ESTABLISHMENT OF A MASTER CYCLE MENU AND STANDARDIZED RECIPE SYSTEM FOR RESIDENCE HALLS FOOD SERVICE OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

By

JOHN LAWRENCE JEFFREY

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1962

Submitted to the faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July, 1967

ESTABLISHMENT OF A MASTER CYCLE MENU
AND STANDARDIZED RECIPE SYSTEM FOR
RESIDENCE HALLS FOOD SERVICE
OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

Thesis Approved:

Mary E. Sublett
Thesis Adviser

Helen F. Barbour

D. D. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his sincere appreciation to Miss Mary E. Leidigh, Associate Professor of Food, Nutrition, and Institution Administration, and Director of Food Service Administrative Internship, Oklahoma State University, for her guidance, encouragement and assistance in the completion of this study; to Dr. Helen F. Barbour, Professor and Head, Department of Food, Nutrition and Institution Administration, for her counsel in preparation for this study; to Miss Mary C. Barnes, Food Purchasing Agent for Residence Halls Food Service, Oklahoma State University; and Mr. Forest Little, Manager, Animal Science Meat Laboratory, Oklahoma State University, for information and assistance provided.

Special appreciation is expressed to the Residence Halls Food Service Staff, Miss Elaine Bellew, Mrs. Judy Milroy, Mrs. Karen Spall, Miss Florence Stewart, Mr. Robert Culton, and Mrs. Juanita Tompkins, for without their assistance this study would not have been possible.

The author desires to express a sincere appreciation to Mr. Joe Blair, Director, Residence Halls Food Service, Oklahoma State University, for his guidance, understanding, and encouragement during the period of this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FORMS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Residence Halls Food Service at Oklahoma State University has doubled the number of students served since 1962. This enlargement has increased the need for a highly trained and skilled professional management staff which must assume the responsibility for directing the growth and development of the organization. More man hours of labor must be spent in management activities. This additional responsibility indicates the necessity for centralization and standardization of many functions of the organization.

Under present management procedures, the dietitian and food manager spend a considerable amount of time writing weekly menus and completing production sheet forms. Many aspects of these duties are of a routine clerical nature. Another activity which requires considerable management time on a continual basis is standardization of recipes and computation of food ingredients for the desired quantity yields. The author feels these duties can be centralized and organized to provide the food service staff with more time to perform broader functions of management such as organizational planning and employee training.

With the electronic data processing equipment available

today, many of the clerical duties performed by the decision making process can be quickly and accurately accessible to management. Several applications of electronic data processing have been made in developing menus and standardizing recipes. For example, with proper input data, a week's menu can be prepared by computer in 40 seconds (31). In essence, a total electronic data processing system can be developed for a food service organization.

The findings and conclusions of a study (8) completed on this University campus revealed that there are several problems delaying development of a total electronic data processing system. Prominent among these are insufficient and inaccurate data for input. Information for a data processing program must be standardized and be available in common units of measure. For sufficient and accurate input data, centralized menus and standardized recipes must be used by the organization.

The purpose of this research is to develop and actuate a centralized menu and standardized recipe system for Residence Halls Food Service at Oklahoma State University. It is the purpose of this thesis to provide bases for additional study, and in the future, adaptation of a total electronic data processing system. The immediate objectives are:

1. To provide a reduction in clerical duties at the Management Staff organization level.
2. To provide increased student acceptance of food service.

3. To provide more efficient control of costs.

4. To provide more efficient use of equipment and personnel.

It is the desire of the author to compile a system which will be functionally implemented into the operation of Residence Halls Food Service at Oklahoma State University.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The rapid increase of student enrollment at colleges and universities has imposed additional demands on the management of Residence Halls Food Services. Several investigations have been made recently into the activities of the personnel affected by this growth.

A study by Lipscomb and Donaldson (27) of activities directed by administrators measured the degree of perceived responsibility, and authority, and delegated responsibility and authority. Management estimated they delegated authority to subordinates in a lesser degree than was their own estimated responsibility or authority. The study concluded that delegation of selected activities would provide additional time for administrators to spend on higher level managerial activities such as planning, coordination and evaluation.

A considerable amount of professional food service personnel's time is spent on repetitive clerical duties. Miller (30) states that as much as five hours daily is spent on clerical duties. Another survey revealed that one-fifth of the total work time of 137 dietitians in the test group was spent in essential but non-productive activity (34).

The importance of eliminating the repetitive non-professional duties from the management staff's daily schedule is becoming more significant as a result of the rapid advances in food service technology. To keep abreast of these advances more management time must be spent in investigating, innovating and adapting new processes (8). A creative atmosphere must be established if management is to be effective. Planning that adds some new or useful element is creative and good planning is the keynote of a sound organization (4). One crucial characteristic of creativity is a permissive attitude (34, p. 294).

The use of new methods to eliminate clerical duties will bring about proper use of professional food management in the future. The manager of the future must be able to adapt new innovations to the organization and translate modern technology into quality food production.

The following portion of this chapter will be divided into three sections. The material will be presented to familiarize the reader with the factors necessary to consider in planning a cycle menu and a standardized recipe system. The first area to be considered will be cycle menu planning. This will be followed by a discussion of literature related to recipe standardization. The final consideration will deal with the evaluation of the effectiveness of the system in satisfying the tastes and preferences of student clientele.

Cycle Menu Planning

For the purpose of this discussion, certain terms should be clarified:

A. Menu -- a listing of the foods to be served, including methods of preparation.

B. Cycle Menu -- a "set of carefully planned menus which are rotated according to a definite pattern".

C. Selective Menu -- a menu which offers a choice in one or all food groups.

D. Selective Cycle Menu -- a menu pattern which offers a selection of food items and is rotated according to a definite pattern (1).

Food service managers find the use of cycle menus has many advantages (50, p. 53). After the initial planning of the menu has been completed, time is freed for the planner to review and revise the cycle menu, to meet the changing needs of the organization such as holidays, vacations, change in personnel, seasonal availability of a food item, or the use of new recipes. Valuable administrative hours are released that can be devoted to other problems (39). An analysis by Hubbard, Sharp and Grant of the time spent in menu writing indicated that developing regular weekly menus had previously required 8 to 12 hours. When cycle menus were introduced, menu writing was reduced to 3 to 4 hours each week, including the menu conference and the completion of desired changes (22). Repetition of the same or similar menu aids in standardizing preparation procedures, giving the production personnel an opportunity to become more

efficient in their plan of work and utilization of time. This also allows more even distribution of the work load among personnel and better use of equipment. The purchasing process and control of inventories will also be simplified (50, p. 53).

The staff of the Dietary Department of the Ohio State University Health Center concluded, after two years of use, that the cycle menu is an effective tool of management (22). They concluded that some of the advantages of the cycle menu are:

A. The time involved in menu writing is minimized. Writing of the original menus is an extensive project, of course. It should be remembered, however, that menus would need to be written, even though they were not part of a cycle. Thus, about half to two-thirds of the time previously spent on menu writing is now available for other duties. This time could be used more effectively in recipe standardization, food production, employee training, and other duties.

B. Standardization of procedures is simplified. Cycle menus clearly define the items to be served. Cycle menus narrow the whole problem of standardization and make it seem more feasible.

C. More acceptable menu items and menu combinations are offered to patients and customers. Unpopular foods and combinations can be replaced with others. This offers an opportunity to develop food acceptability information. Also, common menu-writing errors of poor combinations of color, flavor, and texture can be eliminated through repeated review of the menus before re-use.

D. Employee training is easier. Repetition of the menus enables the employees to become more familiar with fewer procedures. Skill, speed, and confidence in performance generally follows familiarity. This in turn may well lead to a smoother operation.

E. Dietetic interns have an opportunity to become familiar with cycle menus. Since the dietary department considers the cycle menu a valuable management tool, it is felt that experience with it will be useful to the young dietitian in her future positions.

Menu planning is the first step in the preparation and service of attractive and appetizing food which provides the greatest amount of nutrition at a reasonable cost (45). On an institutional level, menu planning involves problems which are unique, consequently requiring much skill and effort. The large amount of time spent by food service managers planning menus might be used to better advantage if some system is used (8). A cycle menu conforms to this need without sacrificing quality if planned, used and evaluated in the proper manner. Flexibility must be the keyword in the use of any cycle menu pattern (39). A cycle menu must be continually evaluated for successful use. Keefe was of the viewpoint that cycle menus will fail if you just have them typed and use them without injecting a fresh viewpoint (42).

The following points must be in mind when evaluating cycle menus (31):

A. Nutritional needs of clientele.

B. Distribution of work load in the kitchen.

C. Equipment available.

D. Age of group, type of work done by group making menus for. (For example - finals, exams)

E. Number of dishes requiring last minute preparation.

F. Appearance -
1. Quantity (servings not too large or small)
2. Color
3. Form or shape
4. Neatness
5. Arrangement

G. Palatability (quality) -
1. Odor
2. Temperature (some hot, some cold)
3. Texture
4. Consistency
5. Flavor - some bland
some sharp
some sweet
some spicy

H. Use variety of methods of preparation. (Some baked, fried, stewed, broiled, etc.)

The type of cycle to be used must be the first consideration. Cycles may be designed on a weekly, monthly, yearly, or seasonal basis. Selection of the length of time for the cycle depends upon which is most suitable for that particular organization. Greer (20) states that a cycle which is to be used for any period of time should be at least three weeks in duration. Stammers (45) on the other hand believes that the length of the cycle is determined by the period of time that a group of individuals eat at the institution, the schedules of the dietary department, and the judgment of the menu planner. Raleigh (42) states that

in any case, the cycle menu should be repeated at least three to four times to be of any value.

Adequate time must be given to space the menu items so that repetition will be limited. However, the time must not be too long so that more popular food items will recur frequently enough to satisfy the customer. Menu items should not be repeated on the same day of the week on consecutive weeks. This would allow the customer to forecast the menu and tend to produce menu monotony. If a food item appears more than once during a week's time a different method of preparation should be used (45).

Selection of the menu items is perhaps the most difficult task. The use of a popularity index has been found to be a very effective and efficient management tool. Gatten (17) explains that the popularity index is the number assigned to each menu item after each meal, on the basis of its sales performance during that meal. This provides a guide with which to forecast the popularity of the same item during its next reappearance on the cycle.

Use of leftovers is an important factor in the use of cycle menus (42). Leftovers may be planned to supplement the regular menu. Greer (20) states that careful planning and controlling of production will eliminate the majority of leftover problems.

Certain management tools are essential in planning and using cycle menus (45). Standardized recipes, in which the weight and measure of ingredients and method of preparation

have been sufficiently tested are of utmost importance.

Standardized Recipes

While the menu authorizes production, setting in motion activities which culminate in the production and service, the recipe controls production (26). Recipe standardization is the major element of portion control. Portion control is giving a definite quantity of good food for a definite percentage of profit (15). Food service operators who do not have standardized recipes have a basic problem. In simple terms, it is a problem of variation in results, quantity, quality, costs, and in consumer reaction (46).

The basis for the achievement of high quality food service is tested and standardized recipes. A recipe is considered standardized when it has been tried in a given situation and has repeatedly produced good results (50, p. 55). Accuracy in the use of standardized recipes takes the guesswork out of quantity food production. Customers expect and should be able to depend upon having a good item the same way each time it is selected.

Introducing a recipe standardization program into an organization requires careful planning and a clear explanation so that all who are to be involved understand what is to be done and exactly how they will participate (2). The importance of including all participants in the planning stage of the program cannot be emphasized too much. The omission or neglect of this step will severely limit the

results which can be achieved from a program which seems to be perfect in every other respect. It is the non-professional personnel who can make or break such a program if not convinced of the soundness of following new instructions (1). Any change from ordinary practices in a food service organization may cause employees to feel insecure or resentful.

In many food service operations very little thought is given to the format or general form and layout used for writing recipes (2). The form or format of recipes is important if the recipes are to be dependable and to be used by the employees. Recipes should be readable at a distance of 18 to 20 inches by an employee in a standing position. Picking up recipes for closer inspection should seldom be necessary if the information on them is well arranged and spaced. An $8\frac{1}{2}$ x 11" sheet or card has many advantages over smaller sizes (2). Some food service organizations use heavy typing paper $8\frac{1}{2}$ x 11" and place the recipes in clear plastic covers to keep the copy clean when handling. Careful attention should be given to written procedure for preparation of the food item (30).

Definite specifications must be written for standardizing recipes. Cranmore (13) gives the following suggested specifications for standardizing recipes:

A. List the ingredients in the order in which they are to be combined.

B. Give both measure and weight when practical.

C. Avoid fractions as much as possible and use standard terms for abbreviations.

D. Procedure instructions should be complete, clear, concise and simple to understand. They should be written in a step-by-step process appearing directly in line with each ingredient or group of ingredients used on one operation.

E. Multiple quantities should be worked out for large and small service.

F. List the yield in total volume or pounds as well as the size and number of servings. Specify the container size and the batter or filling allowance where practical.

G. The total cost, individual portion cost and the date are necessary.

H. Baking and cooking temperature and time must be recorded.

I. Information on calorie value, garnishing and serving suggestions, maximum holding time allowances, directions for leftover storage and use, and space allowed on the reverse side of the recipe file card for acceptability rating are all desirable.

A constant task in a standardized recipe program is refiguring recipes to supply increased or decreased yields as required by anticipated patron count which varies throughout the year. Absolute accuracy is essential in making adjustments to maintain quality and obtain the exact yield desired (2). Callahan (10) has devised the Recipe Magician and Yield Control Guide to assist with the mathematics required for recipe expansion. Through the use of these aids recipe expansion may be completed quickly and with accuracy.

When properly used, standardized recipes can mean the difference between profit and loss in an operation. They are not only an important production tool but they are the key to quality of the product offered to patrons, and therefore vital to the success of the organization (10).

Evaluation of Customer Acceptance

> Employment by food services in the United States has reached approximately 3 million--three times more than the number working in the steel industry. As a result of this surge, such trends as centralization of management functions and food preparation have developed. Technological advances have revolutionized the industry, resulting in automation, radical changes in equipment, and the use of convenience foods. With such large-scale developments has come a loss of some personal relationships with customers that were possible in smaller operations Awareness of the importance of satisfying associations between management and the consumer has evolved (41).

There is a wide variety of ways in which food acceptance surveys can be conducted. The two most common ones are the interview and the questionnaire (33). The procedure that is used is limited by the time and effort required from the people being studied. Questionnaires are best suited for people accustomed to desk work (33). A criticism of questionnaires has been the inability to obtain a satisfactory return of completed questionnaires. However, a food acceptance survey at Purdue University received a 98 per cent return (52). The objective of any food preference study is to gain information and to overcome the complaint

of customers who reject the meal plan given to them because of different eating habits (25). Customers are pleased at the personal interest a study of food preferences shows.

A study by Bellew (5) revealed the urgent need of young college students for nutritional education directed in such a way that a change of behavior takes place. Student committees could provide this information. A University of Washington research paper by Nygreen (37) pointed out that food acceptance is determined by individual food intake rather than total food served. Food service monotony must be avoided if a high degree of food service acceptance is to be maintained.

Satisfaction with food service is influenced by physical conditions and the atmosphere at meal periods (49). Mitchell reported that serving hours and temperature of food received the greatest amount of criticism. Noise in the dining room was ranked as being unimportant. The attitude of personnel and appearance of food was viewed by students in the study as being most important to food service acceptance. A positive feeling toward the food service staff appeared to result in relatively favorable student reaction to residence halls food service while a negative student opinion of the staff seemed to be reflected in a less favorable reaction to the food service (41). The study by Prideaux and Shugart pointed out that associations between students and the food service staff were extremely important to food acceptance. The data indicated that significant

relationships existed between reactions toward food and (a) how well the staff was known by the students, (b) how often the staff was seen by students, (c) the staff's desire to please residents, and (d) their interest in the students as persons. The better the student knew the food service staff the better they accepted residence hall food service.

The menu and standardized recipes have been presented as the key to effective food service management. But without the use of a sound philosophy of human relations the customer may not view the food service as acceptable.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

All residence halls cafeterias at Oklahoma State University are operated with a considerable degree of decentralization. Each unit manager is responsible for effective management of the cafeteria. Each manager or dietitian plans all menus, prepares all production sheets, and calculates recipe yields for the individual cafeteria. As a former residence hall cafeteria manager, it has been my observation that a considerable amount of time is spent on duties which are repetitive or clerical in nature.

The initial objective of this research is to centralize and organize the functions mentioned above to allow the food service staff more time to perform the broader functions of management, such as organizational planning and employee training.

The method of procedure will be discussed in the following sequence:

1. Analysis of previously planned menus for all contract halls.
2. Preparation of the master five week cycle menu.
3. Design of production sheets and evaluation forms.
4. Menu staff meeting.
5. Comparison of menu food costs.

6. Recipe standardization procedure.

7. Evaluation of customer acceptance.

In order to accomplish the objective of the study, personal conferences were arranged with Mr. Joe Blair, Director of Residence Halls Food Service, and the cafeteria managers and dietitians. During the conferences, questions were asked to determine the attitudes of the food service staff concerning a centralized menu and a procedure for standardization of recipes. No unfavorable attitudes or opinions were presented. Mr. Blair was very encouraging concerning the study and the benefits possible. All of the staff members thought the research would be beneficial to the organization and offered useful suggestions.

The project was discussed with Mr. Forest Little, Manager, Animal Husbandry Meat Supply Laboratory, who is responsible for purchasing and processing meat for the residence hall cafeterias. Mr. Little did not feel that the use of a Master Cycle Menu for the cafeterias would create any difficulties in meat purchasing or processing while the advantages offered by the cycle were desirable. Scheduling of production runs in larger quantities at one time would be possible and meat purchases could be planned five weeks in advance rather than two weeks as is presently done. Miss Mary Barnes, Purchasing Agent for Residence Halls Food Service, was consulted for possible problems relating to the purchasing of canned goods and staples for the cafeterias using a Master Cycle Menu.

The research will be limited to the five contract cafeterias. This will include Cordell, Kerr-Drummond, Scott-Parker, Stout, and Murray cafeterias. The contract cafeterias serve three meals a day, six days a week, and on Sunday serve breakfast and the noon meal. The students living in the respective contract residence halls purchase a board contract at the beginning of each semester. This board contract guarantees the student 20 meals a week during the University semester. A meal ticket is issued each student on a quarterly basis to present for meal service. The student pays for all meals and must be present at each meal period to receive value for his board contract. As a result of the projected revenue from the board contract, the University can offer high quality meal service at a low daily rate to the students. The average total daily cost for a student is $1.64.

The five contract cafeterias have a total of approximately 3,800 student board contracts to serve. Murray and Stout serve only female residents while Cordell serves only male residents. Kerr-Drummond and Scott-Parker are coeducational dining facilities. Kerr-Drummond is the largest and most modern cafeteria serving 1,325 students. The cafeteria serving the smallest number of students is Stout with 383 board contracts.

At the present time the variety of food items offered in each cafeteria depends on the clientele and each cafeteria manager writes his own menus. Major variances are

found in the selection of salads and desserts. The entrees and vegetables offered on the hot food counter, however, follow the same basic pattern. Portion sizes may vary because boys desire larger servings. The menu pattern followed by all contract cafeterias for production of hot food counter items is:

LUNCH

1 Soup

2 Entrees (Usually extender items)

3 Vegetables

DINNER

2 Entrees (Usually whole meat items)

1 Potato

2 Vegetables

A copy of the menus served during a five week period of the fall semester will be requested from the food service staff of the five contract cafeterias. A food item frequency distribution chart will be prepared from the menus. This chart will list all food items presented on the menus. The chart will be prepared to show the week each menu selection appeared and the total number of appearances during the five week period.

From the menus previously served and the information obtained from the Frequency Distribution Chart, two food service staff members will be requested to plan a Master Five Week Cycle Menu which would be acceptable to the clientele of all five contract cafeterias.

The Master Cycle Menu prepared will be limited to the food items produced for the hot food counter for the lunch and dinner meals using the above menu pattern. The Master Five Week Cycle Menu will hereafter be referred to as M. C. M. These staff members will be selected because of previous experience and their demonstrated ability to plan highly acceptable menus. The M. C. M. will be designed to prevent any food item except the extremely popular ones as shown by the Frequency Distribution Chart from appearing more than twice in five weeks. The completed M. C. M. will be discussed with the staff members responsible for food production in the contract cafeterias. Adjustments will be made as a result of these discussions. The M. C. M. will be reproduced to provide duplicate copies. A copy is to be provided for Mr. Blair, Director of Residence Halls Food Service, Miss Barnes, Residence Halls Food Service Purchasing Agent, and Mr. Little, Manager of the Animal Husbandry Meat Laboratory, and each contract cafeteria manager.

A weekly menu planning meeting will be established for the discussion of problems encountered and to exchange information. The first meeting will be used to discuss the project and formulate policies concerning the use of the M. C. M. The procedure and form for production sheets and standardized recipes will be determined.

After the day's menu has been served, it is to be evaluated by the food production manager. A Menu Evaluation Form will be prepared for each day of the cycle. The

Evaluation Form and a copy of the Production Sheet will be returned to the Residence Halls Food Service Office daily.

The five week Cycle Menu will be designed to better satisfy the needs of the students and if possible to lower food cost for all contract cafeterias. The total food costs of the five food units used in the study contain many expenditures not controlled by the M. C. M. Therefore, the author felt that total food cost would not be a useful guideline to the actual savings in use of the Cycle Menu.

To determine if the M. C. M. is effective in lowering food costs, a comparison of meat purchases will be made. Meat invoice records from the Auxiliary Enterprise Accounting Office will be used. Meat purchases for a typical five week period of the fall semester will be compared with meat purchases during a comparable period of use of the M. C. M. in the spring semester. To eliminate price fluctuations, both periods will be costed using current prices. The total number of pounds purchased in each period will be compared on a per student basis. This will be done to account for the changes in residence hall occupancy. The results will be studied to determine if an adequate amount of variance in the types of meat served is presented on the M. C. M. and the cost per student will be studied to determine whether a net savings or loss is provided by the M. C. M.

A procedure for standardizing recipes will be formulated by the members of the M. C. M. committee. A method for evaluation of student acceptance of food items on the master

menu will be prepared also. Correspondence will be made with other colleges and universities to obtain information concerning use of centralized cycle menus and standardized recipes.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The initial objective of this study was to centralize and organize the clerical tasks related to menu planning and recipe standardization. It has been observed during past employment the amount of time management personnel expend in clerical duties. The author felt this time could be better utilized in performing management and professional responsibilities. Conferences with Mr. Joe Blair revealed his concern about this subject also. Due to the degree of decentralization in the organization of Residence Halls Food Service at Oklahoma State University, each cafeteria manager is delegated heavy responsibility for the operational success of the cafeteria. Success of the manager is dependent on his ability to effectively plan, staff, train, supervise, and control the functions of his operation. Any clerical duties which can be eliminated would provide additional time for performance of management duties.

The staff members of Residence Halls Food Service were very encouraging regarding the research. In the early stages of the research, many suggestions regarding the menu pattern and procedure for standardization of recipes were offered by the staff. A copy of the menus used in each of

the five contract cafeterias during the fall semester was requested from the manager.

Menu Analysis

The menus were analyzed in regard to variety, contrast, texture, color, and nutritional value. Correct menu planning procedures appeared to have been followed in preparation of the menus. The menus were prepared on the basis of student preferences in the individual residence halls. After analysis of the different menus, it was concluded that the same basic pattern was followed in planning the menus in each cafeteria. On several occasions the same combination of food selections appeared in more than one cafeteria on the same day of the week.

A food item frequency distribution chart was prepared from the menus (see Table A). This chart lists all food items presented on the menus and their frequency of appearance during a five week period. The food items which appear the most frequently are the more popular ones. It was not possible to prepare a frequency distribution for the menus used by Murray Cafeteria because a selective cycle menu was used. Four entree items were listed for each meal. The manager selected two of the four items for a given meal. As a result, the menus would vary considerably during the five week period. However, the menus could be analyzed in regard to correct menu planning and as a guide in preparation of the M. C. M. (see Table B).

Menu Planning

Two food service staff members were asked to plan a five week cycle menu which would be acceptable to the clientele of all five contract cafeterias. These staff members were selected because of previous experience and their demonstrated ability to plan highly acceptable menus. They used the previously planned menus from each cafeteria and the frequency distribution chart as guides. The cycle menu prepared was limited to the food items produced for the hot food counter for the lunch and dinner meals. A menu for the breakfast meal was not planned because of the need to provide a wide variety of menu patterns to satisfy the tastes and preferences of the students in each of the five contract cafeterias.

The author offered suggestions and requested some revisions in the cycle menu as it was planned by the staff members. The menu was designed to prevent any food item except the extremely popular ones as shown by the frequency distribution chart from appearing more than twice during the five week period. With few exceptions most of the food items appear only once during the five week period. Correct menu planning procedures, employee work load distribution, and food cost were taken into consideration in planning the menu. A frequency distribution analysis chart was prepared to assure proper variety in menu selections (see Table C). The completed menu was discussed with other members of the Residence Halls Food Service Staff responsible for the

supervision of food production. These staff members were able to see some minor problems in the menu. These problems were corrected or eliminated from the menu. The author was of the opinion that it was essential to obtain ideas from all staff members involved for the acceptance and success of the research. The completed five week cycle was then referred to as the Master Cycle Menu (M. C. M.). The M. C. M. was then reproduced for distribution. A copy was provided for each contract cafeteria, Mr. Blair, Miss Barnes, and Mr. Little.

Menu Planning Committee

A weekly menu planning meeting was established for the discussion of problems encountered and to exchange information and to continually revise the M. C. M. The success of any cycle menu is dependent upon constant evaluations and improvement. The first meeting was used to discuss the project and formulate policies for use of the M. C. M. The policies, procedures, and forms for production sheets and the evaluation sheets were developed.

The first meeting of the weekly menu planning committee resulted in the following policies concerning use of the cycle menu pattern:

1. All five contract cafeterias would use the same menu pattern for range production.
2. Consideration of portion size and service would be made in relation to clientele served.
3. A cafeteria manager could add additional selections to any meal to provide improved customer acceptance.

The addition of a third entree item of the cafeteria manager's choice was encouraged.

4. All garnish and sauce suggestions offered on the M. C. M. pattern were optional at the discretion of the manager.

5. All food items remaining from previous meal service, i.e., leftovers, would be offered as additional selections rather than being substituted for the food items listed for service that day on the M. C. M.

6. Soups and potato selections could be altered to make use of food products on hand.

7. The M. C. M. could be disregarded entirely in planning meals for special occasions.

8. Each cafeteria would use present recipes in preparation of M. C. M. during the first five week period.

9. Recipes for each product would be analyzed in relation to the degree of standardization.

10. Any cafeteria could request a recipe from another cafeteria for evaluation, comparison, and testing.

These policies were essential for the M. C. M. to be effectively adapted for use in all of the five contract cafeterias. This allowed each manager some discretion which is necessary for creativeness and more enthusiastic management.

Production Sheet Design

A production sheet prepared on an $8\frac{1}{2}$ x 13" mimeograph sheet was developed for use by all contract cafeterias (see Form A). A production sheet was used for each day's range production menu. The M. C. M. was typed on the production sheet with a carbon copy by Residence Halls Food Service Office clerical personnel. This eliminated manual

transferral of the day's menu to the production sheet by the food production manager. To complete the new production sheet it is only necessary to determine the quantity of each item to be produced and record the amount on the production sheet.

After initial use of the production sheet, a column was added to allow the manager to specify portion size on the production sheet. The portion column was considered useful because many of the range production food items are pre-portioned by the range employees before the food is moved to the service counter.

Because of the success of the first M. C. M. staff meeting, a scheduled weekly meeting was planned. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss problems related to the M. C. M. and to evaluate its effectiveness. A staff member from each contract cafeteria attended. Members of the dietetic internship class were encouraged to attend and contribute to the meeting. Mr. Little attended some of the meetings and his suggestions concerning production of some of the meat items were very useful. It was determined that many of the patty steaks such as the chuck wagon steaks and plantation steaks could be mass produced at the meat laboratory by machine. The patty machine could be used rather than hand forming the steaks, which could save a considerable amount of labor.

The menu meeting was scheduled in a different cafeteria each week on a rotating basis. The staff members were

invited for lunch together. New food items were sampled at this time. Two weeks' menus were discussed at each meeting; the one presently being served and the menu for the next week. Any adjustments necessary in the M. C. M. were made at this time. Most of the changes made at the menu meeting were to improve the eye appeal of the menu or to provide more efficient methods of production. Many excellent ideas were exchanged at the meetings.

Menu Evaluation

It was the author's request for each day's menu to be evaluated and an evaluation form was developed for this purpose (see Form B). After each day's menu had been served, it was evaluated by the food production manager. The evaluation sheet was designed to evaluate all factors essential for proper menu planning. The completed evaluation form and a carbon copy of the production sheet were sent to the Residence Halls Food Service Office each day. The author checked each evaluation sheet and production sheet. Comments were recorded for discussion at the next M. C. M. meeting.

Food Cost Comparison

It was the author's intent that the M. C. M. be designed to more effectively satisfy the needs of the student, and, if possible, to lower the food cost of the contract cafeterias. A means was sought to determine if the

M. C. M. could lower food cost. Total food cost for a cafeteria includes many cost factors which could not be controlled by the M. C. M. and therefore total food cost would not be a useful guide in evaluating the savings effected by the use of the M. C. M. Because the M. C. M. includes only the food items produced for the hot food counter, the author decided on a comparison of meat purchases (Table D). Meat invoice records from the Auxiliary Enterprise Accounting Office were used. Meat purchases for a representative five week period of the fall semester were compared with meat purchases for a similar period using the M. C. M. To eliminate variance due to price fluctuations, current prices were used to cost both five week periods. The analysis was categorized on the basis of beef, pork, veal, poultry, and fish and seafood. A subtotal was obtained for each category. The results were compared on a cost per student basis taking into consideration changes in the occupancy rates of the residence halls. The summary of the comparison is as follows:

TABLE D SUMMARIZED

Food Cost Comparison

	Fall, 1966	Spring, 1967
	Total	Total
Student Count	3796	3549
Cost	$35,975.66	$33,530.32
Cost Per Student	9.47	9.45
Estimated Net Savings		$ 2,545.44

With the exception of Scott-Parker, all cafeterias produced a savings by use of the M. C. M. The overall estimated total savings were $2,545.44. Several factors may have affected the cost figures for Scott-Parker. Some food supplies were present from summer school food service. These were primarily frozen meat and seafood which would not have been reflected on the fall inventory, as they are charged directly to the kitchen upon delivery. The M. C. M. is designed to use more veal, pork, and poultry than previous menus planned at Scott-Parker. These items are in general more expensive relative to beef and seafood. This may account for a portion of the difference in the Scott-Parker figures.

Recipe Standardization

At the third menu meeting recipe standardization was the main topic of discussion. All contract cafeterias had a recipe file which was standardized to a limited degree but there was little similarity between halls. It was the author's desire, therefore, to adapt a standard recipe form which would be used by all five cafeterias. Many of the recipes previously used in the cafeteria were typed on both sides of a 5 x 8" card. The production employees were continually flipping the cards over in order to read the complete directions for a recipe. Since this practice could result in errors, an $8\frac{1}{2}$ x 11" sheet was selected as the size for the standard recipe form (see Form C). All information

relating to one recipe was placed on one side of the page. Transparent plastic covers for the recipes were used to prevent soiling or spotting the recipes while in use. A standard three ring binder notebook was used to file the recipes by the type of food product. Mr. Gene Hancock, dietetic intern, standardized fifteen recipes used on the M. C. M. as a long term project. He developed a work sheet for recipe standardization on an 8½ x 13" size sheet (see Form D). This size allowed space to write the entire recipe with ingredients, quantity, and directions on one page. Space was provided at the bottom of the standardization form to evaluate the acceptability and quality of the recipe being tested. This form was used by the contract cafeteria managers to evaluate recipes used in each cafeteria.

A decision was made at the menu meeting for each contract cafeteria to standardize recipes needed for different one week periods of the M. C. M. These recipes were to be produced and then evaluated using the Recipe Standardization Form. As each recipe was standardized it was exchanged with another cafeteria at the next M. C. M. staff meeting. After the recipe was produced a second time by different kitchen personnel, it was re-evaluated and adjustments made by the food production manager. The recipes were then reviewed by the M. C. M. staff members for final approval. One recipe was then selected by the members of the staff for duplicating on the standard recipe form for use by all five cafeterias.

Standardization of recipes is a continual process. Many of the recipes need additional testing and revision to be considered totally satisfactory. Many new recipes should be standardized and used to supplement the food selections presently on the M. C. M. It is the author's desire that additional work on standardization of recipes be continued.

Master Cycle Menu Revision

As use of the M. C. M. progressed during the semester, many improvements were made. Some of the food items appearing on the M. C. M., such as spaghetti and meat balls, presented problems related to service in the larger cafeterias, i.e., Scott-Parker and Kerr-Drummond. Several of the food items required adjustment or rearrangement due to the amount of handwork necessary to produce the product. Most of these problems were eliminated when the individual manager was permitted to determine the method of service for the product. For example, spaghetti and meat balls might be served as a one pan combination dish, Italian spaghetti, in the cafeteria where a problem in service existed.

Menu Evaluation

The primary objective of Residence Halls Food Service is to provide nutritionally balanced attractive meals which are satisfactory to the tastes and preferences of the students. A means for evaluation of student acceptance of the food items presented on the M. C. M. was desirable. A

student food preference questionnaire was considered. Bellew (5), Mitchell (36), Kaufman (25), and Prideaux (41) provide data received from questionnaires related to food preferences and eating habits. However, the use of a questionnaire would not provide as effective contact as personal communications. After discussion with Miss Leidigh and members of the M. C. M. staff, a questionnaire was not used.

The use of the Residence Hall food committees was suggested by the M. C. M. staff. Each residence hall has a food committee composed of from three to seven residents of the hall. At least twice each month, the food committee meets with the cafeteria manager to discuss problems related to food service, plan special meals and parties, and to offer suggestions for improvement of the food service segment of the student life program of the residence hall. Any suggestions related to M. C. M. that the committee reported to the manager were discussed at the M. C. M. staff meetings. In general, no unfavorable comments were presented by food committees in regard to the M. C. M.

For continual success of the M. C. M., constant reviewing and evaluation are essential. The members of the M. C. M. meeting made many improvements on the original cycle. The staff decided that one cycle menu would be unable to continually satisfy the needs of the students. A second cycle menu is planned which would be five weeks in duration, also. The food items would be those more

acceptable during the warmer months of the year, i.e., more salads, cold plates, and sandwiches. It is proposed that the second cycle be served in late spring, summer, and early fall. The original M. C. M. would be served during the cooler months of the year.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Observation during past employment created concern by the author regarding the amount of time food service management personnel expend in clerical duties. This time should be spent performing management and professional responsibilities. The initial objective of the author in this study was to remove from the work load of the cafeteria managers the clerical tasks related to menu planning and recipe standardization. It was proposed to accomplish this by planning a Master Cycle Menu and the creation of a procedure for standardization of recipes.

The review of the literature pointed out the concern of of administrators in the industry on the ability of management to keep pace with the rapid growth of technology. Clerical responsibilities of management must be reduced to accomplish this goal. Electronic data processing is on the horizon for use of the food service industry. However, professional food service management must be educated to its use.

Food service managers find the use of cycle menus has many advantages. After initial planning of the menu has been completed, the planner's time is free to review and

and revise the cycle menu to meet the changing needs of the organization. The saving of time is a definite advantage of the cycle menu. Menu planning is the first step in the preparation and service of attractive and appetizing food which provides the greatest amount of nutrition at a reasonable cost. Flexibility must be provided in any well planned cycle menu, as well as the creation of satisfied clientele.

A standardized recipe system is an essential tool in the planning and use of a cycle menu. Recipe standardization is a major element in portion control. A recipe is considered standardized when it has been tried in a given situation and has repeatedly produced good results. The importance of including all participants in the planning stage of a standardized recipe program cannot be emphasized too much. A well planned recipe design is of prime importance. The quality of food products offered to the patrons is dependent upon the success of the standardized recipe program.

The food product must not only be produced according to a standard, but it must be acceptable to the customer. Customer satisfaction is the ultimate goal of food service. Establishing a personal relationship with the customers will contribute to successful food service acceptance.

In planning of the Master Cycle Menu, a Food Item Frequency Distribution Chart was prepared. This provided the author with information concerning basic popularity of different food items. The Master Cycle Menu prepared for

use in Residence Halls Food Service was reviewed and analyzed by members of the staff. These staff members made final adjustments on the M. C. M. The ideas and suggestions presented by the staff were essential to the success of the research.

A production sheet and evaluation form were devised to aid in improvement of the M. C. M. The menu planning committee was very effective in continued improvement of the M. C. M. The amount of time saved by each staff member was considered valuable, as for most staff members this amounted to an average of one hour per day.

The comparison of meat purchase costs revealed a savings by use of the Cycle Menu. This savings amounted to an estimated $2,545.44 over a five week period. Additional study is needed to determine if the savings will result on a continual basis.

The procedure for standardization of recipes was developed and improvements were made on all recipes used with the Cycle Menu. A plastic covered standard form will be used on all recipes in the future.

The primary objective of Residence Halls Food Service is to provide nutritionally balanced attractive meals which are acceptable to the students. Student food committees were used to evaluate the effectiveness of the menu in regard to customer acceptance. The major problem presented by the food committees was that of preventing monotony in the food service. Continual analysis of the M. C. M. will

be necessary to minimize or prevent this problem.

Further research is needed in the areas of recipe standardization and analysis of M. C. M. food costs. The need for development of standardized procedures is essential for adaptation of an electronic data processing system in the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. After standardization what? School and College Feeding 1:29 (July-Aug.), 1963.

2. Aldrich, Pearl Jackson: Quality food means more than recipes. J. Am. Dietet. A. 35: 1089 (Jan.), 1959.

3. Aldrich, Pearl Jackson: Tailor made recipes for modern food service. J. Am. Dietet. A. 31: 898 (Sept.), 1955.

4. Andrews, Janet T.: Development of a food cost accounting system using electronic data processing. A paper delivered at the 49th annual meeting of the A.D.A., Boston, Mass. Oct. 26, 1966.

5. Bellew, Elaine: A study of changing food habits of college women. Unpublished report, University of Kentucky, 1965.

6. Billyeald, J.: Personal communications.

7. Blackburne, C. E.: The spread sheet. American Restaurant 45: 50 (Nov.), 1961.

8. Brewer, Jessie S.: A procedural guide for establishing data processing system in a food service organization. Unpublished thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1967.

9. Callahan, James F. and Aldrich, Pearl J.: New method of calculating yield of recipes. College Feeding 1: 29 (July-Aug.), 1963.

10. Callahan, James: Recipe expansion made easy. Institutions Magazine 46: 116 (Feb.), 1966.

11. Casbergue, John P.: Computers and dietetics - a new era. A paper delivered at the 49th annual meeting of the A.D.A., Boston, Massachusetts Oct. 28, 1966.

12. Claussen, M. L.: Personal communications.

13. Cranmore, Mary Kavanaugh: A test kitchen of your own? Why Not?: Food Service Magazine 25: 58 (April), 1963.

14. Cycle menu plan adapted for selective menus. J. Am. Dietet. A. 34: 1308 (Dec.), 1958.

15. Diener, Sara A.: Recipe standardization. Unpublished report, Oklahoma State University, 1959.

16. Dodge, Quindara Oliver: EDP-Dietetic systems and the new communications technology. A paper delivered at the 49th annual meeting of the A. D. A., Boston, Massachusetts October 28, 1966.

17. Gatten, L. E.: Cycle menu system aid to food service control. Institutions Magazine 38: 170 (April), 1956.

18. Goertz, Joanne W.: Standardized recipes in conjunction with cycle menus. Unpublished report, Oklahoma State University, 1956.

19. Greer, T.: Twenty-one day cycle menu adopted as a new policy. Institutions Magazine 35: 161 (Oct.), 1954.

20. Greer, T.: Twenty-one day cycle menu planning course. Am. Restaurant Magazine 43: 85 (Oct.), 1959.

21. Hanlon, Timothy E.: Basic concepts and principles of electronic data processing. A paper delivered at the annual meeting of the A. D. A., Boston, Massachusetts October 28, 1966.

22. Hubbard, Rachel M. Ice: Pros and cons of cycle menus. J. Am. Dietet. A. 39: 339 (Oct.), 1961.

23. Ingerson, Helen G.: Personal communications.

24. Jansen, Pearl Z.: Recipe construction. J. Am. Dietet. A. 29: 125 (Feb.), 1953.

25. Kaufman, M.: Food preference questionnaire. J. Am. Dietet. A. 49: 31 (July), 1966.

26. Kotschevar, Lendal H.: Quantity food production. Report, 1966.

27. Lichtenfelt, R.: Planning pre-costing menus. Institutions 43: 167 (Sept.), 1957.

28. Lichtenfelt, R.: Planning pre-costing menus. Institutions 43: 98 (Oct.), 1957.

29. Lipscomb, M. and Donaldson, B.: Management activities of directors of dietetics. J. Am. Dietet. A. 44: 456 (June), 1964.

30. Macfarlane, Alberta M.: Standardized recipe system works. Institutions 44: 28 (Jan.), 1959.

31. Menus and recipes, standing committee report, 8th annual conference National Association of College and University Food Service, Chicago, 1966.

32. Miller, G. E.: To be or not ... J. Am. Dietet. A. 47: 15 (June), 1965.

33. Mitchell, Josephine F.: A comparison of a la carte and a contract food service at Oklahoma State University. Unpublished M. S. thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1960.

34. New method food recipe adjustment. Institutions 56: 103 (Feb.), 1965.

35. Newman, William J. and Summer, Charles E., Jr.: The process of management. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

36. Noland, M. S. and Steinburg, P.: Activities of therapeutic dietitians - a survey report. J. Am. Dietet. A. 46: 477 (May), 1965.

37. Nygreen, M. S.: Food eaten by college students. J. Am. Dietet. A. 30: 359 (April), 1954.

38. Payne, A.: Creativity in therapeutic dietetics. J. Am. Dietet. A. 46: 379 (May), 1965.

39. Pinney, Virginia E.: Cycle menus tempered with flexibility have advantages. J. Am. Dietet. A. 31: 901 (Sept.), 1955.

40. Plan menus to pass the test of time. Institutions 52: 71 (April), 1963.

41. Prideaux, J. S. and Shugart, G. M.: Students reaction to college food. J. Am. Dietet. A. 49: 38 (July), 1966.

42. Raleigh, W. A., Jr.: The magic of masterful menu planning. Inplant Food Management 30 (Sept.), 1963.

43. Rosenblatt, F. R.: Practical method of controlling food costs. Institutions 43: 167 (Oct.), 1958 - (Dec.), 1958.

44. Schroeder, D.: Food complaints are fed to committee. College and University Business 41: 51 (Dec.), 1966.

45. Stammers, Kay: An investigation of cycle menus and the use of cycle menus 'in' industrial food services. Unpublished Report: Eastman Kodak, 1960.

46. Take the guesswork out of food preparation by using standardized recipes. Food Service Management, Publication No. 13 (Aug.), 1965.

47. The menu form guide to food buying. Volume Feed Management 24: 45 (April), 1965.

48. Ummel, Maureen: Standardization of pastry recipes. Unpublished Report, Oklahoma State University, 1951.

49. Warner, Mary Ann: Putting imagination into the menu. College and University Business 28: 48 (Dec.), 1959.

50. West, Bessie Brooks: Food service in institutions. New York: John Wiley and Son, Inc., 1966.

51. Williams, Evelyn: Standardization of recipes. Unpublished Report, Oklahoma State University, 1963.

52. You can take the monotony out of dormitory dining. College and University Business 27: 58 (Dec.), 1959.

APPENDIX

TABLE A

FOOD ITEM FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION

FIVE-WEEK PERIOD BY CAFETERIA

Item	Cordell	Stout	Scott Parker	Kerr Drummond	Total
Sandwiches					
Hamburger/Bun	2	1	2	2	7
Cheeseburger/Bun	2		2		4
Schoolboy/Bun	1		5	2	8
Bar B-Q Beef/Bun	1	2	2	2	7
Submarine Sandwich	1				1
Grilled Cheese Sandwich	3	1	3	1	8
Hot Beef Sandwich	1	2	2		5
Ham Sandwich	1				1
Bologna Sandwich	1	1			2
Hot Turkey Sandwich	1	3	2	2	8
Ham Salad Sandwich		2		1	3
Ham and Cheese Sandwich/Rye		1			1
Chicken Salad Sandwich		1	2	1	4
Ham and Cheese/Bun			4		4
Tuna Salad Sandwich			3		3
Bacon and Cheese Sandwich			1		1
Rueben Sandwich			2		2
Coney/Bun			1	3	4
Salami, Cheese, Lettuce and Tomato Sandwich				1	1
Bacon, Lettuce and Tomato Sandwich				1	1
Tuna Burger				2	2

TABLE A, Continued

Item	Cordell	Stout	Scott Parker	Kerr Drummond	Total
Sandwiches, continued					
Grilled Corned Beef Sandwich				1	1
Poultry - Whole					
Fried Chicken	9	2	10	8	29
Chicken Maryland		1		1	2
Sliced Turkey/Dressing		2	3	2	7
Baked Chicken		1		1	2
Bar B-Q Chicken		1			1
Chicken and Dumplings		1			1
Chicken Cacciatore			1		1
Baked Chicken/Mushrooms				1	1
Poultry - Cubed					
Creamed Chicken	1	1			2
Turkey Supreme	2	1	6	3	12
Chicken and Noodles	4		6	1	11
Chicken Pot Pie/Biscuit	1	2			3
Chicken Tetrazzini		1	3	3	7
Chicken A La King		1		3	4
French Turkey Hash			2	2	4
Turkey Turnover			1		1
Turkey Almond Casserole			1		1

TABLE A, Continued

Item	Cordell	Stout	Scott Parker	Kerr Drummond	Total
Poultry - Ground					
Chicken Salad Sandwich		1			1
Chicken Loaf		1			1
Turkey Loaf				1	1
Pork					
Roast Pork/Dressing	5	1	3	4	13
Pork Chops	1	2	9	4	15
Pork Cutlet	5	2	9	5	21
Pork Tenderloin	1	1			2
Sweet & Sour Pork/Rice			1		1
Pork Chop Suey		1	3	1	5
Sausage Patty		1	2		3
Spareribs	1		1		2
Ham - Whole					
Baked Ham	5	3	12	10	30
Canadian Bacon	1	2	3		6
Bar B-Q Cello Ham	1				1
Grilled Cello Ham	1		1	1	3
Ham - Cubed & Ground					
Ham Balls & Rice		1		1	2
Pork & Noodle Casserole		1			1
Ham Patties		1			1

TABLE A, Continued

Item	Cordell	Stout	Parker	Drummond	Total
Ham & Beans	4	1	3	4	12
Ham & Noodle Au Gratin	1		1		2
Ham A La King	1				1
Creamed Ham	1				1
Ham Fritters			1		1
Ham Loaf	2	1	4	3	10
Ham Sandwich	1				1
Ham & Potato Escalloped	1	1			2
Ham Logs		1		1	2
Miscellaneous					
Franks					
Franks & Baked Beans	1	1	3	2	7
French Fried Franks	1			1	2
Franks & Hot Potato Salad	1			1	2
Bar B-Q Franks		1		1	2
Franks & Sauerkraut		1		2	3
Franks, Cheese, Bacon			2		2
Tamales/Chili		1			1
Macaroni & Cheese	1	1	5	2	9
Plantation Shortcake	1	1	3	1	6
Corned Beef Hash		1	3	1	5
Beef - Cubed					
Hungarian Goulash	1		2	2	5
Beef Stew	3	1	3	4	11
Escalloped Beef	1	1	3	3	8

TABLE A, Continued

Item	Cordell	Stout	Scott Parker	Kerr Drummond	Total
Beef - Cubed, continued					
Beef Chop Suey					
Bar B-Q Beef/Bun	1		1	1	3
Braised Beef & Noodles	1	2	5	3	11
Beef Stroganoff/Rice		2	1	2	5
Beef Pot Pie/Crust	1		2		3
Beef Paprikash		1			1
Beef - Ground					
Chili	3		4	4	11
Spanish Meat Loaf				2	2
Meat Loaf	4	3	9	8	24
Austrian Ravioli	1	1	4	3	9
Meat Balls/Spaghetti	1			1	2
Lasagna	1		2	2	5
Schoolboy/Bun	1				1
Chili Mac	3		2		5
Salisbury Steak	1	1	1	1	4
Hamburger Steak	1				1
Spaghetti Neopolitan	1				1
Italian Spaghetti	1	1	3	4	9
Beef Biscuit Roll	1				1
Chuck Wagon Steak		1	4	2	7
Spaghetti & Meat Sauce		1	1	1	3
Porcupine Meat Balls		1		1	2
Quaker Spaghetti			2		2
Baked Pepper Steak			1		1

TABLE A, Continued

Item	Cordell	Stout	Scott Parker	Kerr Drummond	Total
Beef - Ground, continued					
Spanish Rice				1	1
Hot Tamale Pie				1	1
Sicilian Chopped Steak				1	1
Beef Croquettes				1	1
Beef - Whole Meat					
Roast Beef	7	5	13	11	36
Pot Roast of Beef/Vegetables		2	1		3
Italian Beef Patty		1	4	2	7
Hawaiian Beef Patty		1	3	2	6
Bar B-Q Beef Brisket		1	3	2	6
Beef - Steaks					
Smothered Steak	4	2	2	3	11
Breaded Grill Steak	3	4	8	9	24
Baked Steak	2	2	1	4	9
Breaded Chopped Sirloin Steak	4	2	5	4	16
Country Fried Steak	1	3	5	3	12
Breaded Beef Cutlet	1		1		2
Swiss Steak		1	6	4	11
Grilled Chopped T-Bone		1		6	7
Bar B-Q Steak				1	1

TABLE A, Continued

Item	Cordell	Stout	Scott Parker	Kerr Drummond	Total
Miscellaneous					
Creamed Chipped Beef/Baked Potato	1				1
Creamed Chipped Beef/Toast Cups			2		2
Liver & Onions	3	1	2	2	8
Veal					
Roast Veal	2	2	1	1	6
Veal Cutlet	3	3	2		8
Veal Steak	1		4		5
Chicken Fried Steak	1		4	3	8
Braised Veal Tips/Vegetables		1			1
Veal Parmesan			1	1	2
Veal Steaks Italian			1		1
Lamb					
Lamb Patties/Bacon		1			1
Fish					
Baked Halibut	1	2		2	5
Baked Red Snapper		1			1
Scallops		1		1	2
French Fried Shrimp		1	1	4	6
Catfish			1		1

TABLE A, Continued

Item	Cordell	Stout	Scott Parker	Kerr Drummond	Total
Fish, continued					
Cod Fillets	1		3	3	7
Baked Cod Fillet				2	2
Fish Fillet	3	1			4
Fillet of Sole			1		1
Perch	1		2	1	4
Baked Swordfish			2		2
Fish Sticks	3			1	4
Fish Cakes			1	1	2
Fish Puffies			2		2
Salmon Potato Chip Casserole		1		1	2
Tuna Potato Chip Casserole	2		2	1	5
Tuna Noodle Casserole	1			1	2
Fish Loaf	1	1			2
Salmon Patties		1		1	2
Salmon Croquettes		1	1		2
Shrimp Creole		1	2		3
Salmon Loaf			3	1	4
Salmon A La King				1	1

TABLE B

MASTER CYCLE MENU

RESIDENCE HALLS FOOD SERVICE

Week No. 1

Day of Week	Lunch	Dinner
Sunday	Fried Chicken Baked Steak Whipped Potatoes/Brown Chicken Gravy Buttered Broccoli Spears Buttered or Glazed Carrots	
Monday	French Onion Soup Quaker Spaghetti Fishwich on Bun Green Beans Buttered Spinach/Egg Wedges or Bacon Bits Hominy O'Brien	Oven Fried Liver/ Onions Breaded Beef Grill Steak Au Gratin Potatoes Cinnamon Apple Slices Buttered Mixed Vegetables
Tuesday	Chicken Rice Soup Hawaiian Hamburger Patty Ham & Noodles Au Gratin Green Beans Black Eyed Peas Ranch Style Beans French Fried Okra	French Fried Perch Meat Loaf Parsley Buttered Potatoes Whole Kernel Yellow Corn Buttered Brussels Sprouts
Wednesday	Pepper Pot Soup Salmon Croquettes/ Parsley Sauce Chili/Beans Green Beans Whole Tomatoes Celery Au Gratin	Fried Chicken Bar B-Q Spareribs Whipped Potatoes/ Chicken Gravy Green Peas/Mushrooms Whole Spiced Peach

TABLE B, Continued

Day of Week	Lunch	Dinner
Thursday	Beef Noodle Soup Sliced Corned Beef/ Cabbage Wedge Chicken Salad Sandwich Green Beans Cinnamon Pear Halves Yellow Squash	Roast Beef/Parsley Grilled Pork Cutlet Franconia/Brown Gravy Cauliflower/Au Gratin Pineapple Beets
Friday	Tomato Soup Grilled Cheese Sandwich Escalloped Beef & Potatoes Green Beans Ranch Style Beans Glazed Apricot Halves	Grilled Chopped Sirloin Baked Halibut/Dill Sauce Browned Potatoes Parsley Buttered Carrot Coins Buttered Lima Beans
Saturday	Breaded Veal Cutlet Grilled Ham Slice/ Pineapple Glazed Sweet Potatoes Cream Style Corn Asparagus Spears	Vegetable Soup Coney on Bun Fritos

TABLE B, Continued

Week No. 2

Day of Week	Lunch	Dinner
Sunday	Baked Pork Chop Fried Chicken Whipped Potatoes/ Brown Gravy Chicken Gravy Whole Green Beans/ Pimiento Cinnamoned Applesauce	
Monday	Tomato Soup Austrian Raviola Hamburger on Bun Green Beans Paprika Buttered Cauliflower Buttered Golden Hominy	New England Boiled Dinner Swiss Steak Buttered Rice Broiled Peach Halves Buttered Green Beans/ Pimiento
Tuesday	Potato Soup Ham & Beans/Cornbread Fish Sticks Green Beans Yellow Squash Harvard Beets	Baked Chicken - No Crust Breaded Beef Grills Mashed Potatoes/Brown & Giblet Gravy Stewed Tomatoes Lima Beans
Wednesday	Vegetable Soup Hot Beef Sandwich Frito Chili Pie Green Beans Black Eyed Peas Cream Style Corn	Grilled Pork Cutlet Turkey Supreme Paprika Buttered Potatoes Buttered Brussels Sprouts Cinnamon Pear Halves

TABLE B, Continued

Day of Week	Lunch	Dinner
Thursday	Canadian Cheese Soup Braised Beef/Noodles City Quail Green Beans Wilted Lettuce Tomatoes/Celery	Roast Veal/Peach Slice Charcoal Steakette Buttered Broccoli Parsley Buttered Carrot Coins
Friday	Cream of Mushroom Soup Tuna Burger Beef Stew Green Beans Spiced Peach Halves 7-Minute Cabbage	French Fried Shrimp/ 4 per serving Canadian Bacon/Pine-apple Sauce French Fries or Tater Tots Corn O'Brien Buttered Spinach/Hard Cooked Egg
Saturday	Roast Pork/Apple Ring Chopped T-Bones Lyonnaise Potatoes Mixed Vegetables Cauliflower Au Gratin	Pizza Cream of Chicken Soup

TABLE B, Continued

Week No. 3

Day of Week	Lunch	Dinner
Sunday	Baked Ham/Pineapple Ring Fried Chicken Baked Potato Peas/Mushrooms Glazed Carrot Sticks	
Monday	Beef Noodle Soup Italian Hamburger Patty Chicken Pot Pie/ Biscuit Green Beans Ranch Style Beans Creamed Pearl Onions	Pork Chow Mein Sliced Bar B-Q Beef Paprika Buttered Potatoes Cream Style Corn Buttered Brussels Sprouts
Tuesday	Tomato Soup Egg Salad Sandwich Chili Mac Green Beans Black Eyed Peas Broiled Apricot Halves	Chicken Fried Veal Steak Sliced Turkey/ Dressing Browned Potatoes Asparagus Spears Savory Yellow Squash
Wednesday	Mulligatawney Soup Cod Fillets/Tartar Sauce Creamed Chipped Beef/ Toast Bar B-Q on Bun Green Beans Spicy Rice Cheese Bake Pineapple Beets	Cheeseburger Loaf Baked Steak/Mushroom Gravy Mashed Potatoes Cinnamon Apples Broccoli/Cheese Sauce

TABLE B, Continued

Day of Week	Lunch	Dinner
Thursday	Vegetable Soup Chicken and Noodles Corned Beef Hash Green Beans Buttered Spinach Hominy O'Brien	Pork Tender Veal Parmesan Parsley Buttered Potatoes Lima Beans Whole Spiced Peach
Friday	Cream of Mushroom Soup Salmon Loaf/Parsley Sauce Grilled Ham Sandwich Green Beans French Fried Okra Cinnamon Pear Halves	Baked Haddock Fillets Chuck Wagon Steaks Au Gratin Potatoes Mixed Vegetables Breaded Tomatoes
Saturday	Maryland Chicken Pan Fried Steak Oven Browned Potato Casserole Turnip Greens Whole Kernel Yellow Corn	Submarine Sandwich Chips Chicken Noodle Soup

TABLE B, Continued

Week No. 4

Day of Week	Lunch	Dinner
Sunday	Pot Roast/Vegetables Baked Ham/Fruit Sauce Candied Sweet Potatoes/ Marshmallow Buttered Broccoli Harvard Beets	
Monday	Corn Chowder Beef Stroganoff/Rice Deep Fried Fish Cakes/ Dill Slice Green Beans Tomatoes/Okra Yellow Squash	Grilled Pork Chop Plantation Steak O'Brien Potatoes Succotash Spiced Apple Rings
Tuesday	Beef Noodle Soup Schoolboy/Bun Cheese Fondue Green Beans Buttered Cauliflower Wilted Lettuce	Baked Chicken Breasts/ Seasoned Rice/ Sherry Sauce Grilled Chopped Sirloin Browned Potatoes Brussels Sprouts Whole Spiced Peach
Wednesday	Cream of Celery Soup Sauerkraut/Franks Turkey Turnovers Green Beans Buttered Cauliflower Mixed Vegetables Cinnamon Pear Halves	Spaghetti/Meat Sauce Baked Red Snapper Au Gratin Potatoes Buttered Asparagus Whole Kernel Yellow Corn

TABLE B, Continued

Day of Week	Lunch	Dinner
Thursday	French Onion Soup Ham & Beans/Cornbread Spanish Meat Loaf Green Beans Buttered Spinach Orange Beets	Fried Chicken Swiss Steak Whipped Potatoes/ Giblet Gravy Green Peas Broiled Apricot Halves
Friday	Tomato Soup Macaroni/Cheese Ham Logs/Cherry Wine Sauce Green Beans Black Eyed Peas Parsley Buttered Carrots	Shrimp Creole/Rice Grilled Pork Cutlet Hash Browned Potatoes Buttered Hominy Buttered Broccoli
Saturday	Roast Veal/Peach Slice Chicken Chow Mein Franconia Potatoes Whole Green Beans/ Almonds Breaded Tomatoes	Canadian Cheese Soup Hamburger/Bun French Fried Onion Rings

TABLE B, Continued

Week No. 5

Day of Week	Lunch	Dinner
Sunday	Fried Chicken Roast Pork/Dressing Whipped Potatoes/ Brown, Giblet Gravy Cinnamon Apple Slices Buttered Brussels Sprouts	
Monday	Navy Bean Soup Bologna Sandwich Lasagna Green Beans Cream Style Corn 7-Minute Cabbage	Veal Steaks Chicken & Dumplings Parsley Buttered Potatoes Green Peas Glazed Pear Halves
Tuesday	Cream of Mushroom Soup Fish Puffies - 1½ oz. Hungarian Goulash Green Beans Black Eyed Peas Zucchini Squash	Salisbury Steaks/ Tomato Sauce Ham Mornay Lyonnaise Potatoes Buttered Whole Kernel Corn Asparagus
Wednesday	Pepper Pot Soup Baked Beans/Franks Hot Turkey Sandwich Green Beans Buttered Spinach Glazed Apricot Halves	Baked Swordfish Roast Beef Whipped Potatoes/ Brown Gravy Brussels Sprouts Pineapple Beets

TABLE B, Continued

Day of Week	Lunch	Dinner
Thursday	French Onion Soup Grilled Sausage Patty/ Glazed Pear Beef Pot Pie/Crust Green Beans Spanish Rice Buttered Hominy	Deviled Pork Chops Chicken Fried Steak Duchess Potatoes Glazed Carrots Buttered Broccoli
Friday	Vegetable Soup Pepper Steak Tuna Noodle Casserole Green Beans Ranch Style Beans Yellow Squash	Catfish Fry French Fries Mixed Vegetables Spiced Apple Rings
Saturday	Grilled T-Bone Baked Ham/Fruit Sauce Au Gratin Potatoes Seasoned Wax Beans Peas/Pimiento	Cream of Celery Soup Bar B-Q Beef/Bun Potato Chips

TABLE C

MASTER CYCLE MENU ANALYSIS

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION

Entrees	Week 1	2	3	4	5	Total
Beef Items						
Grilled Steaks	1					1
Baked Steaks	1		1			2
Fried Liver	1					1
Hawaiian Hamburger Patty	1					1
Meat Loaf	1					1
Corned Beef/Cabbage Wedge	1					1
Roast Beef	1				1	2
Escalloped Beef & Potatoes	1					1
Grilled Sirloin	1					1
Deep Fried Plantation Steak	1			1		2
Bar B-Q on Bun	1				1	2
Austrian Ravioli		1				1
Hot Beef Sandwich		1				1
Swiss Steak		1		1		2
Chili/Beans		1				1
Breaded Beef Grills		1				1
Braised Beef/Noodles		1				1
Bar B-Q Steakette		1				1
Roast Veal/Peach Slice		1		1		2
Beef Stew		1				1
Chopped T-Bones		1				1
Italian Hamburger Patty			1			1
Cheeseburger Loaf			1			1
Chicken Fried Veal Steaks			1			1
Sliced Bar B-Q Beef			1			1
Chili Mac			1			1
Creamed Chipped Beef/ Toast Cups			1			1
Corned Beef Hash			1			1
Veal Parmesan			1			1
Chuck Wagon Steaks			1			1
Pan Fried Steak			1			1
Pot Roast/Vegetables				1		1
Beef Stroganoff/Rice				1		1
Grilled Chopped Sirloin				1		1
Spaghetti/Meat Sauce				1		1
Spanish Meat Loaf				1		1
Hamburger/Bun					1	1
Lasagna					1	1
Italian Veal Steaks					1	1
Salisbury Steaks/ Tomato Sauce					1	1

TABLE C, Continued

Entrees	Week 1	2	3	4	5	Total
Beef Items, continued						
Beef Pot Pie					1	1
Chicken Fried Steaks					1	1
Pepper Steak					1	1
Grilled T-Bone					1	1
New England Boiled Dinner		1				1
Schoolboy/Bun				1		1
Hungarian Goulash/Rice					1	1
Pork Items						
Ham & Noodles Au Gratin	1					1
Ham & Beans/Corn Bread	1			1		2
Bar B-Q Ribs (Pork)	1					1
Pork Cutlet	1	1		1	1	4
Grilled Ham/P. A. Slice	1					1
Baked Pork Chop		1				1
City Quails		1				1
Ham Loaf/Fruit Cocktail Sauce		1				1
Canadian Bacon/P. A. Sauce		1				1
Roast Pork/Dressing		1				1
Baked Ham/P.A. Slice			1	1		2
Pork Chow Mein			1			1
Deep Fried Pork Tenderloin			1			1
Ground Sausage Patty					1	1
Submarine Sandwich			1			1
Plantation Shortcake/ Corn Bread		1				1
Bar B-Q Cello Ham			1			1
Grilled Pork Chops				1		1
Sauerkraut/Franks				1		1
Bologna Sandwich					1	1
Baked Beans/Franks					1	1
Deviled Pork Chops					1	1
Fish Items						
Fishwich on Bun	1					1
Baked Halibut	1					1
Salmon Croquettes	1					1
French Fried Perch	1					1
Deep Fried Cod Fillets		1				1
French Fried Shrimp		1				1
Tuna Burger		1				1
Fish Sticks/Tartar Sauce		1				1
Salmon Loaf			1			1

TABLE C, Continued

Entrees	Week 1	2	3	4	5	Total
Fish Items, continued						
Baked Cod Fish Fillets			1			1
Deep Fried Fish Cakes				1		1
Baked Red Snapper				1		1
Shrimp Creole/Rice				1		1
Fish Puffies					1	1
Baked Swordfish					1	1
Catfish Fry					1	1
Tuna Noodle Casserole					1	1
Poultry Items						
Fried Chicken	2	1	1	1	1	6
Chicken Tetrazzini	1					1
Baked Chicken		1				1
Turkey Supreme		1				1
Chicken Pot Pie			1			1
Sliced Turkey/Dressing			1			1
Egg Salad Sandwich			1			1
Chicken & Noodles			1			1
Maryland Chicken			1			1
Baked Chicken Breasts/ Seasoned Rice/Sherry Sauce				1		1
Chicken Chow Mein				1		1
Chicken & Dumplings					1	1
Hot Turkey Sandwich					1	1
Other Items						
Quaker Spaghetti	1					1
Grilled Cheese Sandwich	1					1
Pizza		1				1
Cheese Fondue				1		1
Soups						
Chicken & Rice Soup	1					1
Cream of Chicken Soup		1				1
Chicken Noodle Soup			1			1
Pepper Pot Soup	1				1	2
Beef Noodle Soup	1		1	1		3
Tomato Soup	1	1	1	1		4
French Onion Soup	1			1	1	3
Vegetable Soup	1	1	1		1	4
Cream of Mushroom Soup		1	1		1	3
Potato Soup		1				1
Canadian Cheese Soup		1		1		2

TABLE C, Continued

Entrees	Week 1	2	3	4	5	Total
Soups, continued						
Cream of Celery Soup				1	1	2
Mulligatawney Soup			1			1
Corn Chowder				1		1
Navy Bean Soup					1	1
Vegetables						
Potatoes						
Whips/Gravy	2	2	1	1	2	8
Parsley Buttered Potatoes	1	1	1		1	4
Franconia Potatoes	1			1		2
Browned Potatoes	1	1	1	1		4
Duchess Potatoes	1				1	2
Paprika Buttered Potatoes		1	1			2
Escalloped Potatoes		1				1
Lyonnaise Potatoes		1				1
Baked Potatoes			1			1
Oven Baked Potato Casserole			1			1
Au Gratin Potatoes			1			1
O'Brien Potatoes			1	1	1	3
Hash Browned Potatoes				1		1
French Fries					1	1
Sweet Potatoes						
Glazed Sweet Potatoes	1					1
Candied Sweet Potatoes/ Marshmallows				1		1
Apples						
Sliced Apple Slices					1	1
Cinnamoned Apples	1		1			2
Cinnamon Applesauce		1				1
Escalloped Apples		1				1
Spiced Apple Rings				1		1
Apricots						
Broiled Apricot Halves				1	1	2
Glazed Apricot Halves	1				1	2
Beans						
Seasoned Wax Beans				1		1
Buttered Lima Beans	1	1	1		1	4
Ranch Style Beans	1		1		1	3
Green Beans	5	5	5	5	5	25
Green Beans/Almonds				1		1

TABLE C, Continued

Entrees	Week 1	2	3	4	5	Total
Vegetables, continued						
Beans, continued						
Green Beans, Pimiento		1				1
Beets						
Pineapple Beets	1		1		1	3
Harvard Beets		1		1		2
Orange Beets				1		1
Carrots						
Lyonnaise Carrot Strips	1					1
Glazed Carrot Sticks			1			1
Parsley Buttered Carrot Coins	1	1		1		3
Corn						
Whole Kernel Yellow Corn	1		1	1	1	4
Pepi-Corn		1				1
Cream Style Corn	1	1	1		1	4
Broccoli						
Buttered Broccoli Spears	1	1		2	1	5
Broccoli/Cheese Sauce			1			1
Hominy						
Hominy O'Brien	1		1			2
Buttered Golden Hominy		1		1	1	3
Onions						
French Fried Onion Rings				1		1
Creamed Pearl Onions			1			1
Peaches						
Whole Sliced Peach	1					1
Broiled Peach Halves		1				1
Spiced Peach Halves		1				1
Whole Spiced Peach			1	1		2
Pears						
Cinnamon Pear Halves	1	1	1	1		4
Glazed Pear Halves					1	1
Peas						
Black-Eyed Peas	1	1	1	1	1	5
Buttered Green Peas/ Pimiento	1				1	2
Green Peas					1	1

TABLE C, Continued

Entrees	Week 1	2	3	4	5	Total
Vegetables, continued						
Peas, continued						
Peas/Mushrooms	1		1			1
Rice						
Spanish Rice					1	1
Spicy Rice Cheese Bake			1			1
Spinach						
Buttered Spinach	1		1	1	1	4
Buttered Spinach/ Hard Cooked Egg			1			1
Squash						
Zucchini Squash					1	1
Yellow Squash	1	1	1	1	1	5
Tomatoes						
Whole Tomatoes	1					1
Tomatoes/Celery		1				1
Stewed Tomatoes		1				1
Breaded Tomatoes			1	1		2
Tomatoes & Okra				1		1
Other Vegetable Items						
Mixed Vegetables	1	1	1	1	1	5
French Fried Okra	1		1			2
Buttered Brussel Sprouts	1	1	1	1	1	5
Celery Au Gratin	1			1		2
Buttered Cauliflower	1	1		1		3
Asparagus Spears	1		1	1	1	4
Wilted Lettuce		1				1
7-Minute Cabbage		1				1
Turnip Greens			1			1
Succotash				1		1

TABLE D

RESIDENCE HALLS FOOD SERVICE

FOOD COST COMPARISON

SUMMARY

Fall Semester, 1966

	Cordell	Murray	Stout	Scott Parker	Kerr Drummond	Total
Student Count	542	452	430	1047	1325	3796
Beef	2599.38	1518.41	2270.85	4970.39	7543.08	18902.11
Cost/Student	4.80	3.36	5.28	4.75	5.69	4.98
Veal	325.65	196.43	100.17	289.00	572.20	1483.45
Cost/Student	.60	.43	.23	.28	.43	.39
Pork	1054.61	1062.96	1024.16	2141.08	3148.26	8431.07
Cost/Student	1.95	2.35	2.38	2.04	2.38	2.22
Poultry	466.39	485.11	471.44	893.54	1258.01	3574.49
Cost/Student	.86	1.07	1.10	.85	.95	.94
Fish and Seafood	418.35	535.30	377.69	703.75	1549.45	3584.54
Cost/Student	.77	1.18	.88	.72	1.17	.94
TOTAL	4864.77	3798.21	4244.88	8997.76	14071.00	35975.66
Cost/Student	8.98	8.39	9.87	8.64	10.62	9.47

TABLE D

RESIDENCE HALLS FOOD SERVICE

FOOD COST COMPARISON

SUMMARY

Spring Semester, 1967

	Cordell	Murray	Stout	Scott Parker	Kerr Drummond	Total
Student Count	486	391	383	1011	1278	3549
Beef	2051.21	1253.33	1036.50	4563.33	5304.43	14208.80
Cost/Student	4.22	3.21	2.71	4.51	4.15	4.00
Veal	340.50	235.49	324.43	767.98	1066.00	2734.40
Cost/Student	.70	.60	.85	.76	.83	.77
Pork	1181.09	1031.55	943.44	2294.65	3472.97	8923.70
Cost/Student	2.43	2.64	2.46	2.27	2.72	2.51
Poultry	485.42	447.84	450.32	1454.50	1471.81	4309.89
Cost/Student	1.00	1.15	1.18	1.44	1.15	1.21
Fish and Seafood	348.66	338.29	366.95	765.93	1533.70	3353.53
Cost/Student	.72	.87	.96	.76	1.20	.95
TOTAL	4406.88	3306.50	3121.64	9846.39	12848.91	33530.32
Cost/Student	9.07	8.46	8.15	9.74	10.05	9.45

TABLE D

FOOD COST COMPARISON

Cordell Cafeteria - Fall Semester, 1966

	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 5	Total	Price/	Total
Student Count	549	546	541	538	536	Lbs.	Pound	Cost
Beef Items								
Shoulder Roast	134	229.4				363.4	.78	283.45
Cubed Beef Stew	155	81	60			296	.67	198.30
Grill Steak	174	40	100	70	90	474	.65	308.10
Ground Beef	92	155	286	235	290	1058	.49	518.42
Chopped Beef Stew	80					80	.65	52.00
Cubed Beef Steak		48				48	.95	45.60
Beef Steak	64	248				312	.95	296.40
Liver		30		10		40	.60	24.00
Round Roast			71.5			71.5	.88	62.92
Chopped Sirloin Steak	95		74		104	273	.65	177.45
Ground Beef Patties			43.5	132.5	66	242	.53	128.26
Beef Chili Meat				77	80	157	.49	76.93
Chopped T-Bone				105		105	.65	68.25
Rib Eye Steak				221		221	1.60	353.60
Dried Beef					5	5	1.14	5.70
								2599.38
Pork Items								
Pork Chops	31.9		75.2		25.3	132.4	.89	117.84
Cello Cured Ham	35.2	21.7	22.2	22.3	20.5	121.9	.89	108.49
Cubed Pork	24.8	10				34.8	.49	17.05
Bacon	21.5	62		46.5		130	.64	83.20
Sausage Patties	47	73	52		63	235	.50	117.50

TABLE D, Continued

Student Count	Week 1 549	Week 2 546	Week 3 541	Week 4 538	Week 5 536	Total Lbs.	Price/ Pound	Total Cost
Pork Items, Continued								
Ground Pork	8.5		8			16.5	.45	7.43
Patio Ham	19				73.8	92.8	.96	89.09
4 x 4 Ham		8				8	1.21	9.68
Franks		24	48	14	76	162	.48	77.76
Salami		12				12	.525	6.30
Cured Shank and Pieces		48	36			84	.57	47.88
Pork Cutlets		85	53	102		240	.70	168.00
Pork Chops, End Cut			47			47	.89	41.83
Pork Ribs			26			26	.50	13.00
Cello Cured Ham #2			24	56		80	.79	63.20
Pork Roast				128.9		128.9	.67	86.36
								1054.61
Veal Items								
Luncheon Steaks				80	90	170	.87	147.90
Veal Round Roast		79			38	117	.85	99.45
Veal Steaks			90			90	.87	78.30
								325.65
Poultry Items								
Fryers, Cut	389	75	132	93	188	877	.3275	287.22
Turkey	68.6	91.7	91.6			251.9	.39	98.24
Turkey Roll		27				27	.91	24.57
Turkey, Grade A			122.4		22.1	144.5	.39	56.36
								466.39

TABLE D, Continued

	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 5	Total	Price/	Total
Student Count	549	546	541	538	536	Lbs.	Pound	Cost
Fish and Seafood Items								
Cod Fillets, 3 oz.	90					90	.43	38.70
Cod Fillets, 4 oz.	40	30	114	150	60	394	.42	165.48
Perch	20					20	.56	11.25
Shrimp	90		20			110	1.12	123.20
Fish Sticks	100					100	.43	43.00
Catfish	72					72	.51	36.72
								418.35

TABLE D, Continued

Murray Cafeteria - Fall Semester, 1966

	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 5	Total	Price/	Total
Student Count	428	450	451	478	451	Lbs.	Pound	Cost
Beef Items								
Beef Steak	25.4		52.5			77.9	.95	74.01
Shoulder Roast	35	147.2	168.5	61	57	468.7	.78	365.59
Swiss Steak	48.5					48.5	.90	43.65
Ground Beef	149	114	99	120	235	717	.49	351.33
Ground Beef Patties	41	64.5		58	33	196.5	.53	104.15
Chopped Sirloin	52	53				105	.65	68.25
Chopped T-Bone		63		75		138	.65	89.70
Corned Beef	12	12			24	48	.69	33.12
Dried Beef		10				10	1.14	11.40
Chili Meat		40	169	50		259	.49	126.91
Liver			40	40		80	.60	48.00
Grill Steaks	70			100	100	270	.65	175.50
Cubed Stew Meat				40		40	.67	26.80
								1518.41
Pork Items								
Bacon	45	67			44	156	.64	99.84
Ground Pork	10	20	24			54	.45	24.30
Heat & Eat Link Sausage	48			42		90	.80	72.00
Salami	11.7					11.7	.5250	6.14
Bologna	12.5	7.2		7.2		26.9	.3750	10.09
Pullman Ham	20	20	10			50	.88	44.00
Tenderloin Cutlets	40.5					40.5	.70	28.35
Franks	50		12	60	102	224	.48	107.52
Cello Cured Ham	45.8	55	20.8			121.6	.79	96.06

TABLE D, Continued

Student Count	Week 1 428	Week 2 450	Week 3 451	Week 4 478	Week 5 451	Total Lbs.	Price/ Pound	Total Cost
Pork Items, Continued								
Pork Roast	21	69	50.5			140.5	.67	94.14
Pork Chops		20		75	59.5	154.5	.89	137.51
Patio Ham		77.8	40	33.6	69.7	221.1	.96	212.26
Pork Cutlets			53	42.5	63.2	158.7	.55	87.29
Patio Ham, #2				16		16	.81	12.96
Spareribs					61	61	.50	30.50
								1062.96
Veal Items								
Luncheon Steak	60			50		110	.87	95.70
Veal Steaks	50		30			80	.87	68.00
Veal Roast				38.5		38.5	.85	32.73
								196.43
Poultry Items								
Turkey	183.8	179.4	24.2	98.5	63.9	549.8	.39	214.42
Fryers, Cut		162	156		264	582	.3275	190.61
Turkey Rolls		16		72		88	.91	80.08
								485.11
Fish and Seafood Items								
Cod Fillets, 4 oz.		10			30	40	.42	16.80
Halibut				40		40	.79	31.60
Salmon	24				28	52	.89	46.28

TABLE D, Continued

Student Count	Week 1 428	Week 2 450	Week 3 451	Week 4 478	Week 5 451	Total Lbs.	Price/ Pound	Total Cost
Fish and Seafood Items, Con't.								
Tuna	12	8	4	24	48	48	.58	27.84
Shrimp	60	40				100	1.12	112.00
Fish Sticks					42.5	42.5	.43	18.28
Cod, Unbreaded		30			30	60	.52	31.20
Catfish				30		30	.51	15.30
Salad Shrimp				200		200	.85	170.00
Sole					50	50	.52	26.00
Scallops					50	50	.80	40.00
								535.30

TABLE D, Continued

Stout Cafeteria - Fall Semester, 1966

	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 5	Total	Price/	Total
Student Count	429	433	432	432	426	Lbs.	Pound	Cost
Beef Items								
Chopped Sirloin	109		50	135.5	96	390.5	.65	253.83
Chopped Stew Meat	70		45			115	.65	74.75
Shoulder Roast	36.2		74.3	34.7	70	215.2	.78	167.86
Liver	30					30	.60	18.00
Beef Steaks	75	74		86.5	233	368.5	.95	350.08
Ground Beef	180	115	60	71	154	580	.49	284.70
Grill Steaks	100		80	80		260	.65	169.00
Round Roast	98		59.5	58	68	283.5	.75	212.63
Ground Beef Patties		63			158	221	.53	117.13
Brisket		130.5				130.5	.65	84.83
Cubed Stew Meat		60	96	70		226	.67	151.42
Rib Eye Steak		174				174	1.60	278.40
Corned Beef			18			18	.69	12.42
Rib Eye Roast				56		56	.85	47.60
Chili Meat				100		100	.49	49.00
								2270.85
Pork Items								
Cured Ham Shanks	54					54	.57	30.78
Sausage Patties	29.7	14			21.5	65.2	.50	32.60
Franks	35	120				155	.48	74.40
Pork Cutlets	52.5	61	53			166.5	.70	116.55
Bacon	66	86.7	48			200.7	.64	128.45
Pork Chops	81		31.5		23	135.5	.89	120.60

TABLE D, Continued

	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 5	Total	Price/	Total
Student Count	429	433	432	432	426	Lbs.	Pound	Cost
Pork Items, Continued								
Cello Ham		45	45.4	88.5		178.9	.89	159.04
Canadian Bacon		21			33	54	.86	46.44
Heat & Eat Link Sausage		24	12	18		54	.80	43.20
Patio Ham		36	52.5			88.5	.96	84.96
Cubed Fresh Pork			35	12.5		47.5	.49	23.28
Ground or Cubed Cured Ham			15	24	16	55	.83	45.65
Pullman Ham 4 x 4			6.7		16	22.7	.96	21.79
Fresh Ground Pork				12	6	18	.45	8.10
Pork Tenderloin Cutlets				40.5		40.5	.70	28.35
Pork Roast					89.5	89.5	.67	59.97
								1024.16
Veal Items								
Veal Roast	50.2					50.2	.85	42.67
Veal Stew Meat			20			20	.70	14.00
Veal Steaks			50			50	.87	43.50
								100.17
Poultry Items								
Turkey		93.8	287.7			371.5	.39	144.89
Fryers, Cut	171	287	73	138	110	697	.3275	228.27
Turkey Rolls			18	36	54	108	.91	98.28
								471.44

TABLE D, Continued

Student Count	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 5	Total Lbs.	Price/ Pounds	Total Cost
Lamb Items								
Ground Lamb			10			10	.35	3.50
								3.50
Fish and Seafood Items								
Cod Fillets, 4 oz.	15	40		60		115	.42	48.30
Halibut				75		75	.79	59.25
Salmon		22	44			66	.89	58.74
Tuna	36	12	4	4	4	60	.58	34.80
Shrimp					80	80	1.12	89.60
Fish Sticks		90				90	.43	38.70
Red Snapper Fillets			70			70	.69	48.30
								377.69

TABLE D, Continued

Scott-Parker Cafeteria - Fall Semester, 1966

	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 5	Total	Price/	Total
Student Count	1051	1045	1048	1047	1043	Lbs.	Pound	Cost
Beef Items								
Ground Beef	263	287	284	478	161	1473	.49	721.77
Swiss Steak	120.5					120.5	.90	108.45
Ground Beef Patties	276.5	166	119	258.5	245	1065	.53	564.45
Chopped Stew Meat	210	150	160	112		632	.65	410.80
Grill Steaks	190	150	130	260	90	820	.65	533.00
Round Roast	182	111.4	174			467.4	.75	350.55
Beef Steaks	88	226	264	135		713	.95	677.35
Rib Eye Roast	151			102		253	.85	215.05
Cubed Beef Stew	35	90				125	.67	83.75
Brisket		203				203	.65	131.95
Chopped Sirloin		200	107	109		416	.65	270.40
Corned Beef			54		12	66	.69	45.54
Chili Meat			50	140		190	.49	93.10
Dried Beef				15		15	1.14	17.10
Strip Loin Steaks					410	410	1.60	656.00
Beef Cow Round					121.5	121.5	.75	91.13
								4970.39
Pork Items								
Pork Chops	122.5			206.5	168.8	497.8	.89	443.04
Cubed Fresh Pork	30				36	66	.49	32.34
Pork Cutlets	126.5		84.5	180		391	.70	273.70
Bacon	42.8	70	28	44	89	273.8	.64	175.23
Franks	10		60			70	.48	33.60

TABLE D, Continued

Student Count	Week 1 1051	Week 2 1045	Week 3 1048	Week 4 1047	Week 5 1043	Total Lbs.	Price/ Pound	Total Cost
Pork Items, Continued								
Cello Ham	91.6	58.5	116.7	32.5	63.5	362.8	.89	322.89
Patio Ham		186.3	103	88.2	186.2	563.7	.96	541.15
Heat & Eat Link Sausage		30	30		24	84	.80	67.20
Sausage Patties			65		33	98	.50	49.00
Canadian Bacon			75.6			75.6	.86	65.02
Boneless Pork Loin				152.5		152.5	.765	116.66
Pullman Ham				10		10	.88	8.80
Cubed Cured Ham					15	15	.83	12.45
								2141.08
Veal Items								
Veal Steaks		100			80	180	.85	153.00
Banquet Steaks					160	160	.85	136.00
								289.00
Poultry Items								
Turkey Rolls	208	81	126	153	117	685	.91	623.35
Fryers, Cut		424	208		193	825	.3275	270.19
								893.54
Fish and Seafood Items								
Salmon				108		108	.89	96.12
Perch	100		120			220	.56	123.20
Tuna	40	96	24		48	208	.58	120.64

TABLE D, Continued

Student Count	Week 1 1051	Week 2 1045	Week 3 1048	Week 4 1047	Week 5 1043	Total Lbs.	Price/ Pound	Total Cost
Fish and Seafood Items, Con't.								
Shrimp, Jumbo Breaded	80					80	1.12	89.60
Salad Shrimp				100		100	.85	85.00
Cod, Unbreaded			30		150	180	.52	93.60
Swordfish					121	121	.79	95.59
								703.75

TABLE D, Continued

Kerr-Drummond Cafeteria - Fall Semester, 1966

	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 5	Total	Price/	Total
Student Count	1324	1346	1341	1319	1297	Lbs.	Pound	Cost
Beef Items								
Ground Beef	394		537	589	352	1872	.49	917.28
Ground Beef Patties	204	395.5	307	141.5	219.5	1267.5	.53	671.78
Chopped Sirloin	310	351	265	468.4		1394.4	.65	906.36
Round Roast	173	270.9	161.5			605.4	.88	532.75
Grill Steaks	250	200	200		220	870	.65	565.50
Chopped Stew Meat	547	240	456	312	652	2207	.65	1434.55
Beef Steaks	205	184	131	196	196	912	.95	866.40
Loin Strip Steak	480					480	1.60	768.00
Chopped T-Bone	134			215		349	.65	226.85
Corn Beef		60	78			138	.69	95.22
Liver				120		120	.60	72.00
Roast (Cow Round)				265.5	123	385.5	.75	289.13
Chili Meat					136	136	.49	66.64
Roast (Steer)					179	179	.78	139.62
								7543.08
Pork Items								
Bacon	192.7	279	225.5		176.5	622.6	.64	398.46
Cello Cured Ham	203.4	58.5	105.3	98.8		466	.57	265.62
Franks	108	192			240	540	.475	256.50
Cello Ham #2	80					80	.79	63.20
Heat & Eat Link Sausage	126	102	210	120	120	678	.80	542.40
Ground Pork	16	15	40		32	103	.45	46.35
Cubed Fresh Pork		48			48	96	.49	47.04

TABLE D, Continued

Student Count	Week 1 1324	Week 2 1346	Week 3 1341	Week 4 1319	Week 5 1297	Total Lbs.	Price/ Pound	Total Cost
Pork Items, Continued								
Patio Ham #2		21	79			100	.81	81.00
Patio Ham		327.3		230.2	172	629.5	.96	604.32
Boneless Pork Loin		142		160		302	.67	202.34
Pork Cutlets			191		211	401	.70	280.70
Canadian Bacon			53			53	.86	45.58
Pork Chops			81.5			81.5	.89	72.54
Pullman Ham				20		20	.88	17.60
Sausage Patties				108		108	.50	54.00
Bologna					51	51	.375	19.13
Ground or Cubed Cured Ham			38.5		144	182.5	.83	151.48
								3148.26
Veal Items								
Veal Steaks	200			360		560	.87	487.20
Veal Banquet Steaks			100			100	.85	85.00
								572.20
Poultry Items								
Turkey Rolls	80	197	225	144	184	830	.91	755.30
Fryers, Cut	345	224	290	348	328	1535	.3275	502.71
								1258.01

TABLE D, Continued

Student Count	Week 1 1324	Week 2 1346	Week 3 1341	Week 4 1319	Week 5 1297	Total Lbs.	Price/ Pound	Total Cost
Fish and Seafood Items								
Cod Fillets, 4 oz.			150	150	150	450	.42	189.00
Salmon			80	80	20	180	.89	160.20
Perch		225	90			315	.56	176.40
Tuna		96	36	56	72	260	.58	150.80
Shrimp	240	120	200			560	1.12	627.20
Fish Sticks				135		135	.43	58.05
Catfish	180					180	.51	91.80
Scallops			120			120	.80	96.00
								1549.45

TABLE D, Continued

Cordell Cafeteria - Spring Semester, 1967

	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 5	Total	Price/	Total
Student Count	489	485	484	486	486	Lbs.	Pound	Cost
Beef Items								
Beef Steaks	44		93		31	168	.95	159.60
Ground Beef	220	100	70	84	200	674	.49	330.26
Grill Steaks	110	70			190	370	.65	240.50
Liver	20				20	40	.60	24.00
Ground Beef Patties	105.5		89	43		237.5	.53	125.88
Pickle Corn Beef Brisket	69					69	.74	51.06
Cube Steaks				91		91	.95	86.45
Chopped Stew Meat	50	135	8		145	338	.65	219.70
Chopped Sirloin Steak	75	40		85		200	.65	130.00
Round Roast	48.5	56	69		187.5	361	.75	270.75
Beef Brisket		172	71.7			243.7	.65	158.41
T-Bone Steak		196				196	1.00	196.00
Chopped T-Bone Steak		53.5				53.5	.65	34.78
Dried Beef			10			10	1.14	11.40
Corn Beef			18			18	.69	12.42
								2051.21
Pork Items								
Sausage Patties	21	21	52		82.2	176.2	.50	88.10
Cubed Cured Ham	47	26		40		113	.83	93.79
Ground Pork	6	5	4	5		20	.45	9.00
Pork Cutlets	64	54.5		86	86.7	291.2	.70	203.84
Pork Spareribs	67					67	.50	33.50
Cello Ham	23.5	11	76.2	45	118	167.5	.89	149.08
Franks	28	60		24	72	184	.48	88.30

TABLE D, Continued

Student Count	Week 1 489	Week 2 485	Week 3 484	Week 4 486	Week 5 486	Total Lbs.	Price/ Pound	Total Cost
Pork Items, Continued								
Pork Chops		52.5		87.8	43.2	183.5	.89	163.32
Bacon (End Cut)		20				20	.29	5.80
Bacon		66			84	150	.64	96.00
Pork Roast		61.5		54.5		116	.67	77.72
Patio Ham		9	16.6	25.5		51.1	.96	49.06
Cubed Fresh Pork			15		35	50	.49	24.50
Bologna			51.2		26	77.2	.375	28.95
Salami			8.2			8.2	.525	4.31
Tenderloin Cutlets			94			94	.70	65.80
								1181.09
Veal Items								
Luncheon Steak	60		150		70	280	.87	243.60
Veal Roast		54		60		114	.85	96.90
								340.50
Poultry Items								
Turkey Rolls	32	32	36	40	45	185	.91	168.35
Fryers, Cut	165	207		225.4		597.4	.3275	195.65
Boneless Fryers Breasts				87.4		87.4	1.06	92.64
Turkey					73.8	73.8	.39	28.78
								485.42

TABLE D, Continued

Student Count	Week 1 489	Week 2 485	Week 3 484	Week 4 486	Week 5 486	Total Lbs.	Price/ Pound	Total Cost
Fish and Seafood Items								
Cod Fillets, 3 oz.		60				60	.43	25.80
Halibut				54.5		54.5	.79	43.06
Shrimp	50			60		110	1.12	123.20
Fish Puffies			90			90	.58	52.20
Red Snapper			60			60	.69	41.40
Swordfish			60			60	.79	47.40
Cod					30	30	.52	15.60
								348.66

TABLE D, Continued

Murray Cafeteria - Spring Semester, 1967

Student Count	Week 1 395	Week 2 396	Week 3 387	Week 4 390	Week 5 389	Total Lbs.	Price/ Pound	Total Cost
Beef Items								
Beef Steaks	19	48	50.2			252.2	.95	239.59
Liver	20					20	.60	12.00
Grill Steaks	80	20				100	.65	65.00
Ground Beef		51	74	127		252	.49	123.48
Strip Loin Steak	154.5					154.5	1.60	247.20
Ground Beef Patties	52.5	31.2	52.5	53		189.2	.53	100.28
Round Roast	55				49	104	.75	78.00
Pickle Corn Beef Brisket	26.5				20	46.5	.69	32.09
Chopped Sirloin	42.5	55.5		42		140	.65	91.00
Chopped Stew Meat	30	72			30	132	.65	95.80
Beef Brisket		79.5	51			130.5	.65	84.83
Shoulder Roast		28				28	.78	21.84
Chuck Roast			43.5			43.5	.78	33.93
Cubed Beef Stew				12	25	37	.67	24.79
Cube Steaks				15		15	.90	13.50
								1253.33
Pork Items								
Salami			10	3.7		13.7	.525	7.19
Cello Ham	34.6	22.5	41.8	23		121.9	.79	96.30
Cubed Cured Ham	40	24				64	.83	53.12
Spareribs	100.3					100.3	.50	50.15
Heat & Eat Link Sausage	36	36		30		102	.80	81.60
Pork Cutlets	64	32.5		44.2	52.5	193.2	.55	106.26

TABLE D, Continued

Student Count	Week 1 395	Week 2 396	Week 3 387	Week 4 390	Week 5 389	Total Lbs.	Price/ Pound	Total Cost
Pork Items, Continued								
Pullman Ham	22	11		33		66	.88	58.08
Patio Ham	25.2		23	24.4		72.6	.96	69.70
Franks	24	36		84	40	184	.48	88.32
Pork Chops		11.2		74.9	52.5	138.3	.89	123.09
Bacon		43	22			65	.64	41.60
Fresh Ground Pork		8		15	8	31	.45	13.95
Canadian Bacon		25.3				25.3	.86	21.76
Pork Roast		67.2		30.8		98	.67	65.66
Bologna		6	10		10	26	.375	97.50
Cubed Fresh Pork			13			13	.49	6.37
Tenderloin Cutlets			42			42	.70	29.40
Sausage Patties				22	21	43	.50	21.50
								1031.55
Veal Items								
Round Roast		36		39.4		75.4	.85	64.09
Luncheon Steaks			20		50	70	.87	60.90
Banquet Steaks	40		40		50	130	.85	110.50
								235.49
Poultry Items								
Fryers	244	155		214		613	.3275	200.76
Turkey	67.2	45.6	92.5	70.2	25.5	291	.39	113.49
Turkey Rolls			9		36	45	.91	40.95
Boneless Fryers Breasts				87.4		87.4	1.06	92.64
								447.84

TABLE D, Continued

	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 5	Total	Price/	Total
Student Count	395	396	387	390	389	Lbs.	Pound	Cost
Fish and Seafood Items								
Cod Fillets, 4 oz.			40			40	.42	16.80
Halibut	40					40	.79	31.60
Salmon	44					44	.89	39.16
Perch					30	30	.56	16.80
Tuna	8	32		16		56	.58	32.48
Shrimp	40					40	1.12	44.80
Fish Sticks					31.5	31.5	.43	13.55
Cod, Unbreaded			40			40	.52	20.80
Fish Puffies				10		10	.58	5.80
Swordfish				50		50	.79	39.50
Catfish	40				50	90	.51	45.90
Sole	20					20	.52	10.40
Red Snapper			30			30	.69	20.70
								338.29

TABLE D, Continued

Stout Cafeteria - Spring Semester, 1967

	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 5	Total	Price/	Total
Student Count	385	383	383	383	382	Lbs.	Pound	Cost
Beef Items								
Ground Beef	65	52	102	101	95	415	.49	203.35
Ground Beef Patties	63		10.2	65		138.2	.53	73.25
Pickle Corn Beef Brisket	35.8					35.8	.69	24.70
Round Roast	40				89.5	129.5	.75	97.13
Cubed Beef Stew	25					25	.67	16.75
Chopped Sirloin	42.5	46.5		42		131	.65	85.15
Beef Steak		38.5	32		56.2	126.7	.95	120.37
Grill Steak		50			70	120	.65	78.00
Chopped Stew Meat		100.5		36	90	226.5	.65	147.23
Shoulder Roast		50				50	.78	39.00
Chopped T-Bone		43			43	86	.65	55.90
Beef Brisket			72.6			72.6	.65	47.19
Can Corn Beef			12			12	.69	8.28
Dried Beef			5			5	1.14	5.70
Cube Steak				25		25	.90	22.50
Liver					20	20	.60	12.00
								1036.50
Pork Items								
Cubed Cured Ham	45	18		50		113	.83	93.79
Spareribs	30.4					30.4	.50	15.20
Pork Cutlets	43	54.5		53.7	75.9	227.1	.70	158.97
Cello Ham	31.5		63			94.5	.89	84.11
Patio Ham			33.3	59.7	9.3	102.3	.96	98.21

TABLE D, Continued

Student Count	Week 1 385	Week 2 383	Week 3 383	Week 4 383	Week 5 382	Total Lbs.	Price/ Pound	Total Cost
Pork Items, Continued								
Pullman Ham		11	22			33	.88	29.04
Franks	24	48		48	80	200	.48	96.00
Heat & Eat Link Sausage	24		24	24		72	.80	57.60
Pork Chops		43.8		49.5		93.3	.89	83.04
Canadian Bacon		40.5				40.5	.86	34.83
Pork Roast		35				35	.67	23.45
Bacon			68	23		91	.64	58.24
Tenderloin Cutlets			66			66	.70	46.20
Fresh Curbed Pork			15			15	.49	7.35
Salami			8.2			8.2	.525	43.05
Bologna			8.5		15.4	23.9	.375	8.96
Ground Pork				12		12	.45	5.40
								943.44
Veal Items								
Round Roast		42		38.5		80.5	.85	68.43
Luncheon Steaks			50			50	.87	43.50
Banquet Steaks	40		100		110	250	.85	212.50
								324.43
Poultry Items								
Fryers	110	167	56	262		595	.3275	194.86
Turkey Rolls	24	8	81	32	26	171	.91	155.61
Boneless Fryers Breasts				94.2		94.2	1.06	99.85
								450.32

TABLE D, Continued

Student Count	Week 1 385	Week 2 383	Week 3 383	Week 4 383	Week 5 382	Total Lbs.	Price/ Pound	Total Cost
Fish and Seafood Items								
Cod Fillets, 4 oz.	60		30			90	.42	37.80
Salmon	30		25			55	.89	48.95
Tuna	4	44	4	12	48	112	.58	64.96
Shrimp		32			30	62	1.12	69.44
Fish Sticks		30	30			60	.43	25.80
Fish Puffies				60		60	.58	34.80
Swordfish				30		30	.79	23.70
Red Snapper				30		30	.69	20.70
Catfish Fillets				80		80	.51	40.80
								366.95

TABLE D, Continued

Scott-Parker Cafeteria - Spring Semester, 1967

	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 5	Total	Price/	Total
Student Count	1017	1014	1010	1006	1007	Lbs.	Pound	Cost
Beef Items								
Ground Beef	245	176.5	420	430	380	1660.5	.49	813.65
Liver	80				50	130	.60	78.00
Chopped Sirloin	374.5	181	156	155	118.5	985	.65	640.25
Ground Beef Patties	259.5	83	212.5	225	52.5	732.5	.53	388.23
Strip Loin Steak	394.5			237.5		632	1.60	1011.20
Roast (Round Cow)	176		133		271	580	.75	203.25
Chuck Roast	23.2					23.2	.78	18.10
Cubed Beef Stew	10					10	.67	6.70
Pickle Corn Beef Brisket	123					123	.69	84.87
Beef Brisket		134.5	253			387.5	.65	251.88
Beef Steaks		144.5	242.4		56	442.9	.95	420.76
Grill Steaks		100				100	.65	65.00
Chopped Stew Meat		240		88	350	678	.65	440.70
Round Roast		21				21	.75	15.75
Chopped T-Bone		119				119	.65	77.35
Dried Beef			20			20	1.14	22.80
Corn Beef			36			36	.69	24.84
								4563.33
Pork Items								
Sausage Patties	104				155.5	259.5	.50	129.75
Cubed Cured Ham	120			40		160	.83	132.80
Spareribs	120					120	.50	60.00
Pork Cutlets	107.5	152		183	162.8	605.3	.70	423.71

TABLE D, Continued

Student Count	Week 1 1017	Week 2 1014	Week 3 1010	Week 4 1006	Week 5 1007	Total Lbs.	Price/ Pound	Total Cost
Pork Items, Continued								
Bacon	62	61	62	83.5	66	334.5	.64	214.08
Patio Ham	53.4		63.6	79.8		196.8	.96	188.93
Franks	144	96		120	108	468	.48	224.64
Pork Chops		74		125.5	136.5	336	.89	299.04
Cello Ham		49.8	92.9	89		231.7	.89	206.21
Boneless Pork Loin		64.5			68.7	133.2	.765	101.90
Ground Fresh Pork		23		20		43	.45	19.35
Cello Ham #2		59				59	.79	46.61
Cubed Fresh Pork			42			42	.49	20.58
Tenderloin Cutlets			174			174	.70	121.80
Salami			30.8			30.8	.525	16.17
Bologna			31.9		25.8	57.7	.375	21.64
Pullman Ham				33		33	.88	29.04
Heat & Eat Link Sausage				48		48	.80	38.40
								2294.65
Veal Items								
Banquet Steaks	90		290		250	640	.85	544.00
Round Roast		98.5		165		263.5	.85	223.98
								767.98
Poultry Items								
Fryers, Cut	703	494	227	508		1932	.3275	632.73
Turkey Rolls	128	56	232	80	88	584	.91	531.44
Boneless Fryers Breasts				273.9		273.9	1.06	290.33
								1454.50

TABLE D, Continued

Student Count	Week 1 1017	Week 2 1014	Week 3 1010	Week 4 1006	Week 5 1007	Total Lbs.	Price/ Pound	Total Cost
Fish and Seafood Items								
Cod Fillets, 4 oz.	100					100	.42	42.00
Salmon	60		108			168	.89	149.52
Perch	80					80	.56	44.80
Tuna		24		88	24	136	.58	78.88
Shrimp		80				80	1.12	89.60
Fish Sticks		135				135	.43	58.05
Cod, Unbreaded			40		90	130	.52	67.60
Fish Puffies				36		36	.58	20.88
Swordfish				60		60	.79	47.40
Red Snapper			80			80	.69	55.20
Catfish Fillets					200	200	.56	112.00
								765.93

TABLE D, Continued

Kerr-Drummond Cafeteria - Spring Semester, 1967

	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 5	Total	Price/	Total
Student Count	1273	1272	1272	1271	1302	Lbs.	Pound	Cost
Beef Items								
Beef Steaks	80	204	327		63	674	.95	640.30
Ground Beef Patties	318	105.5	285	60	254.5	1023	.53	542.19
Chili Meat	135	150	100	239	112	736	.49	360.64
Grill Steaks	230	170			220	620	.65	403.00
Liver	70				80	150	.60	90.10
Loin Strip Steak	490					490	1.60	784.00
Beef Steaks, Chefetts	10					10	.74	7.40
Round Roast	179					179	.75	134.25
Can Corn Beef	108		48			156	.69	107.64
Ground Beef	80	276	64	433	440	1343	.49	658.07
Chopped Sirloin Steak		187		177		364	.65	236.60
Chopped Stew Meat		410		96	270	776	.65	504.40
Beef Brisket		136	206.5			342.5	.65	222.63
Roast (Round Cow)		124.5			206	330.5	.75	247.88
Chopped T-Bone		129				129	.65	83.85
Dried Beef			30			30	1.14	34.20
Shoulder Roast			181			181	.78	141.18
Cube Steaks				118		118	.90	106.20
								5304.43
Pork Items								
Heat & Eat Link Sausage	84	99	90	48	90	411	.80	328.80
Bacon	111.5	66	45	22	44	288.5	.64	184.64
Cubed Cured Ham	155	65		140		360	.83	298.80
Corn Dog	6					6	.54	3.24

TABLE D, Continued

Student Count	Week 1 1273	Week 2 1272	Week 3 1272	Week 4 1271	Week 5 1302	Total Lbs.	Price/ Pound	Total Cost
Pork Items, Continued								
Cello Ham	23.5	21	194			238.5	.79	188.42
Spareribs	140					140	.50	70.00
Pork Cutlets	183.5	206	43.2	182	184.1	798.8	.70	559.16
Patio Ham	80.1		98.6	101.9		280.6	.96	269.38
Franks	240	240		300	300	1080	.475	513.00
Pork Chops		96		238.2	171.5	405.7	.89	361.07
Sausage Patties		104.5		155	105.5	365	.50	182.50
Ground Fresh Pork		35		40		75	.45	33.75
Canadian Bacon		116.5				116.5	.86	100.19
Pork Roast		99.3			128.5	227.8	.67	152.63
Cubed Fresh Pork			48			48	.49	23.52
Tenderloin Cutlets			157.5			157.5	.70	110.25
Bologna			52.2		87.8	140	.375	25.50
Salami			56			56	.525	29.40
Pullman Ham				22	22	44	.88	38.72
								3472.97
Veal Items								
Veal Steak Chefetts	10		10			20	.74	14.80
Breaded Steak Chefetts	10		10			20	.70	14.00
Banquet Steaks	120		380		350	850	.85	722.50
Round Roast		175		185		360	.85	306.00
Veal Steaks (Beef Added)			10			10	.87	8.70
								1066.00

TABLE D, Continued

Student Count	Week 1 1273	Week 2 1272	Week 3 1272	Week 4 1271	Week 5 1302	Total Lbs.	Price/ Pound	Total Cost
Poultry Items								
Fryers, Cut	728	539	191	298.8		1756.8	.3275	575.35
Turkey Rolls	80	72	214	118	117	601	.91	546.91
Turkey Cutlets	11					11	.70	7.70
Boneless Fryers Breasts			5	317.5		322.5	1.06	341.85
								1471.81
Fish and Seafood Items								
Cod Fillets, 3 oz.					150	150	.43	64.50
Cod Fillets, 4 oz.	300	150				450	.42	189.00
Halibut	81.5					81.5	.79	64.39
Salmon	80		80	120		280	.89	249.20
Perch	100					100	.56	56.00
Tuna	72	92		72	104	340	.58	197.20
Shrimp		120				120	1.12	134.40
Fish Sticks		153				153	.43	65.79
Cod, Unbreaded			100			100	.52	52.00
Fish Puffies				144		144	.58	83.52
Swordfish				150		150	.79	118.50
Red Snapper			80			89	.69	55.20
Catfish					400	400	.51	204.00
								1533.70

FORM A

RESIDENT HALLS FOOD SERVICE - RANGE PRODUCTION SHEET

DAY_____ RANGE UNIT CYCLE____

DATE_____ BREAKFAST NO. SERVED_____

ON HAND	PREPARE	PORTION SIZE	ITEM	PAN SIZE	LEFTOVER
			JUICES & FRUITS		
			CEREAL		
			ENTREE		

LUNCH NO. SERVED_____

			MEAT		
			POTATOES,		
			GREEN BEANS		
			SOUP		
			GRAVY		

DINNER NO. SERVED_____

			MEAT		
			POTATOES		
			SOUP		
			GRAVY		

ADVANCED PREPARATION & INSTRUCTIONS

FORM B

RESIDENCE HALLS FOOD SERVICE
CONTRACT CYCLE MENU
EVALUATION FORM

Week_____
Day_____
Unit_____

	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Unsatisfactory	Yes	No	Other
1. How does the menu fit the clientele? If poor or unsatisfactory, state why._____								
2. In general, are the choices of items acceptable to customer?								
3. Does the menu meet the requirements for good menu planning:								
A. Color contrast								
B. Contrast of shapes or forms								
C. Temperature contrast								
D. Contrasts of textures								
E. Contrast of flavors								
4. Rate the counter set up and efficiency of service on the basis of the planned menus.								
5. Rate the menu planned as to available kitchen equipment.								
6. Rate the menu planned as to work load distribution.								
7. Rate the menu planned as to the amount of hand work involved.								
8. Rate the menu planned as to the distribution of preparation time.								
9. Does the menu provide for good use of left-over item?								
10. Does the menu provide for flexibility in planning breakfast items?								
11. Are the recipes satisfactory for quality and quantity yield?								
12. Can you maintain an acceptable food cost on this menu?								
13. Comment on any problems encountered with preparation and service of the menu.								
14. List suggestions for improvement of the menus as planned. (Use back of this sheet if necessary.)								

FORM C

RESIDENCE HALLS FOOD SERVICE
STANDARD RECIPE FORM

Size of Serving _____
Cooking Temp. _____
Cooking Time _____
Serving Equipment _____

RECIPE NAME: _____

INGREDIENTS	SPECIFICATIONS	NO.____	NO.____	NO.____	METHOD

FORM D

RESIDENCE HALLS FOOD SERVICE

RECIPE STANDARDIZATION FORM

RECIPE NAME: SIZE OF SERVING

INGREDIENTS USED	SPECIFICATIONS	NO.	NO.	NO.	METHODS USED

Rate Recipe Quality:	Preparation Time:
Are there any production or serving problems? List on back of page.	Cooking Temperature
List suggestions for improvement on back of page.	Cooking Time
Acceptable by clientele?	Serving Equipment

VITA

John Lawrence Jeffrey

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: ESTABLISHMENT OF A MASTER CYCLE AND STANDARDIZED RECIPE SYSTEM FOR RESIDENCE HALLS FOOD SERVICE, OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

Major Field: Food, Nutrition and Institution Administration

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Stillwater, Oklahoma, February 12, 1940, the son of John Lawrence, Sr. and Ruth B. Jeffrey.

Education: Attended Temple Grade School and High School, Temple, Oklahoma; received the Bachelor of Science degree with a Major in Hotel and Restaurant Administration from Oklahoma State University in May, 1962; completed the requirements for the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University, July, 1967.

Professional Experience: Employed by Residence Halls Food Service, Oklahoma State University, in February, 1962, as Assistant Manager, Bennett Cafeteria. Promoted to Manager, Scott-Parker Cafeteria in September, 1962. Served as Assistant to Director of Residence Halls Food Service from September, 1965 to July, 1966; presently employed as Assistant to Director of Auxiliary Enterprises, Oklahoma State University; member of National Association of College and Universities Food Service Directors and Toastmasters International; application for membership in the American Dietetic Association is being requested.