

**Free School Meals (Scotland) Bill
Consultation Report
Summary of Responses**

March 2006

Free School Meals (Scotland) Bill Consultation Report

1 Consultation Process

1.1 A consultation document on the main issues surrounding the proposals in the proposed Free School Meals (Scotland) Bill was drawn up in Spring 2005. Two thousand copies of this were then printed and distributed by post and through a number of voluntary agencies (One Plus, CPAG (Scotland), the Poverty Alliance etc.) beginning on 7th July 2005.

1.2 All Scottish local authorities and Health Boards were mailed a copy as were all major voluntary organisations that could be identified. In addition there was a concerted effort to contact local community organisations working with parents and children or on poverty, health, women's, children & young people's issues. Efforts were also made to ensure that those working with socially excluded groups such as ethnic minorities, disabled people and carers were provided with copies of the document. In addition to mailing out copies of the document it was also made available on Frances Curran MSP's web page and on the websites of CPAG (Scotland) One Plus and the Poverty Alliance where the consultation questions could be completed online.

1.3 In addition various member organisations of the Free School Meals Campaign worked to ensure that there was a good response to the consultation. One Plus, the lone parent organisation, consulted with service users on the main issues contained in the proposed bill and distributed copies of the consultation document and associated questionnaire to lone parents and affiliated agencies; the Scottish Youth Parliament consulted its MYSPs and distributed the document to affiliated local youth agencies and in Edinburgh the Pilton Partnership and Pilton Community Health Project collaborated with the local Community Education team to distribute the consultation widely to local agencies and service user groups within the local SIP area.

1.4 The consultation closed on 14th October 2005 but a few responses (less than 10), which were received after that date, have been accepted. In total 519 consultation responses were received.

2 Question 1: The main proposal of the free school meals (Scotland) Bill is to provide free school meals to all school children in state primary schools. Do you support this extension?

2.1 There were a total of **514** responses to the consultation of which **495 (96%)** favoured the main proposal of the Free School Meals (Scotland) Bill to extend free school meals to all children in state primary schools. Of these positive responses **119** were from organisations (schools, school boards, parents' groups, children and young people's agencies, anti-poverty groups, local authorities, health boards, etc) and **376** were from individuals.

2.1.1 There were 19 responses (**>4%**) opposing the extension of free school meals to primary children of which **7** were from organisations and **12** were from individuals. There were 3 responses (**>0.5%**), all from organisations, which did not state a preference or were equivocal.

2.1.2 A high proportion of all responses were from health professionals and organisations. In total there were responses from **61** professionals and organisations working in a health setting representing almost **12%** of all responses. (**Organisations:** 8 NHS Boards or departments, 10 Community Health/Care organisations, 3 Professional Bodies - **Individuals:** 22 Health Professionals (GPs, School Nurses, Health Visitors etc.) & 18 Community Health Workers). Support for extending free school meals to all primary school children from health professionals and organisations was similar to that shown by the general public with **97%** (59) in favour.

2.1.3 There was a similar level of response from schools and teachers with **56** replies (**>11%**) to the consultation coming from this sector (**Organisations:** 12 schools, 5 school boards, 3 Professional Teaching bodies, 2 National Parent/Teacher bodies – **Individuals:** 31 Teachers & other professionals working in a school setting (Learning Assistants etc.), 3 School Board members). The level of support for the main proposal of the bill was slightly lower amongst this group with **11%** (6) expressing opposition and **89%** (50) support.

2.1.4 Finally there was a high level of response from groups representing parents, families, children and young people and from young people and parents themselves. There were 125 responses (**24%**) which could be identified as coming from these groups - **26** from organisations (14 Children & Young People's Groups; 7 Family & Childcare Groups; 3 Lone Parent Organisations; 2 Parents Groups) and **99** from individuals (12 Childcare Workers; 5 Community Education/Youth Workers; 10 Students; 29 Young People*: 34 Parents** & 19 Lone Parents).

2.1.5 Support from these groups was at a similar level to general responses with **96%** (101) in favour of extending free provision to all primary school children. A full list of organisations responding is attached as an appendice.

2.2 If yes, why do you favour this?

2.2.1 The responses to this question can be placed in two broad categories; those who based their support on the grounds of fairness and equality in society, and those who based it specifically on the grounds of the health and education benefits that would accrue to children. Within the first category, the reasons varied from a belief that all aspects of education should be free, to the view that it would end stigma. Those in the second category based their support on the conviction that all children would benefit from free school meals, that it would improve their health and well-being, and that it would improve their educational attainment. The aim and objective of all respondents here is clearly the building of a healthier, fairer and more just society.

2.3 Reason (1) All aspects of education should be free

'Should be as free as the jotters the kids write on', Joy McLelland, nurse

"Free school meals should be part of our welfare provision for all children along with free education" – Children 1st.

2.3.1 13 people made this response. The issue here was clear cut. If children are required to attend school, then they should be provided with a free meal. The view expressed here was that free school meals should be as much a right as free education itself.

2.4 Reason (2) A support for universalism over means-testing

'Our research, "Britain's poorest children" showed that 14% of children living in severe and persistent poverty had not received benefits in the previous five years. The figures rose to 68% of children who had experienced poverty over a short term...Universal provision is the only mechanism where we can be certain that all children who require a free school meal will be entitled to it', Save The Children

"Meals for the poor are usually poor quality" – Postman.

"By providing meals universally, the quality of meals will be ensured as all sectors of society have a stake, or an interest in this occurring"- GP

2.4.1 The 31 respondents who argued this based their views on two related arguments. Firstly, that a system based on the principle of universality is fairer and more just than that based on means testing. Several respondents here made the point that universalism was at the heart of the NHS and should be at the heart of all aspects of the education system. The question was also asked that, if society was willing to invest in the NHS for universal treatment of disease, why not invest also in universal PREVENTION of disease.

“Means testing creates stigma that discourages uptake of free school meals, with official figures suggesting that around one in three Scots children entitled to free meals are not taking them” - CPAG, Scotland

2.4.2 The second aspect of this argument was the failures and shortcomings of the means testing system. Many here were of the view that such benefits often do not even reach those that they are supposed to help.

“Targeted” or means-tested benefits and services involve complex rules and complicated and expensive administration. Such systems create poverty traps and work disincentives. Initiatives provided on a universal basis have proved successful in achieving a high take-up, are stigmatised less and hit the target more effectively”-
the Scottish Trades Union Congress (STUC)

“Extension to those on working families tax credit would only create another “poverty trap” where slightly exceeding the entitlement income would mean parents of school age children being significantly worse off” – Children 1st.

2.4.3 In addition to the question of stigma, it was pointed out by researchers from Dundee University that many of the poorest households in Scottish society are not in receipt of the type of benefits that enable their children to access free school meals. Many of these households have fallen through the welfare safety net, with the children suffering as a result. It was felt by these respondents that the only answer here lies in the provision of free school meals for all.

“The issues seem to be about whether universal provision can be justified against the claim that funds for feeding the more affluent could be used to aid the more deprived elsewhere.

Providing school meals should be seen as a public health measure and, as such, be free at the point of use. On an annual basis the NHS spends millions of pounds on the universal treatment of disease due in some part to poor diet. Investment in universal prevention measures such as free school meals improve health and reduce need for treatment” - NHS Lanarkshire.

2.5 Reason (3) To Reduce Stigma and increase Take-Up.

“To give every child equal opportunity to healthy food without any stigma”- Antenatal Development Worker.

2.5.1 135 of those responding gave this as their reason for supporting free school meals. This high total should be read in conjunction with the 325, who, when asked in question 4, what measure did they feel would do most to end the stigma associated with free school meals, argued for the introduction of free meals for all.

2.5.2 It was pointed out repeatedly by respondents, particularly those working with children and young people, how children who take free school meals can be singled out and made to suffer.

“Stop the stigma around families receiving this being categorised as “minks”. Lots of children are bullied and would rather go without lunch”- Childcare project worker.

“Once developed there would be no stigma towards those living in poverty. This exists at the moment despite attempts by new technology to overcome it”- Head of Education Services, East Renfrewshire Council.

2.5.3 This can take the form of bullying, which leads to many children not taking their meals, or even a simple feeling of ‘difference’ on their behalf which can prove to be quite distressing. Free school meals, it is argued here, would abolish this at a stroke.

“There is strong anecdotal evidence that some minority ethnic groups attach great stigma to asking for free school meals, so making them universal would bypass this to a great extent” – Glasgow Anti-Racist Alliance.

(The Bill), ***“promotes the concept of equality of opportunity, social inclusion and removes a recognised potential cause of bullying, or simple, yet distressing, ‘feeling of difference’ which affects children’s self esteem”***- UNISON Scotland.

2.6 Reason (4) Would help to reduce poverty and improve living standards

‘25% of children live in poverty, yet only 19% are entitled to free school meals. Extending entitlement to free school meals would help increase the disposable income of some of our poorest household by up to £27 per week’, Child Poverty Action Group (Scotland)

“Our client group would benefit greatly from the extension” – Scottish Low Pay Unit.

“The provision of free, nutritionally beneficial school meals ...would complement our members’ professional aims of improving children’s health and development, promoting social inclusion and tackling poverty and its effects on health” - Community Practitioners and Health Visitors Association.

“...poverty and its corollaries are pressing issues for many of Scotland’s Black/Minority Ethnic population, therefore free school meals would be a well focused intervention, both by reducing financial pressures and contributing to good health”- Glasgow Anti-Racist Alliance.

2.6.1 A few of the comments made by the 142 organisations and individuals who cited reducing poverty as a reason for supporting the extension of free school meals provision. There was a recognition that not only does the present means tested system stigmatize those who qualify for free school meals, leaving many unwilling to take them, but that it omits many other economically disadvantaged sectors of the population.

2.6.2 A significant number of lone parents and low paid workers attested that they struggled to pay for school meals for their children especially when moving from benefits to work.

“Free school meals would be a great help as you’re not that much better off working”
- Single parent.

“... I am on a low income and it would help our family immensely” – Admin Assistant.

2.6.3 As well as this anecdotal evidence the lone parent organisation, One Plus, carried out focus groups with its members & user groups before replying to the consultation. They found that -

“Cost was identified as a key area of concern. In discussion it was raised particularly by those parents with several children, while others felt that the cost of the current provision was too expensive...For lone parents the move from Income Support to employment and receipt of tax credits is often a move from poverty level benefits to low paid, inflexible work; debt and a stressful lifestyle ...This is where free school meals for all children would help reduce the unemployment trap which faces so many lone parents and their children”- One Plus

2.6.4 Similar views were expressed by the Scottish Women’s Convention –

“The SWC would strongly recommend that a Bill for Free School Meals is passed to ensure that the effects of poverty are reduced...Research also shows that millions of mothers have to go without food because they do not have enough money, in order that their children can eat” (CPAG). That this is still the case six years after the Scottish Parliament came into being is perhaps one of the greatest concerns for those living in Scotland” – the Scottish Women’s Convention

2.6.5 The existence of poverty traps, where parents lose out on benefits such as school meals for their children if they take low-paid jobs were also cited by a number of other organisations.

“Many families have difficulty when moving off benefits into work as cost of school meals may mean families worse off in work”- Manager, Perth CAB.

“The current provision disadvantages low income families in work. Extension to those on working families tax credit would only create another “poverty trap” where slightly exceeding the entitlement income would mean parents of school age children being significantly worse off” – Children 1st.

2.6.6 A number of respondents made the point that many low income families in work did not qualify for benefits, and were forced as a result to spend a greater percentage of their income on foods and meals than the better off.

“Food poverty exists in this country and at least children will get a good start in life if they are getting one free meal per day” – Manager, Wester Hailes Health Agency.

“The Joseph Rowntree Foundation’s Poverty & Social Exclusion 2000 survey found that...21% (of poor children) failed to have two substantive meals daily” – STUC

2.6.7 Perhaps the most powerful arguments for change however came from several young people, and those working with them, who related personal experiences of poorer children going hungry under the current system –

“I have children who come and tell me they are hungry”- Learning Support Assistant.

“If free school meals are not provided many school children may go without meals on some days”- Member Scottish Youth Parliament, South Lanarkshire.

2.7 Reason (5) Free School Meals for all is fairer.

“...it would end the discrimination of poverty i.e. all children would get the same choice and quality” – Jenni Marrow, Pennywell Residents Association.

“For fairness to all” – Cllr Loretta Mordi (Lib Dem), Fife Council.

“All children should have access to the same food no matter what their financial background” – School student.

2.7.1 The view that all children should have equal access to the same food, regardless of the financial background of their parents was of prime importance to the 87 respondents who cited this reason. Some believed very firmly that this was an equalities issue that had to be addressed –

“Reviewing the evidence, we are of the opinion therefore that access to free school meals is a social justice and an equalities/equity issue” – GARA

“It would support the equality agenda” – Acting Director for Health Promotion, Greater Glasgow NHS.

2.7.2 A related reason given by the STUC and others was that all children had to be involved to gain the maximum health benefits from any extension -

“The diet and health of all children in Scotland is important. In order to change Scotland’s eating habits action must be taken from an early age and all children have to be involved...” – STUC.

2.7.3 Several working parents and organisations working with them mentioned the reassurance of knowing that children were going to be properly fed –

“I know how reassuring it is to know that the children are receiving a hot nourishing meal. I don’t see why this reassurance shouldn’t be available to all parents and children. It assists financially nutritionally, morally and we should all be the same” – Working Single Parent

2.7.4 Finally several respondents believed that by treating all children equally, according to them the same value, and ending the discrimination caused by poverty, then a new consciousness of equality could be developed throughout Scottish society as a whole.

“I believe it creates a good and sound consciousness amongst our nation of equality and sharing” – Support Worker.

“Equality for all children in state primary schools to ensure that each child is valued” – Health & Safety Officer, One Plus.

2.8 Reason (6) Healthy eating will improve children’s educational attainment & behaviour.

“There is now significant evidence that poor nutrition affects the performance of children in class...poorer children who cannot afford school meals are at an educational disadvantage” - Dr David Player, former Director, Health Education Council

“Overwhelming evidence that provision of free meals is beneficial to children’s physical and educational development and also has long term health benefits” – Psychiatrist.

2.8.1 86 respondents believed that extending free school meal provision would improve the behaviour of pupils both inside and outside school and lead to improved educational attainment particularly that of poorer pupils. One notable aspect of these responses was that a great many came from professional workers within both the health and education sectors. Teachers and their trade unions repeatedly pointed out that in their professional experience the concentration levels of pupils improved if they ate healthy lunches, and worsened if they ate junk –

“Children who eat well can concentrate better” – Retired Headteacher.

“I am concerned that poor diet has an adverse effect on children’s health, concentration and behaviour ...” – Primary Teacher

“Extension should also include secondary school (post 16) to ensure all pupils gain maximum benefit from the education on offer”- SSTA.

“Food affects mood – how can children concentrate if they are deprived of the correct nutrients” – NHS Senior Dietician.

2.8.2 Parents and others made the point that eating together will also aid the important role that socialisation plays in the behaviour and attainment of children -

“Here pupils receive three, 3 course meals per day. This ...undoubtedly leads to improved attainment. It also encourages a sit-down approach to eating (both healthy and social)” – Residential Special School Teacher.

“In the case of my son who is autistic, the school meal would be important as a social situation as well” – Chair, Kaimes Special School Board.

“I also have significant experience that suggests this (eating together) could also have a positive impact on behaviour, rather than a “junk food buzz”” – Youth Worker

2.8.3 It was also noted repeatedly how the two issues—health and educational attainment—impact on one another affecting many future aspects of life –

“...the same determinants that affect child health also impact on educational attainment. The two issues also affect each other: poor health works against educational success and educational attainment strongly affects social and economic prospects and choices about health” - One Plus.

2.8.4 That is by improving diet and attainment not only today’s poverty and ill-health would be tackled but the cycle of deprivation could itself be broken.

2.9 Reason (7) All children would benefit from free school meals

“I can think of nothing better to spend public money on than all our children. I think that focusing on the health of our children by providing one healthy meal a day when as a country our eating habits are so poor would also be a sensible financial investment” – Mum and Medical Student.

2.9.1 80 people gave this as a reason for supporting the extension of free school meals. Some also made the point that even amongst affluent children, diets could still be unhealthy –

“I work and live in fairly affluent areas and the diet of children is still appalling” – Health Visitor.

2.9.2 Thus children from affluent households could and should benefit from healthy free school meals:

“Not only would it benefit hundreds of thousands of children living in poverty it would also address health issues across the board” – Chair, East Lothian Young People & Food Group.

“We would strongly suggest that the argument that those children from better off backgrounds, who do not need Free School Meals, will benefit unfairly is a smokescreen. All our children deserve the best Scotland can offer - nutritious, balanced meals which help to shape eating habits in the future” – Scottish Women’s Convention

2.9.3 However, the focus of the majority of the respondents here was on less well-off children, with the feeling being that they would benefit most if such a scheme was implemented:

“Universal School Meals ensure that all children receive a good nutritional meal and it disproportionately benefits the less well off children ...” – NCH Scotland.

2.9.4 Finally it was argued that the best way to improve the health of the most socially disadvantaged children was not to make them feel different from their peers but to treat all children as equals:

“The best way to target health promotion services and activities at the most socially disadvantaged young people is not to isolate them from their peer group, or treat them as a special case, but rather, to recognise their health needs as part of a wider cohort i.e. all children in Scotland”- Children and Young Persons Worker, One Plus

2.10 Reason (8) Improve children’s diet and support children by improving health and well-being

“Free school meals could contribute to creating an environment where healthy eating is the norm and ensure that we as a nation “turn our backs on the food that is killing us”, (Prof. Mike Lean, Glasgow University) - One Plus

“Because good nutrition is one of the most important guarantees of good health” – Children 1st.

2.10.1 Improving the health of children was the most commonly provided reason for supporting the extension of free school meals provision being given by 274 organisations and individuals. Some respondents stressed that in their experience children were currently going without healthy food at home and that free school meals would at least begin to address this problem.

“Some kids don’t get fed at home. This would help” – Creche Worker

“Ensure that children receive a decent meal each day in case they do not get this after school hours”- Child Care Worker

“...many children in our local area suffer from poor diet. Some children never see a cooked meal” - Senior Officer, Yoker Resource Centre.

2.10.2 A great other many respondents stressed that paying for free school meals should not be seen as a cost but as an investment in the future health of Scottish children:

“Pay for good health rather than pay later for bad health” - Nurse.

“This is not a case of giving out something for nothing. This is a measure by which society makes an investment in children’s health”- Retired teacher.

“We can begin to improve the health of our children by investing in their nutrition” – Iona Community member.

Free school meals would ***“...save the National Health Service budget in the longer term”*** – retired Headteacher.

2.10.3 The negative effects of junk foods on children were also noted by several respondents. The view that Scotland has a dreadful health record could soon be facing a possible ‘tidal wave’ of diet-linked health problems was forcefully put and, for some, is the only context in which this discussion should be taking place. NHS Lanarkshire, for example, argued that there is now a real need for a - ***“radical programme of action beyond implementing the recommendations of ‘Hungry For Success,’*** and was of the view that this Bill ***“should be considered as part of the Executive’s goal to improve the diet of the nation”***.

2.10.4 For other respondents, the evidence from regions such as Scandinavia, where some countries have implemented free school meals, is so overwhelming, that there can be no real argument against the view that such a scheme would improve the health levels of all children.

“The overwhelming evidence from Scandinavia is that free school meals work in improving the health of children and the general population....Millions of pounds could be saved every year from having a healthier working population who have benefited from free school meals in their formative years” - Dr David Player, former Director of the Health Education Council

2.11 Reason (9) Educates young people about diet and/or encourages healthy eating

“Good food habits established in childhood are extended into adult life” - Public Health Dieticians, NHS Ayrshire & Arran

2.11.1 78 respondents gave this reason for supporting the main proposal. Their responses were obviously similar to those expressing support for extended provision on the basis of improved health. However they were more specific in additionally arguing that free school meal provision could assist in developing and nurturing a culture of healthy eating amongst Scottish schoolchildren. Some pointed to current eating habits to illustrate why action must be taken to assist change:

“I have taught children whose packed lunch contents every day are, for example, a chocolate spread sandwich, chocolate biscuits, a bar of chocolate and a Mars Bar drink” – Primary teacher

2.11.2 The belief of many of respondents was that the introduction of healthy and nutritious free school meals would encourage children to make healthy choices.

(Free school meals would) ***“encourage young people to eat more healthily and in school rather than at fast food outlets”*** – Member of Scottish Youth Parliament.

2.11.3 Several respondents argued that the process of educating children in this regard had to start early in life, as it is then that eating habits are formed and can be hard to break:

“I think that people’s eating habits develop early and if this can be modified from an early age it may benefit the nation’s long term health” - Community Nurse Specialist, ADHD Team.

“Promote a healthy attitude to healthy food from the moment children start school”– Primary Headteacher.

2.11.4 Thus providing children with free healthy school meals was seen by UNISON and others as a simple way of educating all children on dietary matters and assisting them in making healthier dietary choices throughout their lives:

“UNISON Scotland believes that access to free school meals for all children is a very simple, yet very effective way to encourage healthier eating habits now and in the future” – UNISON Scotland.

2.11.5 Finally for several of those in the education field free school meals were seen as a way of building on the existing ethos of ‘Hungry for Success’ and Health Promoting Schools:

“The argument outlined by the Campaign that “habits are learnt young” is well made. The Health Promoting School approach will need to look at the whole issue of nutrition including lunch time e.g. work/life balance, leisure activities etc. One head teacher suggested a realignment of the school day of certain European countries” – Chair, Dumfries & Galloway Health Promoting Schools, Steering Group.

2.12 Reason (10) Reduce obesity/diabetes.

“These children are tomorrow’s adults—obesity in children is already rising due to poorer food intake”, NHS senior dietician

2.12.1 26 people gave this response. These responses highlight the growing concern about the accepted links between poor diet, obesity, and diabetes. According to these respondents, there is now an urgent need to address these issues, with the provision of a free and healthy daily school meal, as opposed to the junk food that is often eaten by children at school lunch times, being seen as an important way of doing this.

2.12.2 In addition the Glasgow Anti-Racist Alliance made the point that the three main minority ethnic communities in Scotland (Pakistani, Indian and Chinese) are all at increased risk of developing type 2 diabetes and therefore children from these communities would disproportionately benefit from improved school meal provision.

2.13 Other responses

“If they have money for a school meal they can choose to go to the chip shop and you don’t know” – Mother.

“Would stop the need for parents giving children money with no guarantee they would not buy junk”- Firefighter.

2.13.1 Amongst other reasons given for supporting the main proposal were that it would result in a reduced need for dinner money and leaving school by young people. 26 people believed this, with the focus of many being on the safety of children, and the dangers they are exposed to (dietary, traffic, drugs, etc) when they leave school premises at lunchtimes.

2.13.2 A further 21 people also believed that it would help bring to an end the practice of parents giving packed lunches to their children, which they regarded as often being unhealthy and of poor nutritional value.

* We have only attributed responses as being from “parents” where they have primarily identified themselves as such i.e. where people have also identified themselves as teachers, doctors, school board members or anything else then they have not been counted as “parents”. This means that the number of responses attributed to “parents” under-represents the number of parents who have responded.

** The Scottish Youth Parliament’s members were responsible for ensuring that a great many of the responses were from children, young people and local youth groups. The Scottish Youth Parliament also polled their MSYPs on the main questions in the consultation so the level of young people’s involvement in responding is somewhat under-represented as that reply has been treated as a single one from an organisation.

3 Question 2: As well as extending entitlement to free school meals to all primary school children. The Bill would also give powers to Scottish Ministers to further extend provision to older children. On what grounds would you favour extension to older children.

(1) Geography (e.g. schools within areas of deprivation or particular local authorities)

(2) Age

(3) Pilot schemes (individual or groups of schools chosen to test the effects of free school meal provision on health, attendance, attainment etc)

3.1 This question dealt with one of the proposed provisions of the Bill, which would grant Scottish Executive Ministers the power to extend entitlement to free school meals to children beyond primary school age at a future date. Respondents were asked on what grounds this extension should be undertaken:

(i) Geography (deprived areas and communities)

(ii) Age and

(iii) Pilot schemes.

3.2 Of those who responded:

- 199 (43%) supported option (i), Geography,
- 219 (47%) chose option (ii), Age, and
- 216 (46%) chose option (iii), Pilot Schemes.

3.3 As the options were not mutually exclusive many respondents ticked more than one box. 88 (19%) indicated that they were in favour of all three options whilst 23 (5%) ticked boxes 1 & 2, 30 (6%) ticked 1 & 3, and 12 (2.5%) ticked 2 & 3. Eighty-five of those who responded to the consultation ticked none of the boxes, but of these 23 made it clear in written comments that they supported the widest possible extension of provision.

3.4 Just 10 individuals and organisations (2% of those responding to this question) opposed extending provision completely. Just under half (9) of those who opposed the main proposal to extend free provision to primary school children indicated that they were nevertheless in favour of extending provision to older children on one ground or another. **(NB:** Although only 4 respondents indicated that they were opposed to any extensions taking place amongst older children we have assumed that the remaining six organisations and individuals who opposed the main proposal also probably opposed pilot schemes. That leaves 56 (11% of all respondents) who did not respond in any way to this question).

3.5 Geography:

“The benefits would likely to be most marked amongst deprived populations” – Andrew Gray, consultant psychiatrist

“Personally, I would like free school meals across the board, but if it has to be targeted, then it should be in areas of poverty” Women’s Aid Refuge Worker

3.5.1 One of the most common reasons for selecting this option was the view that it would give children in deprived areas at least one good meal per day. 17 respondents made this clear in the comments accompanying their answer. For many of these people, there was a recognition that free school meals issue is a poverty issue and that in addressing it, those areas and communities that suffer most from poverty would be first to benefit from free school meals. It was also believed that if free school meals were introduced to these areas, it would help families budget and free up more money for other essentials of life:

“Would assist in family budgets and free up money for essential items” – Branch Secretary, Glasgow City Unison

3.5.2 In addition, some respondents believed that by extending free school meals to entire regions or local authority areas, as was suggested by one, it would be a way of dealing with the important question of stigma. The view here was that if all children in an area are entitled to free school meals, poorer children and those who were better off would all be treated the same.

“If restricted, would like to see all children in schools within areas of social deprivation receive free meals, as this would reduce stigma” – Margaret Nisbet, Midlothian Voluntary Action

3.5.3 One argument that was raised by 8 of those who opposed extending free school meals on the basis of geography was the contention that it would miss out those poorer children who live in regions that are not regarded as being amongst the most deprived. It was argued that every area in Scotland has people in it who live below the poverty line therefore extending provision on this basis would lead to many poor youngsters falling through the net.

“In every area of Scotland you will always find children of all ages living in poverty. Free school meals should be provided to all children while they are still attending school” - Women’s Aid children’s worker

3.5.4 It was also argued by some including the SSTA that, far from removing stigma, such a partial extension would stigmatise whole schools and communities.

“This might target the money where its most needed, but could also be divisive or stigmatise areas or individual schools” - Morag Robertson, school teacher

3.6 Age

'The principle which underlies the provision of free school meals for primary school children also applies to secondary school children' - Allan Armstrong, teacher

3.6.1 Extension on the basis of age was the most popular response, with 219 favouring this option. The most common reason given was simply that all school children are entitled to receive, and should receive, free school meals, regardless of age. 110 people offered this argument as grounds for extending provision.

3.6.2 It was recognized by many that the health and wider benefits that would accrue to children if they had free nutritious school meals did not stop when they reached secondary school age; on the contrary it was felt by many that older schoolchildren are, if anything, in even greater need of the benefits that such a scheme would bring.

"Peer pressure at secondary is even greater than primary schools so the stigma of free school meals for 'poorer' families is even greater" – Primary Teacher

"Our older children need a good meal as well as younger children, as they have a lot more studying to do and their nutrition is as important as any other"- North Edinburgh Community Health Active Group

3.6.3 Fairness and support for the principle of universality was also a common theme in these responses. The idea that a line can be drawn between children on the grounds of the type of school that they are attending was flatly rejected by respondents here. All schoolchildren were viewed as being equally deserving of free meals for as long as they are at schools.

"All children should be entitled to free meals up until they leave education" – Lone Parent.

"The need for healthy meals and the health and wider benefits do not stop when children reach secondary school age. They should be as widely available as possible" – Sarah Morton, Parenting Across Scotland

3.6.4 Another reason given for choosing this option was that it would help to maintain good healthy eating practices in older children and that this would encourage healthier eating habits for the rest of their lives.

3.6.5 Many of the 18 advancing this argument made the point that it is often in secondary school that children's eating habits deteriorate; they tend much more than primary school children to eat fast food and neglect nutritional foods. Professor Ian Crombie, of the Public Health Department, Dundee University, pointed out, that adolescence is an ***"important age for developing healthy food patterns"***.

3.6.6 Extending the provision of free meals to all school children was seen as an invaluable means of helping to develop such patterns.

“Teenagers are tending to eat out of school buying fast foods which are not healthy. There is also peer pressure to attend certain food providers. If all children attended a canteen with healthy options, it would become the norm as in countries like Finland” - Tracy Mcleod, antenatal development worker

“Those of secondary age are at a vital stage in their physical development. Here we can promote healthy living and awareness of misleading food information” - Teacher

3.6.7 Other reasons offered here included the view that this was the most non-discriminatory way to extend the provision and the best way to deal with the question of stigma. Some of those who made these responses made the point that it was only if the provision was extended to all schoolchildren could these questions be properly addressed. Many of those critical of expansion of provision based on geography preferred age as the deciding criteria.

3.6.8 It is overwhelmingly the case that those who advocated an extension on the grounds of age believed that it should cover all schoolchildren in secondary education. Very few argued that it should be limited to pupils of a particular age in secondary education.

3.7 Pilot Schemes

“All new schemes need to be piloted and the outcome validated” - Biochemist, Inverclyde Royal Hospital

3.7.1 Almost as many people (216) indicated support for pilot schemes as supported extension on the grounds of age. Most did so without offering details as to why they were giving their support for this measure – although those that ticked all three options were more likely to state reasons. Of those who did give details the most commonly advanced arguments were that pilot schemes were:

1) the best way of gauging whether or not secondary school pupils would actually take up the offer of free and nutritious school meal.

2) the best way to evaluate the actual benefits that would accrue to children and society.

3.7.2 There was a feeling amongst some respondents that children might not always take advantage of what is offered to them, and that pilots would be a way of ensuring that any universal introduction of free school meals would not be a waste of money. Others whilst favouring pilots did query how they would measure success:

“...although it would be hard to isolate the effect of a school meal over all the other factors influencing diet outwith the school” – Chair, Young People & Food group.

3.7.3 A small number of respondents openly criticized the option of pilot schemes though they may well have only been representative of the many more who stated their opposition to any partial extension of provision. Reasons offered included the feeling that there was no need for such schemes, as the existing examples of Finland and Hull prove that the free school meals effectiveness. Others feared that the establishment of pilot schemes would simply lead to delays when action was urgently needed:

“Pilot schemes are good for research purposes, but they take too long to evaluate. Action needs to be taken now! – SSTA.

3.8 Favouring all three options and supporting the widest possible extension of free school meals provision

3.8.1 As noted earlier, 88 people ticked all three options. It is clear from the 47 who did offer comments in support of their choices that most were of the view that all school children should be entitled to free school meals, and that any positive step in that direction would be welcomed.

Unison’s comments summed up the attitude that prevailed amongst this section of the respondents.

‘UNISON Scotland supports free school meals for all children at school in Scotland. Given the defeat in the Scottish Parliament of the School Meals (Scotland) Bill, we understand the reasoning behind this proposed Bill starting out with primary school children, but giving the Scottish Executive powers to extend entitlement further. We would therefore support all of options (i) (ii) and (iii) being able to increase provision, but our preference is for all children in Scotland to also be entitled to free school meals’ - UNISON Scotland

3.9 Not in favour of partial extension on basis of age, geography or pilot schemes, but advocating free school meals for all children

“They all create their own discriminations” - Learning Assistant

3.9.1 In addition to those respondents who ticked all 3 boxes, and were in favour of the widest possible extension of the scheme, there were also a small but significant number (23) of respondents who did not tick any boxes, but made it clear in written comments that they were in favour of universal provision of free school meals.

3.9.2 These respondents believed that there was a contradiction in supporting any of the three options offered and the underlying principle of free school meals for everyone. Instead they wanted the immediate implementation of universal free school meals for all school children, and saw the other three options as a limitation on that vision.

4 Question 3: If Ministers chose to extend the entitlement, what age groups should benefit and why?

4.1 This question attempted to identify support for further extension of free school meals provision to older children at some point in the future (this would be possible if Ministers chose to exercise new powers granted by the Bill). It asked up to what age children should receive free school meals if further extension was to occur.

4.1.1 The responses ranged from all secondary school children, to age groups between 14 to 19 years old and all those in higher education. The grounds on which extension were justified by those responding were similar to those which were made in response to other questions i.e. the ending of stigma; as a means of tackling poverty and deprivation, and as a means of improving the health of all children.

4.2 All children attending state secondary schools:

“From a nutrition perspective, if we are aiming to improve children’s diets generally, we need to consider all children not just those to an arbitrary age” - NHS Lanarkshire

“Children do not become cheaper to feed when they are teenagers” – Children 1st.

4.2.1 This was by far the most popular response. 323 (62%) of those responding felt that all children in secondary schools should receive free meals if provision was extended. To this should probably be added the 20 respondents who believed that free meals should go to all aged up to 18 and the seven who believed they should go to all aged up to 19. That would make a total of 350 (67%) supporting extension up to the upper school leaving age or thereabouts. Quite a few respondents (45) gave this response in combination with support for extending provision to all children up to age 16. There is not necessarily a contradiction here. The upper school leaving age may be the first choice of these respondents and the lower age of 16 their “fall-back” position e.g. if it was felt that extension needed to occur gradually.

4.2.2 Those who gave support to this suggestion were expressing clear support for the policy of the widest possible extension of free school meals. The belief that the health of all children is equally important, and that there is no distinction to be made between the health needs of primary and secondary school children were the reasons offered by many respondents.

“To promote a healthy approach for all we would advocate all children attending school to be included in the programme” – CPHVA.

“Scotland’s poor diet affects all levels of society. The health of ALL children is important” – Midlothian Healthy Living Partnership Project.

4.2.3 For many others, like Unison (Scotland), the extension of provision to cover all secondary school children was seen as the best way of combating stigma –

“If aiming to reduce stigma, then clearly all school children should be eligible, with no age restrictions” – UNISON (Scotland).

4.2.4 A third view was that which was advanced by Glasgow Anti Racist Alliance, who argued that the maximum extension of provision was necessary as an anti-poverty measure –

“...free school meals for all could be an effective intervention useful in challenging the circle of deprivation that still blights the lives of many people in Scotland today, not just at primary, but also at secondary school” – GARA.

4.2.5 Finally a significant number thought that it would be a disincentive to staying on at school if there was only limited extension of provision to those aged below the minimum school leaving age –

“..there is a particular value in ensuring over 16’s benefit as a means of encouraging young people to study beyond school leaving age” – CPAG (Scotland).

“It could also be a financial disincentive to children staying on at school if only those up to the school leaving age of 16 are eligible” – UNISON (Scotland).

4.2.6 The Scottish Youth Parliament also believed that extending free provision to those aged up to 18 would encourage 5th and 6th years to stay on at school.

4.3 All children in state schools up to the minimum school leaving age of 16.

4.3.1 166 respondents (31%) supported extension of provision up to the minimum school leaving age of 16. Given that a further 305 supported extension up to the school leaving age then support for extending provision to at least all those aged 16 and below was running at 80% of all respondents.

4.3.2 The reasons given were usually similar to those who backed option number 3 (iii). There were a number, however, who made it clear that extended provision should go only to those aged 16 and under. One secondary school teacher advanced the view that older pupils tend to buy healthier food anyway, whilst others, like a member of the Scottish Youth Parliament stated that people aged 16 and over were adults and should take responsibility for their own diets.

4.4 Support for extending provision to secondary school children, but not immediately

“The decision should be delayed until after the pilot scheme. Ideally all children would receive a free school meal” - Hungry For Success Development Officer.

There were a small number of respondents (6) who felt that a pilot scheme would be the best way of proceeding before extending provision to older children – though they should perhaps be seen as part of the larger number giving support for this option in response to question 2.

4.5 Other Age groups:

4.5.1 Children at Nursery Schools: This response was made by 9 people. The basic arguments advanced were that the pre-primary school years are vitally important to a child's future physical development and therefore they should be included in any free school meals scheme. There may well be a stronger underlying support for extending provision to younger children than is at first apparent. Firstly the question posed in the consultation document was solely about extending provision up the age range and therefore extending provision downward may not have been seen as a valid option. Secondly a good number of those supporting free school meals for primary children stressed that tackling poor diet and establishing healthy eating habits should begin as early as possible. Further research on support for this policy should be considered.

“Children in Scotland welcomes the proposals to extend provision of free school meals to older children. We would, however, recommend that the first priority is provision of free school meals to pre-school children, as this is the most effective way of creating long-term improvement” - Children in Scotland

4.5.2 College/University students: Six respondents believed that free school meals provision should be extended to young people in further and higher education. The point made here was that many students at FE Colleges and Universities, particularly the former, are often the same age, or younger than some school children. Extension to these groups is also the official policy of the Scottish Youth Parliament.

“I think this bill should be extended to cover tertiary level (college, university) students” - Classroom Assistant.

4.5.6 Younger than sixteen: Whilst the overwhelming majority believed that the provision should be extended to all school children, there was a very small number who stated that it should be limited to various under-16 age levels. These ranged from 12 years old, to 15 years old. The most common response, with 9 people making it, was that the age limit should be 14. The viewpoint expressed here was that children are ‘more or less’ adults and should be allowed to choose what they wish to eat.

4.6 Other responses

These included advocating that provision should be extended to the children of asylum seekers (3) (in fact they already receive them though there is no legal requirement to provide them), children in private schools (2) and children attending special schools (5).

5 Question 4: At the time of the *Hungry For Success* report, Scottish Ministers introduced measures to eliminate children experiencing stigma when they took free school meals. In your personal or professional experience do you believe that stigma still exists for those claiming free school meals? If yes, how can stigma be eliminated?

5.1 Question 4 dealt with the question of stigma. Of the organisations which responded **94 (85%** of those which answered the question) believed that stigma still exists. Only **16** organisations (**14.5%** of those answering) believed that stigma has been eliminated due to the measures taken after “Hungry for Success”. The response of individuals was very similar with **299 (84%** of those who answered the question) believing that stigma had not been eliminated compared to **58 (16%)** who believed that it had. In total 393 organisations and individuals (**84%**) believed that stigma still existed as opposed to 74 (**16%**) who believed that it had been eliminated.

5.2 Most respondents believed that the continuing stigma attached to the receipt of free school meals has an adverse effect on take-up resulting in children either (i) going without a proper meal or (ii) increasing the expenditure of already hard-pressed households. Consequently the question looked at ways in which this stigma might be removed altogether.

5.3 The responses to this question can be placed in three main categories: (i) those who believe that it is means-testing itself which is the major factor behind the continuing problem of stigma; (ii) those who consider the present system needs to be altered to make it less apparent which children are in receipt of free school meals & (iii) those who consider that the answer to continuing stigma lies in education to change attitudes.

5.4 Suggestion (1) Free healthy school meals for everyone

“During consultation with young people Children in Scotland found that as the system currently stands stigma is attached to free school meals...entitling all children and young people to free school meals would erase the stigma associated with them and encourage uptake” - Children in Scotland

“Stigma may be one reason (explaining low take-up) but there could also be...other reasons such as families not being aware of their entitlement or not knowing how to apply. Providing universal free school meals would be the best way of addressing all these issues”- Save the Children.

“I doubt if this will be fully eliminated unless this provision was available to all pupils...” – Scottish Secondary Teachers Association.

“No different coloured tickets. No tickets at all.” – Retired Nurse.

5.4.1 By far the most popular response was that stigma would be eliminated by providing free meals to all school children with **325** individuals and organisations (>**70%** of those responding to this question) suggesting this.

5.4.2 These respondents identified the system based on means testing as the main cause of stigma, and rejected the view that it could be altered to the point where stigma would disappear. The argument advanced was that if every child was given a free school meal, then the stigma attached to means-testing would be eliminated. Many teachers, health professionals, parents and others testified to the ongoing pain and harm caused by stigma:

“Only by the provision of free healthy school meals as an option for all children, rather than the daily/weekly humiliation of children judged by their parents’ income” - Community Volunteer.

“The stigma affecting young people under the current system has a major effect on their experience of the education system and subsequently their educational achievements”- Lecturer.

“If they were free for all there would be less stigma – people get their social status mocked even at primary schools” – Civil Servant.

“Children can be very cruel and do tease the children getting free meals with words such as “Tramp”, “Loser”... – One Plus Area Manager.

5.4.3 Other respondents with experience of the swipe-card system, including UNISON (Scotland), argued that it simply does not work, because children can often tell who is on free school meals by the choices they make in the dining hall:

“There is no foolproof way of concealing who is entitled to a free meal....Many who are entitled do not take up this right, further disadvantaging their families. Providing a free meal for all pupils would overcome the problem” - Retired head teacher.

“Electronic cards are not an effective way to reduce stigma as children still know who are getting school meals by what the person takes in the dinner hall...” – Katy Mulholland, TGWU Branch

“Lots of schools have introduced systems to overcome this problem – to what cost and has it had any effect? This cost could have been put towards free school meals to all” – Health Promotion Specialist.

“The child in receipt of a free meal has to carefully plan what they can afford to buy in order to avoid possible embarrassment and humiliation at the till point” – Chair, Young People and Food Group, East Lothian Council.

5.4.4 In addition organisations such as The Professional Association of Teachers and individuals working within the education system suggested that evidence already exists which demonstrates that universal provision eliminates stigma and increases take-up:

“If every child is having a school meal the stigma disappears. The Fruit + Initiative was widely and positively recognised and accepted” – Professional Association of Teachers.

“...recent evaluation of the free fruit initiative in East Lothian shows that...the amount of fruit children are eating, both in school and at home has increased. Universal provision removes barriers of affordability, availability and accessibility”- Development Officer, Food & Health, East Lothian Council.

5.5 Suggestion (2) Extend cashless or more discreet payment systems with no separate ticketing

“The use of cashless catering through credit style cards has been successful” – Director of Education, Midlothian Council.

5.5.1 Advocated by a total of 63 people (13% of those answering this question), this was the second most popular suggestion and was premised on the view that more discreet payment systems such as swipe cards or cashless payment offer an effective means of blurring the distinction between those who receive and do not receive free school meals.

5.5.2 However many of these respondents recognized that the present scope of cashless systems was limited and concluded that they would need to be extended throughout Scotland, if the stigma associated with free school meals uptake was to be challenged.

“Cashless catering systems are already implemented in all of Stirling’s secondary schools and some of the larger primary schools. Further roll-out of the programme has been hampered by financial constraints. Additional funding to local authorities...would be welcomed” - Stirling Council Children’s Services

5.5.3 Within the group advocating more discreet payment systems a large proportion (just over half) suggested that currently used systems still allow for easy identification of those receiving free school meals with separate meal ticketing collection, different coloured tickets, separate dinner queuing and other distinguishing arrangements still in place in many schools despite the recommendations of “Hungry for Success”.

“My son collects lunch tickets from the office during school time. His classmates purchase theirs from a special set-up desk before 9 am...a few make comments about us being low income/single parent and it is a concern that as they get older, this will get worse” – Lone parent

5.5.4 Parents, teachers and others were clearly of the view that the payment system for school meals should be far more sensitive to the needs of children who qualify for free meals. The conclusion to be drawn is that, regardless of whether free school meal provision is extended, further steps must be taken to ensure that children receiving free school meals are not easily identified.

5.6 Suggestion (3) An increase in the monetary allowance for a free school meal.

“... the more advantaged children have a flexibility of provision in comparison to those who are entitled to free school meals. The more advantaged children can go home, or to the local shops or have a two course meal. They can supplement their basic meal with additionality, whereas the less advantaged can only have their basic entitlement’, Head of Education Services, East Renfrewshire Council.

“The allowance is either too small or the costs are too high. I suspect the former. The differences between Primary 1 and Primary 7 appetites are not acknowledged... Parents have to supplement the allowance in order that children don’t go hungry....Children can see who gets extra money for lunch” – Denise Morton.

5.6.1 Fifteen of those responding made this suggestion. Several argued that because the monetary allowance for a free school meal is inadequate, it is possible to pick out children on free school meals, even if cashless or swipe card systems are in place. It was noted how children who are in receipt of free school meals often have to calculate and carefully plan what they can and cannot afford, in order to avoid embarrassment at the till point.

5.6.2 This suggestion stands as a counterpoint to that of those advocating a simple rolling out of the swipe card system as it acknowledges that the current level of support is too low to avoid identification of free school meal recipients and subsequent stigma.

5.7 Suggestion (4) Educate children and staff in order to tackle discriminatory attitudes

5.7.1 Thirty people answered in this fashion. The emphasis here was not on hiding the fact that some students are in receipt of free school meals, but on promoting a greater understanding of issues such as discrimination, and, through this process of education, opposing the stigmatization of those who take free school meals. Respondents suggested that catering staff and teachers should be better trained and more understanding of the pain and harm caused by stigma.

5.7.2 Other suggestions, made by a very small number of respondents, included a demand to make poverty history, compulsory school lunches, and the education of parents.

6 Question 5: Do you think that the advertising of junk food and fizzy/sugary drinks in schools should be regulated and effectively banned?

“It should be totally banned. Our children’s health should not be harmed to allow companies selling junk food to make a profit” – Nurse

6.1 Of those organisations responding to this question 96% (107) agreed with effectively banning the promotion of junk food in schools whilst 2% (2) organisations disagreed and a further 2% (2) were unsure. Amongst individuals support was almost as strong with 93% (344) favouring a ban compared to 6% (27) in opposition with just 3 (>1%) unsure about the measure. In total 93% (451) of those responding to the question supported the adoption of a ban on advertising, 6% (29) were opposed and 1% (5) were unsure.

6.2 Though there was no space provided within the consultation document to comment on this measure nevertheless a fair number of respondents, particularly organisations, provided additional comments in support of an advertising ban. There was particularly strong support for an outright ban from Dumfries & Galloway Health Promoting Schools Group and others involved in promoting healthier eating within schools:

“The issue is one of keen debate in East Lothian. Schools should not have to rely on profits from the vending machines to buy books for the library” – Chair, Young People & Food Group, East Lothian Council

“There was support, however, for restrictions on the promotion of unhealthier options in school settings and incentives to support the introduction of healthier vending choices. This is a policy that Stirling Council already adopts...” – Stirling Council Children’s Services

6.3 Support for a ban was also strong amongst children’s organisations and health professionals:

“...healthier choices should be presented and marketed to pupils more effectively to encourage healthier eating and help to prevent dental decay”- Children in Scotland

“It is unacceptable that the manufacturers of such products are able to advertise in schools. Recent research ...clearly showed that food promotion influences children’s food preferences...Regulation should be extended to preclude any sponsorship from such manufacturers for other purposes e.g. purchasing of books, computers, sporting equipment or school events/trips” – NHS Lanarkshire

“The health education and promotion work being carried out by our membership is constantly compromised and challenged by the power of the “junk food and fizzy/sugary drinks” lobby. Therefore any moves to restrict this influence would be welcomed. However the issue of what children eat and the dietary influences they are exposed to outwith the school environment also needs to be adequately addressed” – Community Practitioners and Health Visitors Association.

6.4 Of those who opposed the measure the most common comment was that choice needed to be preserved though some opponents remained critical of the choices currently on offer:

“You can’t go down the road of banning things!! – Instead education and bring in healthy vending machines. It’s to do with choice and that only consists of junk food in schools as there is no alternative” – IT professional

6.5 Of those who were unsure about a ban the charity Save the Children cogently argued for the need to involve children themselves in determining what foods were sold in schools:

“Save the Children agrees that action needs to be taken in order to support children and young people to make healthier choices about what they eat. Further consideration needs to be given to the best way of achieving this and...children and young people should be actively involved in those discussions” – Save the Children.

7 Question 6: Do you think that vending machines dispensing unhealthy foods should be regulated and effectively banned from school premises?

“All foods being dispensed in school premises need to meet statutory nutritional standards, regardless of whether it is available through vending machines or in cafeterias. It is important that the setting of nutritional standards applies to all foodstuffs available for purchase in schools” – The Poverty Alliance

7.1 Support for an outright ban on vending machines dispensing junk food was very strong amongst those responding to this question with 92% (98) of organisations supporting such a move compared to 8% (9) opposing it. Support for a ban was only slightly lower amongst individual respondents with 90% (337) supporting a ban and 10% (39) opposed to one. In total 90% of those responding to this question favoured a ban whilst 10% opposed one.

7.2 There was also strong support for a ban from young people themselves, in particular from members of the Scottish Youth Parliament. Several of those supportive of a ban pointed out that it is not vending machines themselves but their contents which are the real problem:

“It should not be necessary to remove all vending machines in schools if they are stocked with healthy foods. North Lanarkshire Council, e.g. have in place an action plan to remove carbonated drinks from school vending machines and to de-brand all machines. Vending machines containing only carbonated drinks and confectionary items should not be permitted in any public sector premises, including leisure centres and NHS premises. If we are to restrict access to “junk” food ...suitable alternatives must be provided” – NHS Lanarkshire

“Vending machines have a function in helping to reduce queuing and it is entirely possible to stock them with a range of more nutritious products” – Chair, Young People & Food Group, East Lothian Council

7.3 Others pointed out that a ban would not be wholly effective if pupils left school to purchase unhealthy options. Several suggested prohibiting “chip & burger vans” from the vicinity of schools as a partial solution to this problem:

“UNISON would extend such a ban to cover the sale of unhealthy food and drinks by school premises, for example a mobile chip van/burger bar” – UNISON, (Scotland)

“100% ban should not be imposed if the consequence of this is for young people to go off campus to nearby mobile vans to purchase confectionary and sugary foods.Vans parked outside a school campus pose a real conflict of interest for school management teams and the council within the principles of Hungry for SuccessThis issue needs to be addressed nationally by the Scottish Executive” – Chair Health Promoting Schools Group, Dumfries & Galloway Council

7.4 Several of those who stopped short of supporting an outright ban still called for much stronger regulation of vending machines and other sources of junk food within schools:

“They should be regulated but not banned. Vending machines should be subject to the same criteria as applied to meal provision” – Acting Director for Health Promotion, Greater Glasgow NHS

7.5 Others who opposed a ban again stressed that children had to be fully involved in the process of change and feared that forbidding the sale of junk food might simply make it more appealing to teenagers:

“A straight forward ban on unhealthy foods may not be the best way forward and could potentially be counterproductive...” – Save the Children

“Removal of “unhealthy” foods without any support for initiatives to encourage healthy choices may result in children and young people voting with their feet and finding their “junk food” elsewhere” – Stirling Council Children’s Services

8 Question 7: The Bill will require Scottish Ministers to set nutritional standards for school meals. Which existing standards do you think they should be based on?

8.1 This question was included to try to establish whether there was strong support for any existing independently set nutritional standards. A fair proportion of respondents (just over 20%) stated that they did not know about the different standards or failed to give any response. Less than 1% (3) of responses stated their opposition to putting the nutritional standards of school meals on a statutory basis.

8.2 Food Standards Agency: The strongest support was for the adoption of nutritional standards set by the Food Standards Agency with almost 40% (202) of all respondents backing this option. Support was highest amongst individual respondents with 42% backing the FSA’s standards. In addition the Food Standard Agency was the most popular choice of organisations with 30% favoring the adoption of their standards.

8.3 Caroline Walker Trust: Though less popular than the FSA’s standards those of the Caroline Walker Trust still attracted significant support with around 20% (105) of all respondents favoring them. A further 10 respondents (2%) favoured the nutritional standards set by the Executive in the aftermath of Hungry for Success which are based on those of the Caroline Walker Trust. However some respondents felt that more needed to be done to ensure that current guidelines were given statutory status and enforced.

“The Scottish Nutrient Standards set out in “Hungry for Success” are based on the Caroline Walker Trust Guidelines, therefore it should not be necessary to develop new standards. The Scottish Nutrient Standards should be put before Parliament and made statutory if there is concern regarding implementation by some local authorities” – NHS Lanarkshire

“Scottish Nutrients Standards for school lunches are based on Caroline Walker Trust recommendations. It is not that the recommendations are incorrect, it is that they are not being met in schools. There needs, therefore, to be a quality assurance programme to ensure that the standards set by the Caroline Walker Trust are adhered to.” – Head of Education Services, East Renfrewshire Council

8.4 **Other sets of standards:** There was no strong challenger to the Food Standards Agency and Caroline Walker Trust from the others that were suggested. Around 4% (20) of respondents stated that it really did not matter what set of standards were adopted just so long as they were healthy and adhered to. Their views were summed up by one respondent -

“School meals should be healthy, well balanced, low in fat and sugar, without artificial ingredients, and made from scratch on the school premises, preferably from local ingredients. And tasty!” – Lesley King.

8.4.1 A fair number of respondents also made comments opposing the use of processed foods and supporting the use of fresh local ingredients. This included 4% (21) who favoured using the standards set by the Soil Association and promoted by Jamie Oliver in his television series on school dinners.

“It would be useful if the Soil Association’s recommendation that food should be fresh and local were to be followed in order to maximise nutrition value and to encourage children to understand and make best use of fresh food. It would also play an educational function in aiding understanding of where food comes from, how it is produced etc.” – Maggie Mellon, Children 1st.

8.4.2 Relatively small numbers of respondents (<1%) favoured adopting the Dept of Health’s Nutritional Standards or to design new standards after seeking the advice of health professionals (<1%). Some respondents emphasized that whatever standards were set should be evidenced based (1%) and independent of government (2%) - though both these criteria would of course be met by the Caroline Walker Trust and Food Standards Agency.

8.4.3 Unison (Scotland) made very useful suggestions on reviewing the standards eventually set and on providing information to pupils and parents Whilst the CPHVA suggested that the best course of action would be to build on what has already been done and utilize all the expertise available for the benefit of children -

“... we would stress that the standards should be reviewed regularly in consultation with education authorities, health boards, school boards, trade unions representing educational & support staff, as well as school pupils, to ensure their voice is heard in considering what is nutritious and likely to appeal to pupils. Information on nutritional content should be provided to pupils and parents” – UNISON(Scotland)
“Caroline Walker Trust, Food Standards Agency and the Scottish Diet and Nutrition

Strategy have all produced positive work and guidance. It would perhaps be most appropriate to utilise all of this expertise and advice to the benefit of Scottish children” –CPHVA

9 Question 8: Who do you think should be ultimately responsible for dealing with complaints about the nutritional quality of school meals?

9.1 This question was included to try to establish who respondents thought should investigate complaints that nutritional standards were not being met. The key words were “ultimately responsible” as the Schools Inspectorate, local authorities and individual schools all currently have a role in overseeing the implementation of recommendations made in Hungry for Success. Around 2-3% of respondents were unable to decide or left all options blank.

9.2 Local Authorities: One hundred and ninety-four respondents (38% of those expressing a preference) supported giving the ultimate responsibility for dealing with complaints to local authorities. This was the most favoured option with several respondents pointing out that local authorities were best placed to carry out this work

“They could monitor what is being served at schools on a more regular basis” – WAGRAG

9.2.1 Others pointed out that local authorities, as purchasers, should be including nutritional standards as contractual obligations placed on private companies providing meals to schools:

“If local authorities are the purchasers of school meals provision; nutritional quality has to be part of the Service Level Agreement...”- NHS Dumfries & Galloway

9.2.2 However reservations about local authorities’ ability to independently investigate complaints against themselves were expressed, even by those working within councils, and several mechanisms were suggested to overcome this difficulty:

“Officers appointed by the local authority with experience in diets, catering etc. but NOT part of schools’ catering service” – retired Headteacher

“There would have to be a system set up so that the Education Department was dealing with Environmental Health in relation to complaints about the nutritional quality of school meals. In other words there would have to be a referral system outwith the Education Department” – East Renfrewshire Council

9.3 Individual Schools: Only around 12% (61) of respondents thought that individual schools should be ultimately responsible for dealing with complaints though many more thought that they

should play a role in the process. Of those who clearly favoured schools being ultimately responsible several made comments on devolving power down to a local level:

“Each school should have responsibility, keep the catering small and individual” - Church minister.

“This I see as part of a policy towards empowering people” – Classroom Assistant.

9.4 Schools Inspectorate: Although marginally less popular than local authorities the Schools Inspectorate still attracted considerable support with nearly **34%** (169) of respondents who expressed a preference favouring this option. Around 9% (46) of respondents thought that some combination of individual schools, local authorities and the Schools Inspectorate should deal with complaints with the Inspectorate being the final arbiter:

“...school first, then local authority, then schools inspectorate” – Lecturer

“Combination of 1, 2 and 3 via a staged complaints procedure” – RMT

“With emphasis on the adjective “ultimately” the Schools Inspectorate should be responsible for dealing with complaints about the nutritional quality of school meals”
– Scottish Local Government Forum Against Poverty

9.4.1 Amongst those supporting this option several saw it as a logical development of the Inspectorate’s current role:

“Quality of school meals affects children’s educational performance – HMI should look at schools holistically and include these issues” – Lecturer.

“Meals should be inspected in the same way as all other aspects of the school are” – Teacher

“School meals should be included in inspection criteria, both at local authority and HMI level” - Parenting Across Scotland.

9.5 Other suggestions: No other suggestions received a great deal of support though around 4% (21) respondents believed that none of the suggested agencies were suitable and wanted an agency or individual more independent of local or national government to be given responsibility:

“...as local authorities cannot legally enforce against themselves and health authorities have existing knowledge and expertise” – NHS Ayrshire & Arran

“Should be an independent body which is neutral, local authorities perhaps in first place but there should be the power to appeal to someone not responsible for the financing of the service” – Katy Mulholland

“It would be desirable to have an independent body monitoring and evaluating the quality of food in schools e.g. complaint – schools – local authorities – independent body. The Schools Inspectorate should include an evaluation of school meal provision in individual schools” – SSTA

9.5.1 Just under 4% (19) believed that the Scottish Executive or individual ministers should have responsibility for dealing with complaints with one or two believing that the Prime Minister himself should be involved. Of course in a strict legal sense Executive Ministers would be “ultimately responsible”. However the question had been aimed more at estimating public support for a particular agency to become the investigatory body that parents or pupils could approach rather than identifying who should be politically accountable when things went wrong.

9.5.2 Just over **2%** of respondents believed that parents and/or pupils should deal with complaints though even some of those supporting this option acknowledged that the lack of technical expertise would have to be addressed though training or external support:

“The pupils (with guidance)” – Network Manager

9.5.3 Around 1% of respondents saw a role for the Children’s Commissioner with a similar number believing that the school meals service provider should be “ultimately responsible” – though again, as with Executive Ministers, this phrase may have been understood as ‘held accountable’.

“...(whoever we contract out to) as they ultimately effect and determine the quality/nutritional value of these meals” – Teacher.

10 Q 9: How would you encourage children to eat healthier food?

10.1 Question 9 dealt with the ways and means that children could be encouraged to eat healthier food. There were over 30 separate suggestions made. These can be placed into two separate categories; actions which are restrictive or prohibitive, and actions which are positive. The prohibitive or restrictive actions will be considered first.

10.2 Suggestion (1) Remove unhealthy food from school meals menus:

“We believe that schools should remove junk food and fizzy drinks from menus, on the grounds that children and young people already have many opportunities to indulge in unhealthy eating and schools should

not add to that existing choice” -. Barnardos Scotland.

“Key to offering good choices is to ensure that unhealthy choices are not available within the school environment, whether in vending machines, the cafeteria or by school premises” - Matt Smith, UNISON

10.2.1 The call to remove low quality foods from school meals menus was made by 68 respondents and was one of the most popular suggestions as to how to encourage children to eat more healthily. Most of those making the case for this measure took the view that schools simply should not be promoting junk food.

10.2.2 It was argued that children could be distracted by the existence of junk foods on school meals menus, and that the best way to prevent this from happening was to simply remove them altogether. The logic of the argument is that only healthy foods should be on school meals menus. This case was made strongly by several teachers, health professionals, parents and by young people themselves –

“Eliminate poor quality foods from school meals” - Nurse

“The only choices on offer at school should be between healthy alternatives” -Teacher‘

“Stop offering junk food along with the healthier options” – North Edinburgh Community Health Action Group

“Get rid of unhealthy food options” – Member Scottish Youth Parliament

10.3 Suggestion (2) Reduce prices of healthy food

‘It is ridiculous how more expensive it is to buy a pasta salad over a pizza supper’
- Angela Reid, ITPRO-GCU

10.3.1 This was a response made by 24 of those questioned. Inherent within this viewpoint is the proposition that issues such as obesity and ill-nourishment within Scottish society are poverty issues as much as they are health issues. It was pointed out that healthy food is often more expensive than unhealthy food, and many of those living in poverty in Scotland have no choice but to eat unhealthily. Some respondents argued that many people living in poverty are aware of what is and is not healthy food; the problem they face is that they simply cannot afford to buy healthily.

‘Take steps to reduce prices and increase availability of fruit and veg in areas where it is hard to get fruit and veg at reasonable prices’ - Residential Childcare Worker

10.3.2 A related response came from those who identified the need to address poverty as a key element in improving children’s diet. Measures such as increasing state benefits, to ensure that all

families can afford good quality food, and a redistribution of wealth, were advocated by six respondents. Their suggestions were similar to those which advocated reducing the price of healthy food, as they were based on the analysis that it is poverty which is the major factor in the perpetuation of bad diet and consequent ill-health in Scottish society.

10.4 Ban advertising of junk food

“Withdraw advertising for junk food as a first step” - Dr Gerald McCartney

“Close McDonalds” - Women’s Refuge Worker

10.4.1 This was a suggestion made by 19 respondents. The considerable power of those companies, like MacDonalDs, which are seen as promoters of junk foods, was recognised by these respondents as a major contributor to young people adopting unhealthy diets. Some of those responding were more specific, in that they advocated a ban of advertising that is directed towards children. This would mean a ban on such advertising during children’s television programmes, etc, as opposed to a blanket ban. The majority of those supporting this measure, however, did not discriminate in this fashion and are of the view that all junk food advertising should be banned.

“Ban advertising of unhealthy food directed at children—kids TV etc.” – Additional Needs Teacher

10.4.2 These were the main prohibitive suggestions made in answer to this question. Other suggestions included the banning of vending machines from school premises (6 responses) and the banning of burger vans from outside schools (7 responses).

10.5 Positive action - There were several suggestions as to the type of positive action that could be undertaken to encourage healthier eating habits in children. In the main, these fell into one of three categories: action from government, action from the schools, and action from parents themselves. The categories were not always mutually exclusive.

10.5.1 Education: Educational programmes were identified by some 143 respondents as the best means of encouraging healthy eating habits in children. Within this broad category, two separate types of educational programme were suggested: Those which are targeted at schoolchildren, and which take place in the classroom, and those which are aimed at society as a whole.

10.5.2 Education: In the classroom - 86 respondents, perhaps unsurprisingly, thought that school was the best place to begin educating children about a healthy diet. The type of programmes and

approaches varied. The importance of using an educational approach from as early an age as possible was strongly advocated by several teachers and health professionals.

“Starting cooking/health lessons from P1, including food education and healthy food preparation” - Sarah McAllister, Edinburgh University Public Health Sciences programme administrator

10.5.3 .Another suggestion was for a national course for S1 pupils to ensure that they have knowledge of the need for a balanced diet and the importance of correct food choices. A related suggestion, made by the Scottish Secondary Teachers' Association, was for the teaching of food studies courses across the curriculum. One further option, advocated by a Home Economics Principal teacher, was for every schoolchild in Scotland to take a 'Healthy Eating Option' course. An underlying and sometimes overt criticism of the current situation was that if policy makers want to see a real improvement in children's diets they will have to ensure that education on diet and health is given greater priority and resources:

“Highlight the importance of food and health in the curriculum. As things stand it makes up only a tiny percentage of the curriculum’ - Marjorie Shepherd, Development Officer, Food and Health, East Lothian Council.

10.5.4 Of course the inclusion of such subjects into the national curriculum is a task that only the Scottish Executive could oversee. In addition to this type of approach, was the support given to building on ongoing initiatives such as *Hungry For Success* (8 respondents, including NHS Ayrshire & Arran's Public Health Department) and that of *Health Promoting Schools*. Most respondents were of the view that the classroom was the best place to begin the nutritional education of young people though several acknowledged that change would also have to take place in wider society.

“Children will try and eventually eat healthier food when encouraged by the joint influence of teachers, friends and parents. The school environment is an excellent place for healthy eating to start and thus be maintained” - Davina McNeill, Civil Servant

10.5.5 A related response, made by 13 people, was that school children should be shown the effects that junk foods can have on their bodies and their health in general. It was felt by some of those who argued this that the best place for this to be done was in the schools themselves. As such, this category of response fits in to the broader one of education in the classrooms.

10.6 Involving children in the selection and preparation of school meals

“If children are involved in food preparation and cooking, they are more willing to

consume new foods and enjoy the experience” - Ruth Campbell, Public Health Nutritionist on behalf of NHS Lanarkshire

10.6.1 Very much related to education on healthier eating was the suggestion that children be fully involved in the process of changing the content of school meals. 34 respondents made this suggestion. It was seen by many as one of the best ways that children could learn about food and nutrition, and discover for themselves which of the healthy options they most preferred to eat.

10.6.2 Learning through doing was another central theme for those who made this argument. The nature of the involvement envisaged included participation in menu selection, the cooking and preparation of foods, and taster sessions, where new, healthy options could be introduced. Most importantly by giving some ownership over the educational process to children it was hoped that this would deepen their commitment to healthy eating in the future.

10.7 Education: Throughout society as a whole

“Hard hitting promotional events slickly presented to promote the benefits of a healthy diet to counter the business orientated media promotions of unhealthy options” – the Scottish Executive of the Professional Teachers’ Association, Scotland

“TV programmes, kids magazines, well-known celebs endorsing healthier lifestyles” - Susan Lindsay, school nurse

10.7.1 Fifty-seven respondents offered support for this type of approach. Many acknowledged that for a healthier eating message to get across a wide ranging campaign would be needed which engaged with children both inside and outside school.

10.7.2 However the precise means varied. For some, the role of ‘celebrities’, such as TV chef, Jamie Oliver, was key. Oliver’s recent TV series on school meals has clearly had a significant impact on public consciousness as a whole on the question of healthy eating, and a similar campaign was advocated by many as a means of encouraging young people to eat more healthily.

“More programmes such as Jamie Oliver’s, lots of education at all levels and a ban on food industry propaganda” - John Rooney, classroom assistant

10.7.3 Better marketing of healthy foods, using more advanced marketing techniques was another suggestion made.

10.7.4 A co-ordinated, multi-agency response, involving input from PTAs, local authorities, and government agencies, taking the form of seminars, briefings, and advertising campaigns, was also seen as a way of achieving a change in attitudes towards healthy eating.

10.8 Free healthy school meals for all children

“By providing free, nutritious school meals for all schoolchildren” - Local Govt. Officer

10.8.1 Fifty-eight people chose to re-iterate that the provision of free healthy school meals was the key to encouraging young people to eat healthily. For some, this was combined with support for education programmes, and with the removal of unhealthy options from school menus. The view of many was that if offered such a choice, most schoolchildren would take up the offer of a free school meal and that that this would help in the process of creating a society more conscious about the importance of healthy eating.

“If all children were able to have free lunches, they would accept it eventually and eat the choices they were offered” - Children & Family Support Worker Stepping Stones for Young Parents

10.8.2 Other related suggestions included that the Executive fund the building of adequate kitchen facilities for all schools, and for a greater state regulation of the food industry, to cut down at source the inclusion of unhealthy ingredients such as excess salt and sugar etc.

10.9 Positive action from the schools: In addition to positive action from the government, on a strategic basis, it was felt that schools themselves could do much to improve the health consciousness of their pupils. The main suggestions here were: better and more innovative preparation of school meals; rewarding children who eat healthily and giving children a variety of healthy foods to choose from.

10.10 Better preparation of meals to make them more interesting to children

“Present fruit and vegetables in a more exciting way, e.g. as they do in France—colourful arrays of tasty salad dishes...cherry tomatoes in herbs...baking potatoes with delicious fillings...spicy rice etc, less processed foods and more vegetarian dishes, recipes from Jamie Oliver’s cookbooks” - Community Dietician

10.10.1 It was felt by many of the 41 who argued this that there had to be more of an effort by schools to make healthy meals more appetising. There was a perception that healthy food is often seen as dull and unimaginative, and consequently less likely to attract the attention of children than the unhealthy alternatives. The view was that good quality food, if cooked and presented in a creative fashion can and will be seen as an attractive option by schoolchildren.

10.10.2 Of course though this change could be affected at school level it would almost certainly require greater resourcing by the Executive and local authorities to allow for the training of

“dinner ladies” to a higher skill level, the extra preparation time involved and the higher quality of ingredients.

10.10.3 A further suggestion made in this direction was that schools should provide a healthy and sociable eating environment. There were 8 responses arguing for this. It was felt by these respondents that many dining areas in schools were uninviting places, too large, and too busy, and, as such off-putting to many pupils. By way of contrast, it was suggested that smaller dining rooms should be encouraged, with attractive décor, and where the teachers themselves would sit with the pupils and help to build a more sociable and pleasant atmosphere.

10.11 Rewards for children who eat healthily

“Points which children can collect by eating health food and trade these in for rewards such as cinema tickets” Alan Thompson, Dialogue Youth

10.11.1 The idea that schools should introduce this type of incentive for young people was made by 25 respondents. Interestingly, the overwhelming majority of these respondents were young people themselves, and members of such bodies as the Scottish Youth Parliament, and various other youth councils and organisations. In addition to rewards such as cinema tickets, other suggested prizes included free trips to leisure centres, and swimming pools. Such a scheme is currently being piloted in Glasgow and obviously has the support of the young people who responded to this consultation.

10.12 Positive action from parents:

“Our group were particularly enthusiastic about the early and continuing involvement of parents in this whole matter of nutrition and young people. Developing parenting skills, awareness raising around the impact of poor nutrition should be a priority of any campaign”, David Mackie (Chair, Health Promoting Schools Steering Group, Dumfries & Galloway)

10.12.1 It was felt by a significant number of respondents, 63 in all, that parents had an important role to play in the promotion of healthy eating habits amongst children. For some respondents, the view was that the home is the best place for developing such habits and that parents have a prime responsibility to ensure that this happens.

10.12.2 Many others, however, felt, that whilst the parents were indeed important to this, they themselves could not be expected to do it on their own; instead parents themselves would need to be educated and brought into a much wider educational process.

10.12.3 Some argued that parents should be involved in any multi-agency approach, and that they should be able to enrol in healthy eating classes, perhaps at local colleges or the Open University, or be educated through involvement in community group activities.

“Children In Scotland welcomes the proposals for statutory nutritional standards for Schoolsbut suggests that education and guidance for parents and children and young people themselves is essential to successfully developing healthy eating” – Children in Scotland

10.12.4 In many respects, this type of response crosses over with those who see the Scottish Executive as having prime responsibility in helping to build a healthy food eating culture in Scotland. It is clear that these type of educational programmes and initiatives could only be established if the Executive implements them and grants them sufficient funding etc.

10.12.5 These were the main responses to question 9. Other suggestions included the employment of school dieticians, limiting the availability of junk food, and encouraging the buying of healthy produce.

11 Conclusion

11.1 There was a very good response to the consultation with huge support for the main policies of the proposed bill as contained in the draft proposal i.e. –

11.2 Free School Meals: 96% of respondents supported extending Free School Meal provision to all children in state primary schools.

11.3 Ministerial Powers to further extend provision: 80% of respondents supported Ministers extending free school meal provision to secondary pupils aged 16 and under.

11.4 Stigma: 85% of respondents believed that, despite the reforms brought about by through “Hungry for Success”, stigma continues to adversely effect children and needs to be addressed.

11.5 Ban on junk food advertising: 93% of respondents believed that the advertising of junk food and fizzy/sugary drinks in schools should be regulated and effectively banned.

11.6 Ban on vending machines: 90% of respondents supported the regulation and effective banning of vending machines dispensing unhealthy foods from school premises.

11.7 Support for statutory nutritional standards: 40% of respondents wanted to see the adoption of the Food Standard Agency's nutritional standards as a set of minimum statutory standards to which school meals should conform with a further 20% supporting the adoption of the Caroline Walker Trust's standards. Opposition to statutory standards was minimal (less than 1%).

11.8 Complaints system: There was strong support for local authorities (38%) and/or the Schools Inspectorate (34%) to be involved in investigating complaints from parents and pupils about the quality of school meals.

11.9 Suggestions on how to get children to eat healthier food: A number of very innovative suggestions were made as to how to get children to choose a healthier diet. These included:

- (1) Removing unhealthy food from school meals menus:
- (2) Reducing the price of healthy food
- (3) Banning the advertisement of junk food
- (4) Education of children and wider society in healthy eating
- (5) Involving children in the selection and preparation of school meals
- (6) Introducing free healthy school meals for all children
- (7) Positive support for healthy eating by children from schools themselves
- (8) Better preparation of school meals to make them more interesting to children
- (9) Rewards for children who eat healthily
- (10) Positive support from parents.

11.10 Many responses received have contained criticisms of existing school meals provision and suggestions on how to improve it will be of interest to policy makers. All responses will help shape the final form of the Free School Meals (Scotland) Bill when it is finally introduced.

Breakdown of Group/Organisation Responses

Schools:	12
School Boards:	5
Teaching Unions/Professional Bodies:	3
National Parent/Teacher Bodies:	2
Children/Young People's Organisations:	14
Families/Childcare Groups:	7
NHS Boards/Agencies:	8
Community Health/Care Organisations:	10
Professional Bodies (Health)	3
Community organisations/Voluntary Agencies:	16
Councils/Local Authority Departments:	10
Councilors:	4
Parents' Organisations:	2
Lone Parents' Organisations:	3
Women's Organisations:	6
STUC/Trade Unions:	6
National Anti-Poverty Organisations:	5
Black/Minority Ethnic Organisations:	3
Universities/Academic Institutions:	2
Faith organisations:	2
Political parties:	2
Others:	3

Organisation

Support for Main Proposal

Cllr. Jim Towers (SNP), Aberdeenshire Council	Yes
Association for Public Service Excellence	No
Association of Head Teachers in Scotland	Yes
Barnardo's Scotland	No
Bellsbank Women's Project	Yes
Black Community Development Project	Yes
Bonnington School Board	Yes
Bonnyrigg Primary School	Yes
Braidburn School Board	Yes
The Butterfly Trust	Yes
Carleith Primary	No
Child Poverty Action Group (Scotland)	Yes
Childcare @ Home	Yes
Children 1 ST	Yes
Children in Scotland	Yes
Church of Scotland Guild	Yes
Church of Scotland, Church and Society Council	Yes
Clydebank Asbestos Group	Yes
Comely Bank Childminding Group	Yes
Community Practitioners & Health Visitors' Association (CPHVA)	Yes
Coylton Health Clinic, Speech & Language Therapist	Yes

Craigroyston Community High School Board	Yes
Dialogue (Perth)	Yes
Dialogue Youth (Falkirk)	Yes
Dumbarton District Women's Aid	Yes
Dumfries & Galloway Council, Health Promoting School Steering Group	Yes
Dundee University (Prof. Ian Crombie, Section of Public Health)	Yes
Dunfermline/Cowdenbeath Trade Union Council	Yes
East Ayrshire Council, Head of Community Support	Yes
East Ayrshire Youth Forum	Yes
East Lothian Community Health Partnership	Yes
East Lothian Roots and Fruits	Yes
East Pilton Crewe Residents Association	Yes
East Renfrewshire Council (Head of Education Services)	Yes
Edinburgh Youth Council	Yes
Cllr. Loretta Mordi (Lib Dem), Fife Council	Yes
Fife Council (Catering & Cleaning Manager)	Yes
Flotta Community School (Orkney)	Yes
Food & Health Development, East Lothian Council	Yes
Forth Valley Food Links	No
Giffnock/Thornliebank Area Committee	Yes
Glasgow Anti Racist Alliance	Yes
Cllr Keith Baldassara (SSP), Glasgow City Council	Yes
Glasgow City UNISON Branch	Yes

Govanhill Youth Project	Yes
Granton Child & Family Centre	Yes
Healthy Castlemilk	Yes
Home-Start Ross & Cromarty	Yes
Inverclyde University Womens Association	Yes
Inverclyde Women's Aid	Yes
Irvine & District Poverty Alliance	Yes
Irvine & District Poverty Action Group	Yes
ITPRO-Glasgow Caledonian University	Yes
Kaimes Special School Board	Yes
Ladywood Primary School	Yes
Midlothian Council, Director of Education	Yes
Midlothian Healthy Living Partnership Project	Yes
Midlothian Voluntary Action	Yes
Milk for Schools Campaign	Yes
Milton Volunteer & Care Project	Yes
NCH Scotland	Yes
NHS Ayrshire & Arran, Chief Executive	Yes
NHS Ayrshire & Arran, Public Health Dieticians	Yes
NHS Dumfries & Galloway, (Education & Young People Programme)	Yes
NHS Forth Valley	No
NHS Greater Glasgow, Acting Director of Health Promotion	Yes
NHS Lanarkshire, Public Health Nutritionist	Yes

North Edinburgh Community Health Action Group	Yes
North Edinburgh Drug Advice Centre	Yes
North Kelvin Community Council	Yes
North West Edinburgh ADHD Team	Yes
One Plus (Dumfries & Galloway)	Yes
One Plus (3 Towns)	Yes
One Plus (Scotland)	Yes
Our Lady's Primary School (Dundee)	Yes
Papdale Primary School (Orkney)	Yes
Parenting Across Scotland	Yes
Perth Citizens Advice Bureau	Yes
Perth & Kinross Council, Education & Children's Services	No
Pilton Community Health Project	Yes
Poverty Alliance	Yes
Professional Association of Teachers (PAT)	Yes
Public & Commercial Services Union (PCS)	Yes
Rail Maritime & Transport Union (RMT)	Yes
Renfrewshire Young Scot	Yes
Rothiemay Primary School Board (Huntly)	Yes
Royal College of Nursing (RCN) Scotland	Yes
Sacred Heart Primary School (Penicuik)	Yes
Save the Children	Yes
Scottish Food and Drink Federation	N/A
Scottish Green Party	Yes

Scottish Local Government Forum Against Poverty	Yes
Scottish Low Pay Unit	Yes
Scottish Parent Teacher Council	No
Scottish School Board Association (Highland)	Yes
Scottish School Boards Association (Midlothian)	Yes
Scottish Secondary Teachers Association (SSTA)	Yes
Scottish Socialist Party	Yes
Scottish Trades Union Congress (STUC)	Yes
Scottish Women's Convention	Yes
Scottish Youth Parliament (Joint Submission by MYSPs)	Yes
Scottish Youth Parliament, External & Constitutional Affairs)	Yes
Shelter Families Project	Yes
Shetland Childcare Partnership	Yes
Sighthill Community One Stop Shop	Yes
Sikh Sanjog (Edinburgh)	Yes
Soil Association Scotland	N/A
Soroptimist International of Stirling	Yes
South Ayrshire Council, Convenor Lifelong Learning	No
South Lanarkshire Youth Council	Yes
St Aidan's School (Glasgow)	Yes
St Lucy's Primary School (Cumbernauld)	Yes
St Mary's Primary School (Alexandria, Glasgow)	Yes
Stenness School (Orkney)	Yes

Stepping Stones for Young Parents	Yes
Stirling Council, Children's Services	Yes
Stobhill Primary School Board	Yes
UNISON Scotland	Yes
University of Dundee, Dr C. Morelli & Dr. P. Seaman	Yes
VOCAL - Carer Support	Yes
WAGRAG	Yes
Cllr Jim Bollan (SSP), West Dunbartonshire	Yes
West Glasgow Against Poverty (Westgap)	Yes
Wester Hailes Health Agency, Manager	Yes
Wester Hailes Health Agency, Community Dietician	Yes
Who Cares? Scotland	Yes
Yoker Resource Centre	Yes
Young People and Food Group (East Lothian)	Yes
YWCA (Coupar Angus)	Yes