usually assigned to other employees, culinary skills trainings, and training on software.	<i>“Training- chef on site- knife skills. Veggie cutting skills”</i>
Establish Operating Procedures	Action plan specifically includes a plan for developing operating procedure or an intention to develop one for a program. This can include plans for procurement, implementing a program, or changing the current operating procedure.	<i>“Develop procurement document to purchase projected fruits and vegetables.”</i>
Promotion	Action plan specifically includes implementing taste tests or tastings. Additionally, action plans that include marketing, promotion, or advertising to help attain a desired goal.	<i>“This year for Farm to School we are reaching out to several farmers to come in and provide taste testing at each site.”</i>
Other Strategies	Any other specific strategy covered in the plan that is not directly accounted for by one of the other codes.	<i>“Get a calendar to plan and set aside time + dates + stick to them”</i>

the possible paths to your [topic of plan] goals? Brainstorm strategies to achieve your goals. This is just a list of possibilities; not the final set of strategies for your action plan.”). Finally, they selected the best strategies for each goal (“What [topic of

plan] strategy or strategies are best? Which fit the resources available?”).

In the Plan section, participants used the information from the previous sections to create an action plan. Participants re-listed up to 3 goals and

Table 3
Completion Rates of Action Planning Worksheets by Worksheet Section (N = 132)

Amount Completed	Current Picture	Preferred Picture	Plan
None Completed	2% (3)	14% (19)	51% (67)
Partially Completed	14% (19)	34% (45)	28% (37)
Fully Completed	83% (110)	52% (68)	21% (28)

identified expected outcomes for each goal. Then, for each goal, participants entered their strategy to achieve it. They also could add the person responsible for implementation, a measure of success, a target date for completion, resources needed, up to 5 next steps, and any reflections.

Data Analysis

We developed a codebook to code the action plans systematically.¹⁹⁻²¹ Initial goal and strategy codes were developed from a preliminary review of the action plans. Goals were defined as outcomes, whereas strategies were approaches to realize goals. Goals cannot be achieved without some steps being taken, whereas strategies are not contingent on other strategies to be completed successfully. For example, *Obtain Buy-In* is a strategy which can be executed without other strategies. However, *Involve Students in Menu Planning* is a goal that cannot be implemented without using strategies such as obtaining buy-in from students or administration.

During the coding process, codes that warranted separation or combination were discussed and the codebook updated. All 3 personnel responsible for coding action plans were trained on the coding process, participated in the development of the initial codes, and reviewed all code definitions. Two coders independently coded each action plan and met to reconcile differences. Table 2 shows the definitions and exemplars for each code. Overall, inter-rater reliability was 95.5%.

Coders also assessed level of completion of each section of the action plan (none, partial, full). Action plan sections were considered full when there was a response to each question in the sec-

tion, whereas partially completed sections only contained responses to some of the questions in the section. Whereas all sections were coded to determine level of completion, only the Preferred Picture and Plan sections, when completed, were coded for goals and strategies.

Descriptive statistics (means, frequencies) were calculated for each goal, strategy, and completeness code. Data analysis was conducted using R Version 3.6.3.²² One action plan was excluded from the analysis due to illegibility.

RESULTS

Action Plan Completion

Completion of action plan sections decreased with each subsequent section (Table 3). The Current Picture section was fully completed for 83% (N = 110) of the action plans. This rate decreased to 52% (N = 68) for the Preferred Picture section and 21% (N = 28) for the Plan section. Partial completion rates were 14% (N = 19), 34% (N = 45), and 28% (N = 37) for the Current Picture, Preferred Picture, and Plan sections, respectively.

Goals

Table 4 presents the goals identified in each action plan. Goals were organized into 4 types: (1) Increase Participation, (2) Make Menu-related Changes, (3) Engage in Activities Outside the Cafeteria, and (4) Involve Students and/or Community. The 132 action plans included 163 individual goals, with an average of 1.2 goals per plan (range: 0-5). Menu-related goals were the most commonly identified (N = 85, 52% of all goals). Participation-related goals were also frequently included (N = 47,

Table 4
Number of Strategies Mentioned by Goal Type from the Action Planning Worksheets^a

Goal	Totals	N ^{b,c,d}	Secure Material Resources	Learn More Information	Obtain Buy-in or Engagement	Develop Outside Relationships	Facilitate Staff Development	Establish Operating Procedures	Promotion
Increase Participation	Overall Participation	8 (6%)	12 (9%)	28 (21%)	1 (1%)	3 (2%)	12 (9%)	10 (8%)	
	Increase Lunch Participation	0	8	16	0	1	5	6	
	Increase Breakfast Participation	8 (9%)	4	12 (24%)	1	2	7	4	
Make Menu-Related Changes	Overall Menu Related	12 (9%)	30 (23%)	32 (24%)	29 (22%)	13 (10%)	35 (27%)	15 (11%)	
	Procure and Promote Local Produce	6	19	23	26	6	24	11	
	Use KPIs to Improve Meal Selection	1	1	1	1	0	5	0	
Engage in Activities Outside Cafeteria	Improve Menu Selection	5	10	8	2	7	6	4	
	Overall Outside Cafeteria	7 (5%)	5 (4%)	8 (6%)	5 (4%)	1 (1%)	4 (3%)	1 (1%)	
	Incorporate Nutrition Education into Curriculum	3	1	2	0	1	1	0	
Involve Students and/or Community	Create and Maintain School Gardens	4	4	6	5	0	3	1	
	Overall Student/Community Involvement	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	11 (8%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	2 (2%)	
	Involve Students in Menu Planning	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	
	Increase Community Engagement and Knowledge of the Program	0	0	6	0	1	0	1	

Note.

^a The sample contained 132 action plans

^b N = number of unique action plans mentioning each strategy

^c Each column need not sum to n as some strategies were identified more than once for the same plan or were identified for goals not included in the table.

^d Percentages in each row need not sum to 100% as some strategies were identified more than once for the same plan

29%). Goals focused outside the cafeteria were less frequently included (N = 19, 12%). Goals related to student or community involvement were the least commonly included (N = 12, 7%).

Among specific goals, *Procure and Promote Local Produce* was identified in 42 plans (26%) and was the most frequently identified goal. *Improve Menu Selection* (N = 36, 22%) and *Increase Lunch Participation* (N = 30, 18%) were also frequently selected goals. The least frequently identified goals were *Involve Students in Menu Planning* (N = 6, 5%) and *Increase Community Engagement and Knowledge of the Program* (N = 6, 5%).

Strategies

Table 4 presents the selection of strategies, overall and by goal. *Securing Material Resources* was included as a strategy in 28 (21%) of the plans. Specific activities for this strategy included securing funding to support goal efforts and for needed supplies. This strategy was frequently included in plans with larger goals related to outside the cafeteria and specific goals related to increasing breakfast participation, such as purchasing a cart for grab and go service. In most cases, specific sources of potential funding were not identified. *Securing Material Resources* was not identified in plans with goals related to student and community involvement.

The strategy *Learn More Information* was included in 46 (35%) of the action plans. Plans identified wanting information related to the process of procuring local produce, student taste and food preferences, and best practices from other divisions. This strategy was frequently included in action plans for all goals except student and community involvement. It was most frequently utilized in plans with goals related to menu planning.

Obtain Buy-in or Engagement was the most commonly indicated strategy in the action plans. Seventy-five action plans (57%) included this strategy. Buy-in was sought from students, cafeteria staff, school administration and the community. This strategy was used frequently for all of the goal types but was most frequently used in plans with goals involving student and community involvement.

Thirty-seven (28%) of the action plans included the strategy *Develop Outside Relationships*. The most common outside relationship sought in action plans to develop was with local farmers to

procure local produce. Farmers markets and local cooperative extension agents were identified as potential sources for identifying farmers with whom the SND could build a relationship. Other than farmers, examples of outside relationships were with local businesses and produce vendors. *Develop Outside Relationships* was most commonly included as a strategy in plans with goals related to menus and goals that are implemented outside the cafeteria environment.

Facilitate Staff Development was the least utilized strategy, included in 21 plans (16%). Some examples of this code include knife skills training, time management lessons, and education on new regulations and guidelines. Plans mentioned staff training to meet the goal of incorporating more local produce and scratch cooking into school meals. Although this strategy was not frequently identified, it was most frequently included in plans with goals related to menu planning.

Establish Operating Procedures was the second most commonly indicated strategy. This strategy was referenced in 53 (40%) action plans. Developing procurement documents and procedures for local produce were commonly included as a strategy in the plans. Some other examples include menu cycling procedures, scheduling procedures for staff and for deliveries, and standardization of recipes and preparation methods. This strategy was commonly identified in plans with goals of all types except student and community involvement.

Strategies related to the *Promotion* of program activities were included in 43 plans (33%). Promotion encompassed taste tests and marketing efforts. Plans suggested using taste tests to market new entrees or products, especially local produce, to students. Examples of other marketing strategies included promotion of local items through displays in the cafeteria or on menus, utilizing the school website or social media to advertise, and others forms of communication to parents. *Promotion* was most frequently included in plans with goals related to participation and menus.

Other Strategies were included in 39 plans (30%). The code *Other Strategies* accounted for any other strategy included in the plan that did not fit within the context of one of the other codes. Examples of other strategies utilized in the plans included developing educational programs, introducing change

slowly, and various ways of improving the menu such as improved presentation, increased scratch cooking, and additional food stations.

DISCUSSION

We aimed to understand the goals and goal types prioritized in school nutrition programs following a Team Nutrition training in Virginia. Additionally, we aimed to determine the completion rates of action plan worksheet sections. Completion of the action plan worksheets decreased with each section. There are several potential reasons for the low rates of plan completion in this study. This could be a result of unclear instructions, lack of sufficient time to gather necessary information or to complete the plan, or inadequate motivation to change.^{13,23} Low compliance in plan development is problematic as previous research has shown that action plans that are more specific are more likely to be implemented than plans that are less detailed.^{13,24}

The strategies included in the action plans showed the importance of obtaining buy-in for each of the 4 goal types: Increase Participation, Make Menu-related Changes, Engage in Activities Outside Cafeteria, and Involve Students and/or Community. This is consistent with previous research that indicates obtaining buy-in from stakeholders is an evidence-based strategy for improving implementation.^{25,26} Improving buy-in is one of the most important implementation strategies for achieving goals in school settings.^{7,27} In addition to being important, strategies used to obtain buy-in are considered highly feasible by school implementation specialists.⁷ Staff development and securing material resources were the least frequently included among the 7 strategies. It is possible that many SNDs felt that it would not be feasible to secure new resources or funding and tried to avoid using the strategy when possible.⁷ Additionally, it is not always necessary to secure material resources for every goal. Similarly, staff training is not a necessary strategy for all goal types. However, unlike securing material resources, it is often considered more feasible and important by implementation specialists.⁷

The results of this study filled a gap in the current school-based nutrition intervention literature by highlighting emerging patterns of implementation strategy usage among SND action plans. These can be used to inform future Team Nutrition trainings

in Virginia. Additionally, several recommendations for researchers and practitioners of school nutrition programs can be derived from the findings. These are presented below.

Recommendations

Understand that menus are a key area of concern for SNDs. The majority of goals selected were menu-related with improving participation as a secondary priority. This was not surprising as both of these goal types were within the scope of school nutrition programs. Because goals outside the cafeteria and related to student or community involvement are not typically part of the SNDs' work, they were less frequently addressed. Trainings should focus on menu-related or participation goals as these are an area SNDs are interested in improving. Alternatively, for trainings focused on goals outside the scope of SNDs work, such as building school gardens or engaging the community, it may be important to build motivation among SNDs and offer resources to help with the selection of implementation strategies related to these goals. A survey conducted with school food service personnel found that over 80% of SNDs were interested in attending a training related to marketing child nutrition programs to students and families, suggesting this is an area for which many SNDs are not as comfortable and would benefit from training on how to implement marketing into their programs.²⁸

Recognize that desired or useful strategies may vary by action plan. Strategies must be tailored to the goals of the action plan, and therefore, vary based on the goal type. Staff training was identified as a strategy to achieve the goals of improving menu selection or adding more local produce to the menu but was infrequently identified as a strategy in other contexts. Likewise, obtaining material resources was not a pertinent strategy for all goals. Action plans focused on improvements outside the cafeteria identified *securing material resources* as a strategy to meet that goal more frequently than action plans with goals related to student or community involvement. *Develop outside relationships* is another example of a strategy that was disproportionately identified for certain goals, particularly for procuring local produce.

When asking SNDs or other school nutrition personnel to perform duties that have traditionally

been seen as outside of their job responsibilities, it is important to obtain buy-in. For specific goals that were outside the normal responsibilities of the SNDs' work, such as creating or maintaining a school garden, obtaining buy-in was a predominant strategy in many action plans. Previous research suggests that people in school environments may be more likely to identify strategies that are within the scope of their job to implement.⁷ Therefore, for goals previously considered outside the scope of the SNDs' job, obtaining buy-in from relevant school employees is important. To obtain buy-in, careful planning prior to an intervention is required and implementers may need to be coached in stakeholder engagement strategies.²⁹

Recognize that additional resources may be needed to fully develop action plans. Because completion rates of the action planning worksheet decreased with each section, it is important to recognize that trainings may need to provide SNDs with more information on how to develop an action plan more fully. Providing guidance throughout the action plan development process with examples of ideal plans has resulted in higher quality action plans and improved plan specificity.^{13,30} Additionally, incentives also can improve completeness of the action plans, although without guidance or feedback, there will likely be no improvement in plan specificity.³¹ Another potential strategy to improve plan completion is to separate worksheet sections over the course of the training to reduce the burden of developing the plan in one session. This may give participants more time to think about their goals and potential strategies while also encouraging detailed responses to each section. This strategy could be used along with additional guidance on action planning.

Strengths and Limitations

A limitation of this study is that evaluating the quality and fidelity of the trainings was outside the scope of this study. Additionally, due to the scope of the VDOE Team Nutrition evaluation, it was not possible to connect strategies and action plan completion to division-level implementation. However, the action plans were used to see patterns among goals and strategies that can be explored further. A strength was the quality and richness of the data provided through the action plans.

An additional strength is the large representative sample of divisions across the state of Virginia that were included in this study. Despite this robust, statewide sample, the primary intention was to limit the discussion of selected strategies by goal type to Virginia programs, as there are many factors that could impact goal or strategy selection for SNDs in different states. However, in general, the overall recommendations are supported by the findings of studies in other states and may be more applicable to school-based training programs nationally.

Future Research

To advance implementation strategy research, it is important to understand which strategies can be feasibly implemented in a school setting. Additionally, future research should determine the strategies that are most effective for specific goal types. An improved understanding of both tailored strategies for goals and the feasibility of strategies in schools can be used to inform future trainings for SNDs to develop the skills necessary to best implement those strategies in their divisions. This also will advance the existing school-based implementation strategies research through a better understanding of effective strategies that can streamline the implementation of evidence-based practices into schools within Virginia. Future research should examine the generalizability of these findings outside of Virginia.

IMPLICATIONS FOR HEALTH BEHAVIOR OR POLICY

One of the objectives included in *Healthy People 2030* focuses on reducing the proportion of children with obesity.³² Schools are often an effective setting for interventions to target obesity as children consume up to half of their daily calories while at school.³ Additionally, improvements to the lunchroom environment and school curriculum to make healthier choices easier for students have been shown to reduce the prevalence of obesity.³³ The findings of this study have implications for the trainings with school personnel that aim to improve the lunchroom environment. Organizers of training programs for school nutrition personnel should consider:

Tailoring skills developed at trainings to fit the goal types is critical for success. To tailor trainings,

program planners must understand the types of strategies that are frequently identified for the different goal types. Trainings can teach participants the tools needed to implement the suggested strategies, as this may improve perceived feasibility.

Trainings targeting goals outside of the school meal program setting may benefit from providing tips on best practices for obtaining buy-in from school administration and other relevant school personnel. These trainings may also need to build motivation among SNDs to focus on these goal types.

Trainings may benefit from offering support to foster the completion of action plans. This may result in the development of more complete action plans with more specific goals and strategies.

Acknowledgement

This project was funded using US Department of Agriculture grant funds.

Human Subjects Approval Statement

This project was reviewed by the Western IRB (#PTI3IKSF) and determined to not meet the definition of human subjects research.

Conflict of Interest Disclosure Statement

All authors of this article declare they have no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Pyle SA, Sharkey J, Yetter G, Felix E, Furlong MJ, Poston WS. Fighting an epidemic: the role of schools in reducing childhood obesity. *Psychol Sch*. 2006;43(3):361-376. doi: org/10.1002/pitts.20146
2. National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS). www.nces.ed.gov/surveys/sass/. Published 2020. Accessed February 14, 2020.
3. Lee R, Gortmaker S. Health dissemination and implementation within schools. In Brownson RC, Colditz GA, Proctor EK, eds. *Dissemination and Implementation Research in Health: Translating Science to Practice*. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Oxford University Press; 2012:419-436.
4. Cotton W, Dudley D, Peralta L, Werkhoven T. The effect of teacher-delivered nutrition education programs on elementary-aged students: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Prev Med Rep*. 2020;20:101178. doi: 10.1016/j.pmedr.2020.101178
5. Proctor EK, Powell BJ, McMillen JC. Implementation strategies: recommendations for specifying and reporting. *Implement Sci*. 2013;8:139. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-8-139
6. Cook CR, Lyon AR, Locke J, Waltz T, Powell BJ. Adapting a compilation of implementation strategies to advance school-based implementation research and practice. *Prev Sci*. 2019;20(6):914-935. doi: 10.1007/s11121-019-01017-1
7. Lyon AR, Cook CR, Locke J, Davis C, Powell BJ, Waltz TJ. Importance and feasibility of an adapted set of implementation strategies in schools. *J Sch Psychol*. 2019;76:66-77. doi: 10.1016/j.jsp.2019.07.014
8. Powell BJ, Waltz TJ, Chinman MJ, Damschroder, LJ, Smith, JL, Matthieu, MM, et al. A refined compilation of implementation strategies: results from the expert recommendations for implementing change (ERIC) project. *Implement Sci*. 2015;10:1. doi: 10.1186/s13012-015-0209-1
9. Lane HG, Turner L, Dunn CG, Hager ER, Fleischhacker S. Leveraging implementation science in the public health response to COVID-19: child food insecurity and federal nutrition assistance programs. *Public Health Rep*. 2020;135(6):728-736. doi: 10.1177/0033354920959285
10. Herschell AD, Kolko DJ, Baumann BL, Davis AC. The role of therapist training in the implementation of psychosocial treatments: a review and critique with recommendations. *Clin Psychol Rev*. 2010;30(4):448-466. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2010.02.005
11. US Department of Agriculture Food and Nutrition Services. *The Story of Team Nutrition: Executive Summary of the Pilot Study*. www.fns.usda.gov/story-team-nutrition-executive-summary-pilot-study. Published 1999. Accessed June 12, 2019.
12. US Department of Agriculture Food and Nutrition Services. About Team Nutrition. https://www.fns.usda.gov/tn/about-team-nutrition. Published 2019. Accessed March 12, 2020.
13. Hagger MS, Luszczynska A. Implementation intention and action planning interventions in health contexts: state of the research and proposals for the way forward. *Appl Psychol Health Well Being*. 2014;6(1):1-47. doi: 10.1111/aphw.12017
14. Luszczynska A, Tryburcy M, Schwarzer R. Improving fruit and vegetable consumption: a self-efficacy intervention compared with a combined self-efficacy and planning intervention. *Health Educ Res*. 2007;22(5):630-638. doi: 10.1093/her/cyl133
15. Schwarzer R. Modeling health behavior change: how to predict and modify the adoption and maintenance of health behaviors. *J Appl Psychol*. 2008;57(1):1-29. doi: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2007.00325.x
16. Richert J, Reuter T, Wiedemann AU, Lippke S, Ziegelmann J, Schwarzer R. Differential effects of planning and self-efficacy on fruit and vegetable consumption. *Appetite*. 2010;54(3):611-614. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2010.03.006
17. Bagozzi RP, Dholakia UM, Basuroy S. How effortful decisions get enacted: the motivating role of decision processes, desires, and anticipated emotions. *J Behav Decis Mak*. 2003;16(4):273-295. doi: org/10.1002/bdm.446
18. Virginia School Quality Profiles. Virginia Department of Education. www.schoolquality.virginia.gov. Published 2019. Accessed October 9, 2019.
19. Creswell JW, Plano Clark VL. *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. 3rd ed. London, UK: SAGE; 2017.

20. Creswell JW. *A Concise Introduction to Mixed Methods Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE; 2014.
21. Saldaña J. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. 2nd ed. London, UK: SAGE; 2012.
22. R Core Team. R: a language and environment for statistical computing. www.r-project.org. Published 2020. Accessed December 3, 2021.
23. Degroote L, Van Dyck D, De Bourdeaudhuij I, De Paepe A, Crombez G. Acceptability and feasibility of the mHealth intervention “MyDayPlan” to increase physical activity in a general adult population. *BMC Public Health*. 2020;20(1):1032. doi: 10.1186/s12889-020-09148-9
24. Fleig L, Gardner B, Keller J, Lippke S, Pomp S, Wiedemann AU. What contributes to action plan enactment? Examining characteristics of physical activity plans. *Br J Health Psychol*. 2017;22(4):940-957. doi: 10.1111/bjhp.12263
25. Greenhalgh T, Robert G, Macfarlane F, Bate P, Kyriakidou O. Diffusion of innovations in service organizations: systematic review and recommendations. *Milbank Q*. 2004;82(4):581-629. doi: 10.1111/j.0887-378X.2004.00325.x
26. Cabassa LJ, Baumann AA. A two-way street: bridging implementation science and cultural adaptations of mental health treatments. *Implement Sci*. 2013;8(1):1-14. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-8-90
27. Ronto R, Rathi N, Worsley A, Sanders T, Lonsdale C, Wolfenden L. Enablers and barriers to implementation of and compliance with school-based healthy food and beverage policies: a systematic literature review and meta-synthesis. *Public Health Nutr*. 2020;23(15):2840-2855. doi: 10.1017/S1368980019004865
28. Flure L, Pflugh Prescott M, Ajie W, Allison T, McCaffrey J. Training preferences of school food service staff vary by role in the school nutrition program. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(1):50. doi: 10.3390/ijerph18010050
29. Hickey G, McGilloway S, O’Brien M, Leckey Y, Devlin M, Donnelly M. Strengthening stakeholder buy-in and engagement for successful exploration and installation: a case study of the development of an area-wide, evidence-based prevention and early intervention strategy. *Child Youth Serv Rev*. 2018;91:185-195. doi: 10.1016/j.childev.2018.06.008
30. Reinwand DA, Crutzen R, Storm V, Wienert, J, Kuhlmann, T, de Vries, H, Lippke, S. Generating and predicting high quality action plans to facilitate physical activity and fruit and vegetable consumption: results from an experimental arm of a randomised controlled trial. *BMC Public Health*. 2016;16:317. doi: 10.1186/s12889-016-2975-3
31. Omran J, Trinh L, Arbour-Nicitopoulos KP, Mitchell MS, Faulkner GE. Do incentives promote action planning in a web-based walking intervention? *Am J Health Behav*. 2018;42(4):13-22. doi: 10.5993/AJHB.42.4.2
32. US Department of Health and Human Services. Healthy People 2030. Reduce the proportion of children and adolescents with obesity — NWS04. Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion. www.health.gov/healthypeople/objectives-and-data/browse-objectives/overweight-and-obesity/reduce-proportion-children-and-adolescents-obesity-nws-04. Published 2020. Accessed May 15, 2021.
33. US Department of Health and Human Services. Healthy People 2020. Obesity: Meal or Fruit and Vegetable Snack Interventions to Increase Healthier Foods and Beverages Provided by Schools. Community Preventative Services Task Force. www.healthypeople.gov/2020/tools-resources/evidence-based-resource/obesity-meal-fruit-vegetable-snack-interventions-increase-healthier-foods-beverages-schools. Published 2016. Accessed May 15, 2021.