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Outline

• School Nurse Workload across the United States
• School nursing in the 21st Century
• Addressing student social needs and population level social determinants of health (particularly in underserved areas)
School Nursing in the U.S.

95,800 Nurses (LPN, RN, NP)

(Willgerodt, Brock, & Maughan, 2018)
School Nursing Across the U.S.

- **Private School**
  - 34.6% Full or part-time school nurse

- **Public School**
  - 81.9% Full or part-time school nurse

- **Elementary**
  - 62.4%

- **Secondary**
  - 24.7%

- **Mixed**
  - 12.9%

(Willgerodt, Brock, & Maughan, 2018)
Full-time, Part-time FTE; or No School Nurse

Full: 39.8
Part: 30.1%
No: 30.1%

Full: 56.9%
Part: 22.0%
No: 21.1%

Full: 72.9%
Part: 12.9%
No: 14.3%

Full: 80.7%
Part: 13.6%
No: 5.7%

(Willgerodt, Brock, & Maughan, 2018)
Number of Schools Covered by SN

1: 32.8%
2: 22.1
>2: 36.8%

1: 67.1%
2: 20.1
>2: 15.5%

1: 54.8.1%
2: 17.1
>2: 38.9%

(Willgerodt, Brock, & Maughan, 2018)
Percentage of schools providing each number of services for students with chronic health conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Services Provided in Schools</th>
<th>Total %, (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.4 (6.6-13.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.8 (3.9-8.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.1 (7.7-13.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.5 (13.6-22.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.2 (51.0-63.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Leroy, Tiu, & Maughan 2019)
Framework for 21st Century School Nursing Practice™

STANDARDS OF PRACTICE

- Care Coordination
- Community/Public Health
- Leadership
- Quality Improvement

Students
Healthy, Safe, Ready to Learn

Family and School Community

© National Association of School Nurses, 2015

BETTER HEALTH. BETTER LEARNING.™
Home and Community Factors That Impact Health and Learning Per 100 U.S. Students

KEY:

- Hunger
- English not spoken at home
- Single parent home
- Parent without GED Diploma
- Cannot afford healthcare
- No vehicle
- No home

(NASN, 2015a)
Individual Social Needs

• Health disparities (Pastor et al 2015; Beck et al., 2016)
• Chronic absenteeism (NASN, 2015b)
• Access to medical access
  – Dental, vision, physical
• Community resources
  – Food bank, prescriptions, transportation vouchers,
Population Social Determinant of Health

- Advocates of Community Structure Changes
- School Education/Health Reform
- Access to a school nurse
  - Payment (Medicaid, Return on Investment (Wang et al, 2014))
  - Lack of laws, policies and/or standards regarding school health services (Network PHL)
“An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure” - Benjamin Franklin
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School Discipline Reform & School-Based Restorative Justice Practices as a Strategy for Health Justice

Thalia González, Professor, Occidental College & Senior Scholar, Georgetown University Law Center
SDoH are conditions in the environments in which people are born, live, learn, work, play, worship, and age that affect a wide range of health, functioning, and quality of life outcomes and risks. SDoH include:

- Economic stability (e.g., employment, housing stability, poverty)
- Education (e.g., early childhood education, high school graduation)
- Social and community context (e.g., social cohesion, incarceration)
- Health and health care (e.g., access to primary care, health literacy)
- Neighborhood and built environment (e.g., access to healthy foods, crime)
Health Justice Framework

“Understanding health as a matter of justice and civil rights law as a health intervention has the potential to strengthen public health advocacy.”

Harris & Pamucku (2019)
What role do schools play?

Education is a key social determinant of health
What role do schools play?

Schools can mitigate or exacerbate the effects of toxic stress and ACEs can have on youth development.
Why does school discipline reform matter for health?

When we deprive students of access to education — attainment and social emotional learning, relationship development, and connectedness — it impacts their emotional well-being and places them at increased risk of social and economic instability, chronic disease, and low life expectancy.
2.7 million K-12 students received at least one out-of-school suspension

2015-2016 Civil Rights Data Collection: Out-of-School Suspensions

FIGURE 13: Percentage distribution of students receiving one or more out-of-school suspensions, by race and sex

NOTE: Data may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights; Civil Rights Data Collection, 2015-16.
Approximately 120,700 students experienced expulsion

2015-2016 Civil Rights Data Collection: Expulsions
The GAO report also revealed that students with disabilities faced disproportionately higher rates of discipline compared to their peers without disabilities.

Among students with disabilities, Black students were overrepresented in the discipline data.
Regardless of the type of public school attended, Black students and students with disabilities were suspended at disproportionate higher rates than their peers.
Trends in Exclusionary School Discipline Practices at the Pre-K Level

- A seminal 2005 study found that preschoolers were being expelled at rates more than three times higher than school-aged children (Gilliam, 2005).

- According to the Civil Rights Data Collection, Black pre-K children are 3.6 times as likely to receive one or more out-of-school suspensions (OSS) as white pre-K children
  - Black children represent 19% of pre-K enrollment, but 47% of pre-K children receiving one or more OSS

- Analysis of data from the 2016 National Survey of Children’s Health found that an estimated 50,000 preschoolers were suspended at least one time, and another 17,000 were estimated to have been expelled.
  - 250 preschool students being suspended or expelled on the average school day (Center for American Progress, 2017).
Exclusionary discipline is a health equity issue
Negative academic outcomes

- Decreased academic engagement, performance, and attendance
- Increased likelihood of dropout
Negative classroom outcomes

- Increased likelihood of future disciplinary actions
- Decreased feelings of safety
- Lower school connectivity
Negative *socioeconomic* outcomes

- Increased likelihood of involvement in the juvenile justice system
- Double the poverty rate for those aged 25 and older with no high school diploma
Negative **health** outcomes

- Fail to address the “root causes” of behavior
- Undermine critical protective factor — *school connectedness*
How does this all fit together?
Understanding the connections between school discipline and health justice.
By pushing students out and depriving them of **critical protective factors**, ESD practices exacerbate racial disparities and external stressors that threaten the health and wellbeing of developing children.

These practices undermine the traditional purpose of schools—which is to create a safe, nurturing, learning environment.
Protective Factors

• Positive academic experiences
• School connectedness, i.e., supportive relationships with adults and peers
• Social and emotional skills and capacities
School Connectedness

School connectedness is rooted in the “extent to which students feel personally accepted, respected, included, and supported by others in the school social environment.”
Three Principles to Improve Outcomes for Children and Families

Supportive alternatives that emphasize healthy development of the whole child positively reinforce each of the three design principles to cultivate healthier school environments, empower students, remove barriers to educational attainment, and equip students with the skills to thrive in and outside of the classroom.
Whole-School Model of RJ

Tier 3 (support and reentry)

Tier 2 (respond to harm and conflict)

Tier 1 (build and strengthen relationships)
Supportive relationships with peers and adults are key indicators of school connectedness and result in improved resilience, self-efficacy, and engagement.

- Survey of 412 high school students across 29 classrooms found improved student-teacher relationships with RJ practices (Gregory, et al., 2014).

- K-3 teachers reported that RJ supported the “development of authentic relationships with their students based on mutuality” and improved relationships with families (Armour & Todic, 2016).

- PK-5 students identified RJ as increasing student-teacher connectedness, self-regulation, self-awareness, and improved peer interactions (Tolefree, 2017).

Design Principle #1: Support Responsive Relationships
Supporting social and emotional capacities are associated with a range of positive outcomes: decreased behavioral and emotional issues, improved academic performance, positive staff relationships and satisfactions, and parent and family engagement in the schools.

Seven year case study of small urban high school, students identified self-efficacy, conflict resolution skills, and leadership development as outcomes of whole-school RJ practices (González, Sattler, and Buth, 2018)

Two-year ethnographic study with adolescent girls in public urban high school found that restorative circles promoted refined anger management, active listening and interpersonal sensitivity, key aspects of pro-social behavior (Schumacher, 2014)
Reducing suspension and expulsions reduce stress

- 84-percent drop in out-of-school suspensions among sixth graders in one Texas school during the first year RJ was introduced (Armour (2013))

Narrowing of the racial-discipline gap for Black non-Hispanic and Hispanic students

- In addition to incremental decreases (2011–2012 and 2012–2013) in the suspension gap between Black and white students, 107 by 2013, Oakland schools had decreased their discipline disproportionality across multiple racial categories, if not eliminated them altogether (Jain, 2014)

Design Principle #3: Reduce Sources of Stress
Looking Ahead

• Increased state level legislation
• Continued removal of exclusionary and punitive practices
• Developing whole school models
Keep the conversation going

Thalia González: thaliagonzalez@oxy.edu

Thank you!
State Policies to Address the Breakfast Gap

Mathew Swinburne
Associate Director
The Network for Public Health Law-Eastern Region
Background on National School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs

- Administered by the US Department of Agriculture’s Food and Nutrition Services in partnership with state and local government.
- Federal law does not mandate participation.
- USDA provides funding in the form of reimbursements for school meals that meet certain federal standards.
- Reimbursement is based on the category of meal:
  - Free—below 130% of federal poverty line
  - Reduced price—130%-185% of federal poverty line
  - Full Price
- **Categorical Eligibility**—Automatically eligible for free meals if receive SNAP, TANF, FDPIR, in foster care, homeless, ....
- **Community Eligibility Provision**—allows schools to offer free meals to all students if at least 40% of enrolled students are categorically eligible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Reimbursement Rates</th>
<th>Lunch</th>
<th>Breakfast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free</td>
<td>$3.41</td>
<td>$1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Price *</td>
<td>$3.01</td>
<td>$1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Price</td>
<td>$0.32</td>
<td>$0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Student Share for Reduced Price</td>
<td>$0.40</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Lunch Program (FY 2018)
- Approximately 100,000 schools
- 29.8 million children/day
  - 22 million were free or reduced price meals
- 4.89 billion lunches in the year
- 74.3% were free or reduced price
- Federal expenditures- $13.8 billion

School Breakfast Program (FY 2018)
- Approximately 90,000 schools
- 14.7 million children/day
  - 12.5 million free or reduced price meals
- 2.42 billion breakfasts in the year
- 85.4% were free or reduced price
- Federal expenditures-$4.4 billion

What is the Breakfast Gap?
Factors Contributing to the Breakfast Gap

Logistics

- Does the school participate in the school breakfast program?
- Getting students to school early for the traditional breakfast program

Social

- Some students skip the breakfast program because they are conscious of peer perception

Economic

- Reduced-price breakfast contribution
- Cost to the school
Impact of the Breakfast Gap

Health Impact/Food Insecurity
- Linked to childhood obesity
- Cardiovascular disease
- Asthma
- Diabetes
- Poor mental health

Academic Impact of School Breakfasts Participation
- Higher test scores, calmer classrooms, fewer trips to the nurse, stronger attendance, higher graduation rates.
- One study suggested that increasing breakfast participation from 50% to 70% would result in:
  - 3.2 million students achieving better standards tests scores
  - 4.8 million fewer absences
  - 807,000 more students graduating high school.
Research into State Laws Addressing the School Breakfast Gap

- Project completed by Kasia Foster, J.D. 2020 and Kirby McMahon, J.D. 2019
  - Issue Brief
  - 50-State Survey

- Identified 6 Categories of Policy Intervention
  1. Require Schools to Offer Breakfast
  2. Require Innovative Breakfast Models
  3. Start-up/Expansion Funding
  4. Universal Free Breakfast
  5. Eliminate the Reduced-Price Category
  6. Additional Per-Meal Reimbursements
Require Schools to Offer Breakfast

- No federal mandate to participate in the lunch or breakfast program.
- 29 states and D.C. mandate that schools offer breakfast
  - 22 jurisdictions have a threshold of need to activate requirement
    - Based % of students eligible for free or reduced-price meals.
    - Range from 10% in TX to 80% in CT
  - 16 jurisdictions offer an exemption or waiver to the requirement: financial difficulties, low participation, . . . .
Require an Innovative Breakfast Model

- 10 states require schools to provide innovative breakfast programs
  - Aimed at addressing the social and logistical barriers
  - Breakfast after the bell, breakfast in the class room, food carts in the hall way, . . . .

- 6 states have a need threshold to activate requirement
  - Example: NY 70% eligible for free or reduced price lunch.
  - 4 states have waiver/exemption provisions for economic hardship or lack of need.
11 States provide additional state funding to help cover the start-up/expansion costs of operating breakfast program.

- Additional staff time and equipment
- Grants or appropriations for specific schools or school districts
- Priority granted based on need--usually defined by the % of students eligible for free or reduced-price meals.
  - Examples: IL 40% and NV 70%
  - New Jersey awards priority to schools with highest percentage of students eligible for free or reduced price but also looks at schools with lowest participation in breakfast program.

~$2,300
8 States and DC have implemented universal free breakfast—

- All students are eligible regardless of family income
- Aimed at reducing stigma and financial barriers
- Threshold to activate (% eligible for free or reduced price meals)
  - CO 70%
  - FL 80%
  - NM 85%
Eliminate Reduced-Price Category

- 8 states and DC have eliminated the reduced-price category/merged with the free meal category.
  - Students who qualify for reduced price meals are given their breakfast for free
  - ME exempts high schools from requirement (grades 9-12)
  - Some states offset the revenue lost from the merger by providing additional funding to the schools
    - ME: “the difference between the federal reimbursement for a free breakfast and the federal reimbursement for a reduced-price…” ($0.30)
15 States and D.C. provide additional per-meal funding to schools to off-set costs and encourage participation

**Qualifying Meals**
- Every breakfast served (DC, IL, MA)
- Only Free and Reduced-Price Breakfasts (MN, NM, OR)

**Method of Funding**
- Schools receive a per/meal reimbursement automatically from the state
- Grant Application (CA and MO)

**Amount of Additional Reimbursement**
- Most common reimbursement rate is 10 cents/breakfast (CT, IL, MA,…)
- MN—reimbursement varies by grade level of students → highest for pre-kindergarten and kindergarten students at $1.30/breakfast.
Thank you
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