The impact of a population-level school food and nutrition policy on dietary intake and body weights of Canadian children
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A B S T R A C T

Objective. The objective of this study is to assess population-level trends in children’s dietary intake and weight status before and after the implementation of a provincial school nutrition policy in the province of Nova Scotia, Canada.

Method. Self-reported dietary behavior and nutrient intake and measured body mass index were collected as part of a population-level study with grade 5 students in 2003 (n = 5215) and 2011 (5508), prior to and following implementation of the policy. We applied random effects regression methods to assess the effect of the policy on dietary and health outcomes.

Results. In 2011, students reported consuming more milk products, while there was no difference in mean consumption of vegetables and fruits in adjusted models. Adjusted regression analysis revealed a statistically significant decrease in sugar-sweetened beverage consumption. Despite significant temporal decreases in dietary energy intake and increases in diet quality, prevalence rates of overweight and obesity continued to increase.

Conclusion. This population-level intervention research suggests a positive influence of school nutrition policies on diet quality, energy intake and healthy beverage consumption, and that more action beyond schools is needed to curb the increases in the prevalence of childhood obesity.

© 2013 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Inc. Open access under CC BY-NC-ND license.

Introduction

Public policy is a critical component of population health interventions (Hawe and Potvin, 2009) and offers an important opportunity to address the rising public health concerns of child and adolescent obesity (Story et al., 2009b). Rates of overweight and obesity have increased over the last two decades (Shields, 2006a; Tremblay and Willms, 2000; Willms et al., 2003) and have significant health (Whitaker et al., 1997; Must et al., 1999; Rocchini, 2002; Biddle et al., 2004) and economic implications (Kirk et al., 2011; Kuhle et al., 2011; Tran et al., 2013). Current evidence suggests the need for comprehensive, sustainable initiatives to stimulate the changes necessary to produce a population-level change in childhood weight status (Hobbs, 2008); however, there is a relative paucity of population-level intervention research to help inform this important public health issue (Sanson-Fisher et al., 2008). Schools are an important partner in population-level obesity prevention, particularly through supporting early development of healthy behaviors, including promoting healthy eating and physical activity (Stone et al., 1998; Story et al., 2009a; Wechsler et al., 2000). Over the past ten years, many school jurisdictions have developed and implemented nutrition policies and guidelines as part of a broader strategy to address childhood obesity (Boehmer et al., 2007; Foster et al., 2008).

In Canada, there is no national/federal school nutrition policy or school feeding program; rather provincial/territorial jurisdictions are responsible for developing policies to regulate and manage school food. Research and policy activity in the Canadian province of Nova Scotia (NS) provide a timely opportunity to explore the relative impact of a nutrition policy on children’s health behaviors and weight status over time (McIsaac et al., 2012). Provincial results from the 2003 Children’s Lifestyle and School Performance Study I (CLASS I) (Veugelers and Fitzgerald, 2005b; Veugelers et al., 2005) helped to inform new policies and investments related to school health over the past decade in NS. The Food and Nutrition Policy for Nova Scotia Public Schools was introduced in 2006, with full implementation expected in all public (state) schools by 2009. This policy included all three categories defined in an earlier systematic review, including nutritional guidelines, regulation of food and beverages available and price interventions (Jaime and...
Nova Scotia Nutrition Policy 2006: Summary of directives.

| Table 1 | Nova Scotia Nutrition Policy 2006: Summary of directives. |
|---|---|
| Directives | Description |
| 1. Food and Beverages Served and Sold in School | 1.1 During the school day when students are present, food and beverages served and sold in school will be consistent with the Food and Beverage Standards for Nova Scotia Public Schools. This includes cafeterias, canteens, vending machines, and lunch, breakfast, and snack programs. 1.2 The policy and food and beverage standards are also in effect during evening programs for students provided by the school. (Refer to Directives 5 and 6 for considerations for Fundraising and Special Functions.) 1.3 Schools will ensure that the majority of choices available are from food and beverages of Maximum Nutrition, recognizing that they are more nutritious than those of Moderate Nutrition. 1.4 Schools will serve or sell only milk (white, chocolate, flavored, and nutritional alternatives to milk, e.g., soy), 100% juice, and water as beverages as per the Food and Beverage Standards for Nova Scotia Public Schools. 1.5 Schools will not use deep fat fryers to prepare food. |
| 2. Clean Drinking Water | 2.1 Schools will ensure that students and staff have access to clean drinking water during the school day. 2.2 Teachers and administrators will encourage students to drink water, especially during periods of hot weather or increased physical activity. This may be facilitated by allowing water bottles into the classroom. 2.3 Schools will ensure that there is always at least one bottle of water per classroom. 2.4 Schools will serve only water and milk (white, chocolate, flavored, and nutritional alternatives to milk, e.g., soy) in the school cafeteria. |
| 3. Programming | 3.1 It is expected that all schools will participate in the Nova Scotia Department of Agriculture's School Milk Program. 3.2 Schools will ensure that students are aware of breakfast, lunch, and snack programs that are available in their school. 3.3 Schools will ensure that students are aware of the importance of hand washing and will provide students with the opportunity to wash their hands before consuming meals. 3.4 Schools will ensure that students are aware of the importance of hand washing and will provide students with the opportunity to wash their hands before consuming meals. 3.5 Schools will ensure that students are aware of the importance of hand washing and will provide students with the opportunity to wash their hands before consuming meals. |
| 4. Pricing | 4.1 To ensure that healthy food and beverage choices are accessible to the majority of students, schools will make affordability the primary consideration when setting prices or profit margins. Meal programs, in particular, will be priced with this in mind. 4.2 Teachers and administrators will encourage students and staff to choose healthy food and beverages. This may be facilitated by placing healthy food and beverages at student eye level. 4.3 Schools will ensure that students are aware of the importance of hand washing and will provide students with the opportunity to wash their hands before consuming meals. 4.4 Schools will ensure that students are aware of the importance of hand washing and will provide students with the opportunity to wash their hands before consuming meals. 4.5 Schools will ensure that students are aware of the importance of hand washing and will provide students with the opportunity to wash their hands before consuming meals. |
| 5. Fundraising | 5.1 Fundraising with food and beverages organized by and through schools will center only on items of Moderate Nutrition. 5.2 Non-food fundraising events that may occur once or twice a month and are accessible to the majority of students, schools will center only on items of Moderate Nutrition. |
| 6. Special Functions | 6.1 Food and beverages of Maximum and Moderate Nutrition will be served during Special Functions. However, Special Functions may include items from the Minimum Nutrition list. Special Functions are events that may occur once or twice a month and include special occasions and in-school celebrations (e.g., parent-teacher night, Remembrance Day, school bazaar, Spring Fling, Halloween, Christmas bake sales). 6.2 Schools will ensure that students and parents are aware of breakfast, lunch, and snack programs that are offered in or through the school at minimal or no cost and are accessible to all students. 6.3 Schools must ensure that any food programs are offered in or through the school at minimal or no cost and are accessible to all students. 6.4 Schools will ensure that any food and beverages served and sold in school are consistent with the Food and Beverage Standards for Nova Scotia Public Schools. |
| 7. Promotion and Advertising | 7.1 Promoting healthy food and beverage choices that emphasize and are consistent with the Maximum Nutrition and Moderate Nutrition lists. 7.2 Giving priority to healthy food and beverages as defined by the Maximum Nutrition list (e.g., counter-top refrigerators, placement of fruits and vegetables at student eye level). 7.3 Schools will ensure that students and parents are aware of breakfast, lunch, and snack programs that are offered in or through the school at minimal or no cost and are accessible to all students. 7.4 Schools will ensure that any food and beverages served and sold in school are consistent with the Food and Beverage Standards for Nova Scotia Public Schools. 7.5 Schools will ensure that any food and beverages served and sold in school are consistent with the Food and Beverage Standards for Nova Scotia Public Schools. |
| 8. Food as a Reinforcer | 8.1 School staff and volunteers will not offer food as a reinforcer or withhold food from students as a consequence, except in cases where a program planning team is using applied behavioral analysis to implement an individual program plan for a student. 8.2 Teachers and administrators will encourage students and staff to choose healthy food and beverages. This may be facilitated by placing healthy food and beverages at student eye level. 8.3 Schools will ensure that students are aware of breakfast, lunch, and snack programs that are offered in or through the school at minimal or no cost and are accessible to all students. 8.4 Schools will ensure that any food and beverages served and sold in school are consistent with the Food and Beverage Standards for Nova Scotia Public Schools. |
| 9. Students Who May Be Vulnerable | 9.1 Schools will ensure that students and parents are aware of breakfast, lunch, and snack programs that are offered in or through the school at minimal or no cost and are accessible to all students. 9.2 Schools must ensure that any food programs are offered in or through the school at minimal or no cost and are accessible to all students. 9.3 Schools will work with parents to ensure that staff and volunteers are aware of food allergies and guidelines for supporting children with food-related chronic diseases (e.g., diabetes, celiac disease). 9.4 Schools will ensure that any food and beverages served and sold in school are consistent with the Food and Beverage Standards for Nova Scotia Public Schools. |
| 10. Portion Sizes | 10.1 Schools will serve and sell appropriate portions of food and beverages. Super-sized portions are not appropriate to serve or sell in schools. Refer to Canada's Food Guide to Healthy Eating for information related to portion sizes. 10.2 Schools will ensure that students are aware of the importance of hand washing and will provide students with the opportunity to wash their hands before consuming meals. 10.3 Schools will ensure that students are aware of the importance of hand washing and will provide students with the opportunity to wash their hands before consuming meals. 10.4 Schools will ensure that students are aware of the importance of hand washing and will provide students with the opportunity to wash their hands before consuming meals. |
| 11. Food Safety | 11.1 Schools are required to prepare and serve foods in accordance with food safety standards and guidelines as outlined by the Health Protection Act of the Nova Scotia Department of Agriculture. This may require the need for a Food Establishment Permit, food safety training, and Workplace Hazardous Materials Information System (WHMIS) training. 11.2 Schools will ensure that students are aware of the importance of hand washing and will provide students with the opportunity to wash their hands before consuming meals. 11.3 Schools will ensure that students are aware of the importance of hand washing and will provide students with the opportunity to wash their hands before consuming meals. 11.4 Schools will ensure that students are aware of the importance of hand washing and will provide students with the opportunity to wash their hands before consuming meals. |
| 12. Nutrition Education | 12.1 The Department of Education will work with partners to ensure continued development and currency of high-quality, evidence-based health education curriculum that includes food and nutrition outcomes. 12.2 The Department of Education will work with partners to ensure continued development and currency of high-quality, evidence-based family studies curriculum that includes food and nutrition studies. 12.3 When possible, schools should integrate nutrition education into other subject areas and activities beyond the classroom. 12.4 The Department of Education will work with partners to ensure continued development and currency of high-quality, evidence-based family studies curriculum that includes food and nutrition studies. 12.5 The Department of Education will work with partners to ensure continued development and currency of high-quality, evidence-based family studies curriculum that includes food and nutrition studies. |

**Table 1 (continued)**

| Directives | Description |
|---|---|
| 12. Nutrition Education | 12.1 The Department of Education will work with partners to ensure continued development and currency of high-quality, evidence-based health education curriculum that includes food and nutrition outcomes. 12.2 The Department of Education will work with partners to ensure continued development and currency of high-quality, evidence-based family studies curriculum that includes food and nutrition studies. 12.3 When possible, schools should integrate nutrition education into other subject areas and activities beyond the classroom. 12.4 The Department of Education will work with partners to ensure continued development and currency of high-quality, evidence-based family studies curriculum that includes food and nutrition studies. 12.5 The Department of Education will work with partners to ensure continued development and currency of high-quality, evidence-based family studies curriculum that includes food and nutrition studies. |

**Lock, 2009.** Briefly, the Nova Scotia Nutrition Policy (NSNP) is intended to increase access to and enjoyment of health-promoting, safe, and affordable food and beverages served and sold in public schools, with the objective of helping to make the healthy food and beverage choice the easy choice in the school setting. The policy mandates standards for foods and beverages served and sold in schools and provides directives for various school eating practices (including pricing, programming and advertising) and guidelines that encourage schools to foster community partnerships and support local food products (Government of Nova Scotia, 2008). A summary of the policy directives and guidelines is provided in Table 1. Following policy implementation, a subsequent data collection cycle in 2011 (CLASS II) provided an opportunity to explore how changes in school food practices as a result of the NSNP may have affected changes in student behavior, if at all. The objective of this study is therefore to assess population-level trends in children's nutritional intake and weight status from 2003 to 2011 as they relate to the potential impact of the NSNP.

**Methods**

**Study design**

CLASS is a large, cross-sectional, provincial study that has investigated the relationship between nutrition, physical activity, mental health and school performance of grade 5 students in Nova Scotia across two time points (2003 and 2011). The vast majority of the grade 5 student population in Nova Scotia attends...
public schools; all public schools were invited to participate in both data collection cycles. In 2003, 282 of 291 schools (96.9%) agreed to participate and 5517 parents provided their consent, resulting in an average response rate of 51.1% per school. The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 269 of 286 schools (94.1%) and informed consent from 5913 parents. The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 51.1% per school. The 2003 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 282 of 291 schools (96.9%) agreed to participate and 5517 parents provided their consent, resulting in an average response rate of 51.1% per school. The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 269 of 286 schools (94.1%) and informed consent from 5913 parents.

The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 51.1% per school. The 2003 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 282 of 291 schools (96.9%) agreed to participate and 5517 parents provided their consent, resulting in an average response rate of 51.1% per school. The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 269 of 286 schools (94.1%) and informed consent from 5913 parents. The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 51.1% per school. The 2003 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 282 of 291 schools (96.9%) agreed to participate and 5517 parents provided their consent, resulting in an average response rate of 51.1% per school. The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 269 of 286 schools (94.1%) and informed consent from 5913 parents.

The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 51.1% per school. The 2003 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 282 of 291 schools (96.9%) agreed to participate and 5517 parents provided their consent, resulting in an average response rate of 51.1% per school. The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 269 of 286 schools (94.1%) and informed consent from 5913 parents. The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 51.1% per school. The 2003 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 282 of 291 schools (96.9%) agreed to participate and 5517 parents provided their consent, resulting in an average response rate of 51.1% per school. The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 269 of 286 schools (94.1%) and informed consent from 5913 parents.

The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 51.1% per school. The 2003 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 282 of 291 schools (96.9%) agreed to participate and 5517 parents provided their consent, resulting in an average response rate of 51.1% per school. The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 269 of 286 schools (94.1%) and informed consent from 5913 parents. The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 51.1% per school. The 2003 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 282 of 291 schools (96.9%) agreed to participate and 5517 parents provided their consent, resulting in an average response rate of 51.1% per school. The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 269 of 286 schools (94.1%) and informed consent from 5913 parents.

The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 51.1% per school. The 2003 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 282 of 291 schools (96.9%) agreed to participate and 5517 parents provided their consent, resulting in an average response rate of 51.1% per school. The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 269 of 286 schools (94.1%) and informed consent from 5913 parents. The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 51.1% per school. The 2003 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 282 of 291 schools (96.9%) agreed to participate and 5517 parents provided their consent, resulting in an average response rate of 51.1% per school. The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 269 of 286 schools (94.1%) and informed consent from 5913 parents.

The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 51.1% per school. The 2003 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 282 of 291 schools (96.9%) agreed to participate and 5517 parents provided their consent, resulting in an average response rate of 51.1% per school. The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 269 of 286 schools (94.1%) and informed consent from 5913 parents. The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 51.1% per school. The 2003 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 282 of 291 schools (96.9%) agreed to participate and 5517 parents provided their consent, resulting in an average response rate of 51.1% per school. The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 269 of 286 schools (94.1%) and informed consent from 5913 parents.

The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 51.1% per school. The 2003 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 282 of 291 schools (96.9%) agreed to participate and 5517 parents provided their consent, resulting in an average response rate of 51.1% per school. The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 269 of 286 schools (94.1%) and informed consent from 5913 parents. The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 51.1% per school. The 2003 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 282 of 291 schools (96.9%) agreed to participate and 5517 parents provided their consent, resulting in an average response rate of 51.1% per school. The 2011 cycle of data collection provides a comparable sample with 269 of 286 schools (94.1%) and informed consent from 5913 parents.
was attributable to carbohydrate and protein increased in 2011 from 2003 and this decreased for percentage of total energy intake attributable to fat (Table 3). The average sodium intake significantly decreased from 2615 mg in 2003 to 2405 mg in 2011. Average intake of vitamin C, folate, vitamin A, zinc and calcium exceeded EAR values in 2003 and 2011. However, the average intake of these micronutrients decreased over the years and rates of inadequate levels among respondents increased. In particular, inadequate levels of calcium increased from 48.5% in 2003 to 55.3% in 2011. Average intake levels of vitamin D were below reference values in 2003 and 2011, with over 80% of respondents having inadequate intakes. Intake of total fiber decreased in both boys and girls and these levels were below reference values for AI. In relation to dietary behaviors and intake, in both 2003 and 2011, 95% of grade 5 students reported they usually ate breakfast either at home or at school (Table 4). After adjusting for potential confounders, students were 33% more likely to bring a lunch prepared from home (PR = 1.33, 95% CI = 1.19, 1.50) and 33% less likely to buy lunch at school in 2011 relative to 2003 (PR = 0.67, 95% CI = 0.48, 0.92). Students in 2011 compared to students in 2003 were also 13% more likely to eat supper in front of the TV and less likely to eat supper at the table with others, although this was not significant after adjusting for confounders. Moreover, we observed a statistically significant 16% decrease in the likelihood of students reporting eating at a fast food restaurant in 2011 relative to 2003. In 2011 relative to 2003, students reported consuming 0.26 serving per day more milk products, while no difference in mean consumption of fruits and vegetables was observed in adjusted models. Adjusted regression analysis also revealed a decrease of 0.20 can or glass per day in SSB consumption, which included a 0.09 can or glass per day decrease in soda consumption. Significant decreases in dietary energy intake along with increases in diet quality as measured by the DQI were also observed over time. The prevalence of overweight (excluding obesity) remained relatively unchanged at 23.1% in 2003 compared with 22.6% in 2011, whereas the prevalence of obesity increased slightly from 9.8% to 10.5% over the same time period.

**Discussion**

This study involved a large population-based comparison of grade 5 students in Nova Scotia in 2003 and 2011, which represents the timeframe before and after the implementation of the NSNP. This policy began influencing changes in school food in Nova Scotia from 2006 with full implementation expected by 2009. As this study observes trends from 2003 to 2011, we can examine population differences before and after policy implementation, although without a comparison group, it is not possible to disentangle any effects of the policy from wider societal changes. Nonetheless, this study provides “real world” evidence of the impact of a population-level (province-wide) intervention to promote healthy eating in schools. Thus far, the majority of research has focused on shorter term (one to three years) nutrition-related changes using an experimental or cross-section design in relation to state or district-wide implementation of a nutrition policy (Jaime and Lock, 2009). As very few studies have assessed changes at a population level (Mullally et al., 2010), our study contributes important population-level context and adds to the limited evidence of the long-term, organic changes observed following nutrition policy implementation. Similar to other studies, we observed positive trends in diet quality (Cullen and Watson, 2009; Cullen et al., 2008) and energy intake (Mendoza et al., 2010) following the implementation of the NSNP, but we did not find statistically significant increases in consumption of vegetables and fruit that have been reported by others. A decline in SSB consumption over the timeframe observed in this study is consistent with other research following the implementation of a school-based nutrition policy (Blum et al., 2008; Johnson et al., 2009; Jones et al., 2010); however, different from earlier work, we did not differentiate between beverages consumed at home and at school.

Typically, school nutrition policies focus on foods available at school, rather than the food provided at home. The focus on improving school food is important for NS as earlier research (CLASS I) found that students who purchased lunch at school (compared to those who brought their lunches) consumed less fruits and vegetables and more SSB, which is consistent with the findings of this study. Further, we observed a significant decrease in average soda consumption, which is consistent with other research following the implementation of a school-based nutrition policy. Nevertheless, the overall dietary quality remains below recommended standards and there is a need for ongoing evaluation of the impact of school nutrition policies.

**Table 3**

Dietary Reference Intakes (DRIs) and observed nutrient intakes among grade 5 students attending public schools in the Canadian province of Nova Scotia in 2003 and 2011.

| Nutrient | DRI categorya | Reference value | Mean ± SE | 2003 | 2011 | P-value | Effect sizeb | Prevalence of inadequacy |
|----------|----------------|-----------------|-----------|------|------|---------|-------------|-------------------------|
| Carbohydrate | % | AMDR | 45–65 | 55.6 ± 0.1 | 56.5 ± 0.1 | <0.001 | 0.11 | 2.5% | 2.0% |
| | (g/d) | EARc | 100 | 299.7 ± 2.4 | 267.1 ± 2.2 | <0.001 | 0.18 | 1.7% | 2.3% |
| Protein | % | AMDR | 10–30 | 14.8 ± 0.1 | 15.9 ± 0.1 | <0.001 | 0.22 | 3.4% | 1.7% |
| | (g/kg/d) | EAR | 0.76 | 1.94 ± 0.02 | 1.84 ± 0.02 | <0.001 | 0.09 | 6.5% | 7.6% |
| Fat | % | AMDR | 25–35 | 30.7 ± 0.1 | 28.7 ± 0.1 | <0.001 | 0.25 | 7.4% | 19.6% |
| | (g) | EAR | ND | 73.4 ± 0.6 | 62.0 ± 0.5 | <0.001 | 0.25 | – | – |
| Vitamin C (mg) | EAR | 39 | 163.5 ± 1.7 | 125.8 ± 1.5 | <0.001 | –0.26 | 5.4% | 11.7% |
| Folate | EAR | 250 | 363.8 ± 2.8 | 335.2 ± 2.5 | <0.001 | –0.15 | 27.7% | 33.5% |
| Vitamin A (ug RAE/d) | EAR | 445 | 918.7 ± 12.6 | 898.5 ± 10.9 | 0.22 | <0.03 | 16.7% | 18.9% |
| Iron (mg) | EAR | 420 | 901.1 ± 12.7 | 881.8 ± 10.6 | 0.25 | <0.03 | 15.3% | 16.0% |
| Males | EAR | 5.9 | 12.1 ± 0.1 | 12.5 ± 0.1 | 0.03 | 0.06 | 8.7% | 8.1% |
| Females | EAR | 5.7 | 11.1 ± 0.1 | 11.5 ± 0.1 | 0.03 | 0.06 | 10.6% | 8.5% |
| Zinc (mg) | EAR | 7 | 10.2 ± 0.1 | 9.5 ± 0.1 | <0.001 | <0.12 | 24.6% | 30.5% |
| Calcium (mg) | EAR | 1100 | 1181.9 ± 9.7 | 1110.0 ± 9.6 | <0.001 | <0.10 | 48.5% | 55.3% |
| Vitamin D (IU) | EAR | 400 | 251.5 ± 2.7 | 245.2 ± 2.7 | 0.10 | <0.03 | 80.7% | 81.4% |
| Total fiber (g) | Males | AI | 31 | 16.2 ± 0.2 | 15.6 ± 0.2 | 0.01 | <0.08 | – | – |
| Females | AI | 26 | 15.6 ± 0.2 | 15.1 ± 0.2 | 0.03 | <0.06 | – | – |
| Sodium (mg) | UL | 2200 | 2615.1 ± 20.6 | 2404.8 ± 18.7 | <0.001 | <0.14 | – | – |

a AMDR = Acceptable Macronutrient Distribution Range; EAR = Estimated Average Requirement; ND = Not Determined; AI = Adequate Intake; UL = Upper Limit.

b Effect size is mean 2003 — mean 2011 / SD.

c EAR is the value that is estimated to meet the requirements of 50% of healthy individuals. AI is used in the absence of definitive data on which to base an EAR. The prevalence of inadequacy cannot be determined with values below an AI because lower values may be adequate. EAR is not available for total fat intake. Sodium intake levels were compared with the Upper Limit (UL) values above which potential adverse effect may occur (i.e. high blood pressure). Only the UL was used for sodium because health concerns pertain primarily to the excess consumption of sodium and sodium deficiencies are extremely rare in Canada.
Effect of the Nova Scotia Food and Nutrition Policy on dietary behaviors, dietary intakes, and weight status among grade 5 students attending public schools between 2003 and 2011.*

| Outcome | 2003 | 2011 | P | Unadjusted change | Adjusted change |
|---------|------|------|---|------------------|----------------|
| Dietary behaviors | | | | | |
| Eat breakfast | 95.3% | 94.9% | 0.400 | 0.99 (0.99, 1.00) | 0.99 (0.98, 1.00) |
| Bring a prepared lunch from home | 59.1% | 79.3% | <0.001 | 1.35 (1.20, 1.52) | 1.33 (1.19, 1.50) |
| Buy lunch at school | 17.3% | 12.8% | 0.003 | 0.69 (0.58, 0.82) | 0.67 (0.48, 0.92) |
| Supper at table with others | 72.4% | 73.0% | 0.618 | 1.00 (0.98, 1.03) | 0.98 (0.96, 1.01) |
| Supper in front of the TV | 56.1% | 60.9% | <0.001 | 1.10 (1.05, 1.15) | 1.13 (1.07, 1.18) |
| Eat at fast food restaurant | 49.6% | 40.8% | <0.001 | 0.84 (0.76, 0.91) | 0.84 (0.77, 0.92) |
| Dietary intakes | | | | | |
| Mean servings of fruits & vegetables per day | 5.20 | 5.23 | 0.596 | 0.01 (−0.16, 0.18) | −0.08 (−0.27, 0.19) |
| Mean servings of grain products per day | 4.68 | 4.99 | <0.001 | 0.29 (0.19, 0.39) | 0.26 (0.17, 0.34) |
| Mean servings of milk products per day | 3.23 | 3.54 | <0.001 | 0.31 (0.25, 0.37) | 0.24 (0.18, 0.31) |
| Mean servings of meat & alternatives per day | 1.52 | 1.59 | <0.001 | 0.06 (0.03, 0.09) | 0.06 (0.03, 0.09) |
| Mean soda intake (cans or glasses/day) | 0.44 | 0.27 | <0.001 | −0.16 (−0.19, −0.13) | −0.09 (−0.11, −0.06) |
| Mean sugar-sweetened beverages (non-diet soda, fruit juices, and sweetened tea cans or glasses/day) | 0.99 | 0.62 | <0.001 | −0.34 (−0.41, −0.26) | −0.20 (−0.27, −0.12) |
| Mean dietary energy intake (kcal) per day | 2151 | 1887 | <0.001 | −267.15 (−323.62, −210.69) | −248.52 (−301.21, −195.83) |
| Mean DQI score | 62.0 | 63.0 | <0.001 | 0.71 (0.39, 1.04) | 1.80 (1.33, 2.27) |
| Weight status | | | | | |
| Overweight (excl obese)* | 23.1 | 22.6 | 0.625 | 1.01 (0.92, 1.09) | 1.03 (0.94, 1.12) |
| Obese† | 9.8 | 10.9 | 0.020 | 1.15 (0.95, 1.39) | 1.26 (1.08, 1.48) |

* Multilevel models with clustering of students within schools within school boards.

† P-values derived using the Rao-Scott Chi-square or t-test where appropriate.

‡ Models adjusting for the potential confounding effects of gender, household income, parental education, and place of residency. Students from public schools that did not participate in both years of the study were excluded from the regression analysis. Dietary outcomes were further adjusted for energy intake. Prevalence ratio (PR) from Poisson random effect models with robust variance assessing the effect of FNP on binary outcomes (i.e. dietary behaviors and weight status) and |β| coefficients are derived from linear random effect models assessing the effect of FNP on continuous outcomes (i.e. dietary intake and DQI score).

* Overweight (excluding obese) compared to normal weight. Students without height and weight measurements for BMI calculations were excluded from the analysis.

† Obese compared to normal weight. Students without height and weight measurements for BMI calculations were excluded from the analysis.

lunch from home) had poorer diets and were more likely to be overweight and obese (Veugelers and Fitzgerald, 2005b). Food served during school lunch should now follow the NSNP but the frequency with which options are available varies according to the capacity and interest of the school to manage a lunch program. Notably, the results of this study found that students were more likely to bring a lunch prepared from home and less likely to buy lunch at school following the implementation of the NSNP. The decrease in school lunch participation is an important area of investigation considering unintended negative consequences following nutrition policy implementation that have been reported in other studies. For example, Cullen et al. (2006) reported that students might compensate for lack of access to ‘banned’ foods by buying other processed foods. Although unfounded in research (Wharton et al., 2008), schools often report difficult obstacles in creating healthier food options such as the fear that profits will be negatively influenced. Free fruit and vegetable programs (Bere et al., 2007; Coyle et al., 2009) and price reductions in healthy food options (Blum et al., 2008; Gonzalez et al., 2009; Johnson et al., 2009; Jones et al., 2010) are school strategies that have also demonstrated improvements in children’s diet quality and provide an opportunity to support families and strengthen school policies related to nutrition.

National surveys have suggested a leveling of childhood overweight and obesity rates. The 2004 Canadian Community Health Survey and the 2009–2011 Canadian Health Measures Survey suggest that rates of overweight (excluding obese) among children decreased from 18.1% in 2004 to 16.2% in 2010 whereas obesity remained the same at 8.2% in 2004 and 8.1% in 2010 (Shields, 2006b; Statistics Canada, 2012). Compared to the leveling of national results, this study reported no change in overweight (23.1% to 22.6%) but a slight increase in obesity (9.8% to 10.9%) along a similar time period. It is important to note that lifestyle and poor health are particular challenges to residents of NS (Government of Nova Scotia, 2012); our results suggest that the current conditions that make it difficult for children to acquire nutritious foods and recommended levels of physical activity might have an influence on prevalence rates over time and these factors extend beyond the school gates. Although several studies have reported an impact of nutrition policy on body weight (Foster et al., 2008; Kubik et al., 2005; Sanchez-Vaznaugh et al., 2010), the current study did not find similar effects.

It is possible that the NSNP led to some potential positive effects on nutrition, including a reduction in percentage of energy from saturated fat and a decrease in SSB consumption. However, there was evidence of a negative trend in micronutrient and dietary fiber consumption. There are several reasons for this. First, students in 2011 were less likely to buy their lunch at school and more likely to bring a lunch from home than in 2003, as discussed above. It could also be because of increasing media attention on the healthiness (or not) of school meals internationally over the last decade (Institute of Medicine, 2010) or because the changes brought in by the policy itself may have been perceived more negatively by parents and students. An unintended consequence of this shift to food brought in from home might be to negatively impact overall nutritional quality, since international research comparing school meals and packed lunches in England between 1990 and 2007 showed that mandatory school food standards had widened the nutritional gap between school meals and packed lunches (Evans et al., 2010). The modest changes reported might also be reflective of the complexity of school nutrition policy implementation and the significance of obstructive community-related factors, such as the widespread availability of energy dense, nutrient poor food (Swinburn et al., 2011) and the increasing cost of healthy foods (Nova Scotia Participatory Food Costing Project, 2011; Ricciuto and Tarasuk, 2007). Although we saw a reported reduction in consumption of fast food, this could reflect a number of contributing factors that were beyond the NSNP (e.g., increasing food prices or greater awareness of the negative effects of fast food consumption more broadly). It may also reflect social desirability bias although this is difficult to judge without further exploration. These factors may also explain the lack of change in the rates of overweight and obesity. Although weight status is an outcome, we believe that dietary changes are also the more informative measures for evaluating a policy that targets food and nutrition.

In the current study, nutrition policy implementation occurred across the province in conditions that were not controlled by research. Therefore these results provide significant insight on the potential
real-world effects that result from a population-level policy intervention. Importantly, the NSNP is a comprehensive policy that not only includes regulations and guidelines for school food, but also encourages schools to consider broader factors that contribute to the school food environment. The importance and health benefits of applying a comprehensive approach to school nutrition are well supported in the literature (Van Cauwenberghe et al., 2010; Wang and Stewart, 2012) and have been found to be beneficial to diet quality, active lifestyles, and body weight (Veugelers and Fitzgerald, 2005a). Future research will use a comprehensive model to study the effects of specific school policies and practices on students’ health behaviors and body weights. Furthermore, we will explore school-level differences in the school food environment to help us understand how differences in policy implementation (i.e., with respect to reported adherence to policy directives and guidelines as well as the adoption of broader health promotion initiatives) across different schools may have influenced student behaviors.

 intervention context has been reported as a key component of evaluations relating to obesity prevention (Waters et al., 2011) and further exploration of this construct through qualitative case studies will provide critical evidence to help interpret the observed outcomes across schools and improve policy and practice in Nova Scotia (Hawe and Potvin, 2009; Wang and Stewart, 2012).

Strengths of our study include the relatively high response rates and reduction of nonresponse bias through the use of weighting. Furthermore, we adjusted for a number of potential confounders, measured participants’ height and weight, and applied consistent protocols to survey administration. We also used a validated FFQ which enables consideration of a number of important dietary factors and we have considerable experience with the use of this tool for population level analyses of the type reported here (e.g., Veugelers and Fitzgerald, 2005a, 2005b). Most of the questions included were validated, although self-reported responses, including those in the YAQ, remain subjective and hence may be prone to error. Unfortunately, this remains a limitation of population-based dietary surveys, but has been mitigated by the steps taken above to ensure consistency in data capture. The YAQ may not fully capture newer foods, e.g., energy drinks. FFQs may also overestimate intake (Burrows et al., 2010) although this is less of an issue in our study which uses the same tool over two time points. We also observed that, relative to 2003, parents in 2011 reportedly had higher levels of education and higher incomes. These changes paralleled not only economic growth but also differences in participation rates, and underline the importance that temporal comparisons are adjusted for these socioeconomic differences, as was done in the present study.

In summary, population health approaches that include a focus on healthy school policies are critical in the prevention of childhood obesity. The implementation of the NSNP provides an important opportunity to explore the relative effect of student population trends in nutritional habits and weight status observed before and after policy implementation. Although this study reports improvements in diet quality, energy intake and healthy beverage consumption, no significant effects on overweight or obesity were observed over time. It is clear that more action is needed to curb the increases in the prevalence of childhood obesity. This includes more consistent messaging and support for parents and the community to reinforce healthy school food practices.
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