



SCHOOL BREAKFAST SCORECARD: 2004

Fourteenth Annual Status Report on the
SCHOOL
BREAKFAST
PROGRAM

November 2004

Food Research and Action Center

1875 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Suite 540

Washington, DC 20009

Phone (202) 986-2200 fax: (202) 986-2525

e-mail: foodresearch@frac.org

<http://www.frac.org>

Acknowledgements

This report was prepared by Randy Rosso, with assistance from Nicole Woo, PJ Andrews, Lynn Parker, and Jim Weill.

The Food Research and Action Center gratefully acknowledges the following funders whose major support in 2003-2004 has helped to make possible our work on expanding and improving nutrition programs.

| | |
|---|---|
| America's Second Harvest | John D. and Catherine T. |
| Anonymous | MacArthur Foundation |
| Morris and Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation | A.L. Mailman Family Foundation |
| California Endowment | MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger |
| The Annie E. Casey Foundation | Meyer Foundation |
| Community Capital Fund | The Moriah Fund |
| Consumer Health Foundation | National Dairy Council/Dairy Management, Inc. |
| England Family Foundation | Nestle USA |
| Entertainment Industry Foundation | New Directions Foundation |
| Equal Justice Works | New Prospect Foundation |
| Evangelical Lutheran Church in America | The David and Lucile Packard Foundation |
| Fannie Mae Foundation | Prince Charitable Trusts |
| Food Marketing Institute | Pritzker Early Childhood Foundation |
| General Mills Foundation | Public Welfare Foundation |
| Robert P. and Judith N. Goldberg Foundation | Charles H. Revson Foundation |
| Grocery Manufacturers of America | Sara Lee Foundation |
| Robert Wood Johnson Foundation | Share Our Strength |
| Joyce Foundation | Taste of the NFL |
| Kaiser Permanente | Trellis Fund |
| Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation | Trust for Early Education |
| Kraft Foods, Inc. | United Food & Commercial Workers Union |
| Land O'Lakes Foundation | UPS Foundation |
| | Weissberg Foundation |

Additional Copies

Free PDF versions of this report can be found at <http://www.frac.org>, and hard copies of this publication may be purchased for \$7 (Washington, D.C. residents must add 6 percent sales tax). All orders must be prepaid and sent to:

FRAC Publications, Attn. Wanda Putney
1875 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 540
Washington, D.C. 20009
Tel: 202-986-2200

For More Information

For more information about the programs reviewed in this report, or to sign up for FRAC's weekly electronic News Digest, visit FRAC's website at <http://www.frac.org>.

About FRAC

The Food Research and Action Center is the leading national organization working for more effective public and private policies to eradicate domestic hunger and under-nutrition.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| Executive Summary..... | v |
| Introduction..... | 1 |
| Why Breakfast At School?..... | 3 |
| School Breakfast Program Basics..... | 6 |
| FRAC's Findings..... | 7 |
| National Performance | 7 |
| State by State Performance | 9 |
| Unserved Low-Income Children..... | 12 |
| State Efforts..... | 13 |
| Changes to the School Breakfast Program Enacted in the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004..... | 17 |
| Conclusion..... | 21 |
| Technical Notes | 23 |
| | |
| Appendix A: Model School Breakfast Programs | 25 |
| New York City..... | 25 |
| Wisconsin | 26 |
| Ohio | 28 |
| | |
| Table 1: Low-Income Student Participation in School Lunch (NSLP) and Breakfast (SBP) Programs | 33 |
| Table 2: School Participation in School Lunch (NSLP) and Breakfast (SBP) Programs..... | 34 |
| Table 3: Total Student Participation in School Breakfast Program (SBP) | 35 |
| Table 4: Additional Participation and Funding in Each State if 55 Low-Income Students Were Served School Breakfast (SBP) Per 100 Served School Lunch (NSLP)..... | 36 |
| Table 5: State Legislation Promoting School Breakfast | 37 |
| | |
| Table 6: Income Guidelines and Reimbursement Rates for the School Breakfast Program, 2003-2004 | 43 |
| | |
| Table 7: Income Guidelines and Reimbursement Rates for the School Breakfast Program, 2004-2005 | 44 |
| | |
| Selected Bibliography..... | 45 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE 2004 FOOD RESEARCH AND ACTION CENTER SCHOOL BREAKFAST SCORECARD

The number of children from low-income families eating school breakfast increased almost 354,000 in the 2003-2004 school year from the year before. This 5.2 percent increase in participation is the largest in nine years.

A larger share of the children eating free and reduced price lunch is now also starting the school day with a free or reduced price breakfast. For every 100 low-income children eating free or reduced price school lunch, 43.1 also participate in the breakfast program, up from 42.3 in the 2002-2003 school year. This is the largest improvement in this ratio in 10 years.

At the start of each school day, a record 7.1 million children from low-income families (and a record 8.7 million children overall) now start the day right by eating a nutritious breakfast at school. (See Table 1, on page 33.)

The percentage of schools offering school lunch also operating school breakfast increased from 78.3 percent in 2002-2003 to 79.4 percent in 2003-2004. (Table 2, page 34.)

State by State Performance

While the national ratio was 43:100, twelve states served school breakfast to at least 50 out of every 100 low-income children eating school lunch:

- Oregon 56.0
- West Virginia 56.0
- Kentucky 54.8
- Mississippi 54.7
- Texas 54.0
- Oklahoma 54.0
- Arkansas 53.7
- New Mexico 53.0
- South Carolina 52.5
- Vermont 52.3
- Georgia 52.3
- Louisiana 51.2

Seven states served school breakfast to fewer than one in three low-income children eating school lunch:

- New Hampshire 32.9
- Nebraska 32.4
- Alaska 31.6
- Illinois 27.9
- Utah 27.8
- New Jersey 26.0
- Wisconsin 24.8

The ten states that are foregoing the most federal funds and shortchanging the most low-income students by not reaching the 55:100 ratio reached by the best performing states are:

| State | Number of Students Not Served | Dollars Foregone |
|--------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| California | 313,817 | \$62,019,656 |
| New York | 222,849 | \$44,349,855 |
| Illinois | 183,247 | \$36,797,178 |
| Florida | 111,016 | \$22,003,393 |
| Pennsylvania | 92,273 | \$18,332,010 |
| New Jersey | 91,737 | \$18,201,384 |
| Ohio | 81,033 | \$16,191,286 |
| Michigan | 65,362 | \$13,034,430 |
| Wisconsin | 65,183 | \$12,826,690 |
| Arizona | 52,517 | \$10,419,239 |

Eight states operated school breakfast in virtually all (97 percent or more) of their schools that also offer school lunch:

- South Carolina 99.5
- Rhode Island 98.7
- Delaware 98.6
- Arkansas 97.8
- Texas 97.7
- Georgia 97.5
- West Virginia 97.4
- North Carolina 97.4

Six states operated school breakfast in fewer than 60 percent of their schools that also offer school lunch:

- Illinois 59.4
- Nebraska 54.2
- Ohio 53.8
- Connecticut 50.7
- New Jersey 48.7
- Wisconsin 47.2

INTRODUCTION

There are 13 million children in America, Census Bureau data tell us, who live in families which do not have enough resources to purchase an adequate, balanced diet. One important response to this is school feeding programs.

At the start of each school day, 8.7 million children – 7.1 million of them from low-income families – now start the day right by eating a nutritious breakfast at school. (See Table 1, on page 33.) This is thanks to the growth of the School Breakfast Program.

Close to four out of every five schools that offer school lunch now also offer school breakfast to their students (see Table 2, on page 34), and more than four out of every ten low-income children who consume a school lunch also eat breakfast at school (see Table 1). This proportion has risen in 13 of the last 14 years since FRAC launched a long-term school breakfast expansion effort and began producing this report. The 7.1 million low-income children in the breakfast program in the 2003-2004 school year were 354,000 children more than the prior year.

This significant growth wasn't always the case. The School Breakfast Program began in 1966 as a pilot program because Congress had special concerns about children from rural areas who had to travel long distances to school and students whose parents were too poor to provide them with a full breakfast. The program was made permanent in 1975, but it has taken a long time to reach the levels of participation by schools and students that we see today. Even in 1990, only 3.4 million low-income students were participating in the School Breakfast Program, but participation has more than doubled since then.

As the program has expanded to more schools and reached more students, study after study has shown that a good breakfast eaten at school boosts student achievement, reduces absenteeism, improves student nutrition and health, and reduces overweight. Indeed, more and more towns and cities are recognizing these gains and offering free breakfast to every child, regardless of income, in order to increase school breakfast participation and boost academic performance.

But there is much more to do. While millions of students now gain the nutritional, health and educational benefits of a school breakfast, and while more and more school officials and policymakers are becoming aware of the importance of this program, there are still almost 9.4 million low-income students

who participate in school lunch but go without this much-needed nutritional and educational boost in the morning (see Table 4, on page 36). Many of these children are arriving at school not ready to learn and unable to concentrate, because they have not eaten a morning meal.

This report, FRAC's fourteenth annual assessment of the School Breakfast Program, explains to parents, students, advocates, schools and school districts, communities, states, and the federal government how to and why we should expand use of this proven tool for meeting nutritional, health, and educational needs in the country. It examines the program, its benefits, and the performance of the nation and each state in reaching children with school breakfasts during the 2003-2004 school year.

The report estimates the number of additional children states could have helped, but did not, and federal nutrition funding states could have received, but did not, had each state performed as well as the top-performing states. For most states, such an improvement in school breakfast performance would provide millions of dollars in federal assistance to help many thousands of low-income children. Nationally, it would mean serving an additional 2 million children and bringing almost \$400 million to communities across the country.

Also provided are examples of model breakfast programs at schools that have overcome obstacles to student participation. Models include "universal" breakfasts (when breakfast is served for free to all students) and breakfast in the classroom at the start of the school day (an idea winning over educators and support staff wherever it is tried).

Finally, the report describes the improvements to the School Breakfast Program enacted in the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004, and concludes by recommending next steps for federal, state, and local governments to take to bring the School Breakfast Program to the millions of low-income children who are not taking advantage of it.

Defining Hunger and Food Insecurity

Households classified as hungry by the annual U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and Census Bureau survey are those in which adults have decreased the quality and quantity of food they consume, due to lack of resources, to the point where they are likely to be hungry on a frequent basis, or in which children's intake has been reduced, due to lack of resources, to the point where children are likely to be hungry on a regular basis and adults' food intake is severely reduced. Approximately 3.8 million households, with 9.4 million members, were hungry in 2002, the last year for which data are available.

*Even when hunger is not present, households are determined to be **food insecure** by the survey when resources are so limited that adults in the household are: running out of food; reducing the quality of food their family eats; feeding their children unbalanced diets; skipping meals so their children can eat; are forced to use emergency food charities; or are forced to take other serious steps to adjust to the economic problems threatening the adequacy of the family's diet. The number of food insecure households includes the hungry households enumerated above. Approximately 12.1 million households, with 34.9 million members (including 13.1 million children), were food insecure in 2002.*

WHY BREAKFAST AT SCHOOL?

There are many reasons to offer breakfast at school. Supporting education and health, compensating for low family incomes, and improving the school environment are among them. The research confirms what common sense has told parents and grandparents for generations:

Many children do not eat a nutritious breakfast at home.

Millions of families in the United States cannot afford to feed their children healthy breakfasts every day. In 2002, 16.5 percent of households with children under 18, containing 13.1 million children, were food insecure or hungry. Participation in free and reduced price school breakfasts helps these families stretch their limited food budgets.

Regardless of income, many families find that early morning school bus schedules, long commutes to jobs, nontraditional work hours, and the other conditions of family life in 21st century America make it difficult to prepare or sit down for a nutritious family breakfast. In addition, some children, especially teenagers, have no appetite for breakfast just after they wake up. Other children may have to wait for long periods of time between an early breakfast at home and a late lunch at school, also making breakfast at school an important option.

School breakfast improves children's diets. Breakfasts served as part of the School Breakfast Program are required to provide one-fourth or more of the key nutrients children need every day, and contain no more than 30 percent of calories from fat and 10 percent of calories from saturated fat.

A recent study by the Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) reports that children with access to school breakfast eat a better overall diet, less fat, and more magnesium, vitamin C and folate. Other USDA research shows that children who participate in school breakfast eat more fruit, drink more milk, and consume less saturated fat than those who do not eat school breakfast or who have breakfast at home.

School breakfast can help reduce obesity. In general, skipping breakfast is associated with a significantly higher risk of obesity among adults. Researchers suggest that people who do not eat breakfast get very hungry later on in the day and tend to overeat as a result—consuming more calories each day than they would if they had eaten breakfast in the morning. School breakfast helps ensure that children will not be tempted to overeat at other meals

or snack before lunch. School breakfast also helps to build lifelong healthy eating habits.

Obesity rates have doubled among children and tripled among adolescents over the past 20 years. These alarming figures translate into increased risks of premature death and an overall lower quality of life because obesity is associated with an increased risk of diabetes, heart disease, stroke, asthma, osteoarthritis, psychological disorders, and cancer.

One study has found anti-obesity impacts of school breakfast specifically. Research published in the Archives of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine found that food insecure elementary school-aged girls who participate in School Breakfast or School Lunch or Food Stamps, or any combination of these programs, have significantly less risk of being overweight.

Missing breakfast impairs learning. Researchers report that children who skip breakfast are less able to distinguish among similar images, show increased errors, and have slower memory recall. Studies also show that hungry children have lower math scores and an increased likelihood of repeating a grade, and that behavioral, emotional and academic problems are more prevalent among hungry children. In addition, hungry children are more likely to be absent and tardy.

School breakfast improves student behavior and learning environments. Studies have shown that students who participate in school breakfast have lower rates of absence and tardiness and exhibit decreased behavioral and psychological problems. Researchers also report that children who eat school breakfast have fewer discipline problems and visit school nurses' offices less often.

Eating breakfast at school helps students perform better academically. Students who eat school breakfast at the start of the school day show a general increase in math and reading scores. Studies published in the Archives of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine have concluded that students who increase their participation in the school breakfast program improve their math grades, and that children who eat breakfast at school – closer to class and test-taking time – perform better on standardized tests than those who skip breakfast or eat breakfast at home.

The evidence supporting the connection between breakfast and learning is abundant. Research published in the International Journal of Food Science and Nutrition shows that children who

eat a complete breakfast, versus a partial breakfast, make fewer mistakes and work faster in math and number checking tests. In the American Journal of Clinical Nutrition, researchers report that providing breakfast to mildly undernourished students at school improves their speed and memory in cognitive tests. And an academic review of the scientific literature on breakfast and learning published in the Journal of The American Dietetic Association concludes that there is a significant correlation between eating in the morning and test results, memory and verbal skills.

SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAM BASICS

The School Breakfast Program, like the National School Lunch Program, provides per meal cash reimbursements to public and non-profit private schools and residential childcare institutions that provide free and reduced price meals to eligible children. Reimbursable meals must meet federal nutrition standards.

It is an entitlement program, meaning that any school offering meals under the federal guidelines will be reimbursed with federal dollars. Also, any student who attends a school with the federal school meal programs is allowed to participate. However, the school must participate before a hungry child can be fed.

What students pay for meals depends on their family incomes. Children from families with incomes at or below 130 percent of the federal poverty line receive meals for free. Children from families with incomes between 130 percent and 185 percent of the poverty line receive meals at a reduced price—the students pay a share of the cost (no more than 30 cents per breakfast), while the federal government pays for the rest. All other participating students, officially designated as receiving “paid” meals, pay most of the cost for their meals or snacks, although all students’ meals do receive some level of federal support. The exceptions to this pricing structure are schools that offer breakfast at no charge to all students (see page 16).

During the 2003-2004 school year, schools were reimbursed \$1.20 in federal funds for each free breakfast, \$0.90 for each reduced price breakfast and \$0.22 for each paid breakfast. The reimbursement rates are adjusted annually based on the Current Price Index. (During the 2004-2005 school year, schools will be reimbursed \$1.23 per free breakfast, \$0.93 per reduced price breakfast, and \$0.23 per paid breakfast.) “Severe need” schools, where 40 percent or more of the lunches served two years prior were free or reduced price, receive slightly higher reimbursements per breakfast. (The Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 made it easier for low-income schools to receive the higher “severe need” reimbursements. See page 12 for details.) Schools in Alaska and Hawaii are reimbursed at a higher rate per breakfast. Some states supplement the federal reimbursement. See Table 5 on page 37.

SCHOOL BREAKFAST IN 2003-2004: FRAC'S FINDINGS

The data in this report are from the United States Department of Agriculture and an annual survey of state child nutrition officials conducted by FRAC. Student participation estimates are based on average daily participation during the months of September through May of each school year, as provided by the USDA and verified by FRAC with state officials. (For years before 2002, the estimates are based on average daily participation in March of each school year.) School participation estimates are based on state data from the month of October of each year. (For technical notes, see page 21.)

National Performance

Since the National School Lunch Program is broadly used by low-income children, participation in that program is a useful benchmark against which to measure student and school participation in the School Breakfast Program.

Student Participation


Approximately 8.7 million children participated in the School Breakfast Program during the 2003-2004 school year. This is up from 8.2 million children in the prior year.

Of the 8.7 million children participating in 2003-2004, more than 7.1 million, or 82.0 percent, received free or reduced price meals (see Figure 1 and Table 1). This was up from the nearly 6.8 million in the prior year, an increase of 354,000 low-income children, or 5.2 percent, in the number eating breakfast. Since 1990, the number of low-income students receiving free or reduced price breakfasts has more than doubled.

During the 2003-2004 school year, 28.4 million children participated in the National School Lunch Program, and 16.5 million, or 58.1 percent, of them received free or reduced price lunch. These numbers also grew from the prior year.

Comparing the two programs, during the 2003-2004 school year, 43.1 students received free or reduced price breakfast for every 100 students receiving free or reduced price school lunch (see Table 1). This was an improvement from the ratio of 42.3 during the 2002-2003 school year, the largest bump in this ratio for 10 years.

Figure 1: Student Participation in the Free and Reduced Price School Breakfast Program




* The data for 1987–2001 are estimates of student participation in March of each year, while the data for 2002-2004 are nine-month averages. (If March estimates were used, 2002 would list 6.7 million students, 2003 would list 7.0 million, and 2004 would list 7.5 million. See page 23 for technical notes.)

From 2002-2003 to 2003-2004, both the pool of low-income students grew (the number receiving free or reduced price lunches went up by 519,000), and the ratio of low-income students in the lunch program who were also eating school breakfast rose.

Nevertheless, for every 100 students receiving free or reduced price school lunch, well over half of them still are not benefiting from a school breakfast. There remains considerable need for improvement on this measure.

School Participation

Nationally, during the 2003-2004 school year, 79.4 percent of the schools that offered school lunch participated in school breakfast. The number of schools offering lunch increased, but the number offering breakfast increased faster, leading to an increase in the proportion of schools participating in the breakfast program, up from 78.3 percent in the prior year (see Figure 2 and Table 2).



State by State Performance

Student Participation (Table 1, page 33)

Student participation in the School Breakfast Program varies considerably from state to state. Often, greater participation reflects effective state and local efforts to get more schools into the program and to make school breakfast more attractive and accessible to students. Effective state and local strategies include: state requirements that certain types of schools must participate; supplementary state funding for school breakfast; outreach and education campaigns; elimination of paperwork barriers in the application process; methods (e.g., electronic cards) that make invisible which students are low-income and thereby eliminates stigma; and implementation of universal free breakfast programs.

Top States in Ratio of Low-Income Student Breakfast Participation to Lunch Participation

| | |
|----------------|------|
| Oregon | 56.0 |
| West Virginia | 56.0 |
| Kentucky | 54.8 |
| Mississippi | 54.7 |
| Texas | 54.0 |
| Oklahoma | 54.0 |
| Arkansas | 53.7 |
| New Mexico | 53.0 |
| South Carolina | 52.5 |
| Vermont | 52.3 |
| Georgia | 52.3 |
| Louisiana | 51.2 |

During the 2003-2004 school year, the top 12 performing states served free or reduced price breakfasts to more than 50 students for every 100 students who received a free or reduced price lunch. (See sidebar.) These are the same twelve states that had a ratio of 50 or higher during the 2002-2003 school year, but all of them improved their ratio in the 2003-2004 school year.

Oregon and West Virginia led the nation in school breakfast participation, serving free or reduced price breakfast to 56 students for every 100 eating a free or reduced price lunch.

On the other end of the spectrum, seven states served free or reduced price breakfast to fewer than one in three of the students eating a free or reduced price lunch (New Hampshire, Nebraska, Alaska, Illinois, Utah, New Jersey, and Wisconsin). Of these seven, only Alaska, New Jersey, and Wisconsin increased their ratio by at least 1.0 from the previous year.

Overall, twenty states increased their breakfast-to-lunch ratio by at least 1.0. Idaho and Hawaii achieved the largest increases, boosting their ratios by 4.7 and 3.4, respectively. In addition to achieving the largest increase in its breakfast-to-lunch ratio, Idaho also led the nation in the increase in the number of children in its breakfast program – 18.5 percent. Four other states increased participation by at least 10 percent – Rhode Island, Colorado, Nevada, and Ohio.

Meanwhile, 27 states saw no significant change (less than 1.0 in either direction) in school breakfast participation from the prior year. Four states (Maryland, the District of Columbia, Virginia, and Kansas) experienced decreases in their ratio by at least 1.0.

Lowest States in Ratio of Low-Income Student Breakfast Participation to Lunch Participation

| | |
|---------------|------|
| Iowa | 35.6 |
| New York | 35.4 |
| North Dakota | 35.3 |
| Connecticut | 33.7 |
| Colorado | 33.4 |
| New Hampshire | 32.9 |
| Nebraska | 32.4 |
| Alaska | 31.6 |
| Illinois | 27.9 |
| Utah | 27.8 |
| New Jersey | 26.0 |
| Wisconsin | 24.8 |

School Participation (Table 2, page 34)

Seventeen states, one fewer than in the previous year, operated school breakfast in 90 percent or more of the schools operating school lunch during the 2003-2004 school year. Idaho and Oklahoma are new additions to this list, while the District of Columbia, Tennessee, and Mississippi dropped off it. Eight of the 17 states operated school breakfast in virtually all schools that operate school lunch (97 percent or more). Six states, the same states as in the 2002-2003 school year, served breakfast in less than 60 percent of the schools offering school lunch.

Twenty-five states increased the percentage of schools serving school lunch that also served school breakfast by at least one percentage point, led by Indiana, which improved on this score by

9.1 percentage points over the 2002-2003 school year. Five other states improved on this measure by at least four percentage points (Idaho, Utah, New Jersey, Oklahoma, and North Dakota). Rhode Island increased the number of schools serving breakfast by almost 20 percent. Rhode Island advocates have been pushing for several years to add districts and schools to the program, and the state served school breakfast in 70 percent more schools in 2003-2004 than in 1999-2000.

UNSERVED LOW-INCOME CHILDREN

Participation by children in the School Breakfast Program varies significantly from state to state. No state is reaching as many children as it should, but some states are providing clear leadership on this important measure. The higher participation rates reached by a number of states show just how much room for improvement there is in the other states. By the standard set by the best states, there are millions of eligible, low-income children who are missing nutritious and educationally important breakfasts, and the remaining states, altogether, are forgoing hundreds of millions of dollars in available federal funds for child nutrition.

To provide one estimate of the number of children who go unserved, but whom states could serve, and the amount of federal funding states are forgoing, FRAC assumed each state could do as well as the average of the current top five states in the performance ratio: a standard of 55 free or reduced price breakfast participants per 100 free or reduced price lunch participants. While this is not the optimal measure – states should be serving more than 55 per 100 – it is clearly an achievable measure.

FRAC figured how many additional children per state could be reached at the 55 per 100 ratio. FRAC then multiplied this unserved population in each state by the reimbursement rate for 170 days of breakfast (a typical school year) to estimate the amount of federal breakfast funding each state could have obtained if it had performed as well as the five best states in the 2003-2004 school year. (For more technical notes, see page 21.)

According to this formula, state school breakfast programs failed to reach nearly 2 million children eligible for free or reduced price breakfasts, and states failed to access close to \$391 million in federal funding to provide these children with breakfasts (see Table 4). The states sacrificing the most federal funds in absolute terms are those with both large populations and substantial lags in ratios. For example, California, Florida, Illinois and New York make up 831,000 (or 42.3 percent) of the nearly 2 million children who were unserved under this criterion, and \$165.2 million (or 42.3 percent) of the foregone federal funds.

But the losses in all lagging states are significant – the \$12.8 million foregone in Wisconsin and \$6.9 million in Utah, for example, are more important, proportionally, to those states' economies than the \$62.0 million in California.

STATE EFFORTS (Table 5, page 37)

Altogether, 36 states have their own legislative requirements related to the School Breakfast Program and/or provide state funds for school breakfasts. In addition, almost all states, and over 60 percent of all school districts, use direct certification to some degree, a federal option that allows states to make students automatically eligible for free school meals if their families participate in the Food Stamp Program or the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program. As mentioned in the next section, child nutrition reauthorization phases in mandatory direct certification of children whose families receive food stamps, beginning in the 2006-2007 school year. While this is being phased in, states and school districts that are not yet required to use direct certification of food stamp families still have the option of using it for food stamp and TANF families.

Also, over two-thirds of the states take some advantage of Provision 2 and/or Provision 3 of the National School Lunch Act, which allow schools to provide breakfasts and/or lunches free to all children (“universal free breakfast”) under certain circumstances.

Universal Breakfast

Universal school breakfast programs are those that provide breakfast to all children in a school – or district – regardless of family income, without charge. Because a universal program reduces administrative burdens, draws no lines between students based on income, attracts more low-income children because there is no stigma, and rapidly increases overall participation so that every child can do better in school, the idea is gaining popularity.

At least 40 states have schools, and often large school districts, with universal breakfast programs, which provide breakfast at no charge to all children. New York City, Cleveland (Ohio), and Kansas City (Missouri) are among the cities that have (or have announced the implementation of) universal breakfast in every school. Other cities, such as Portland (Oregon), offer breakfast at no charge to all students in at least half of their schools.

One way schools can offer universal breakfast is to implement Provision 2 or 3 of the National School Lunch Act, the federal act that also covers school breakfasts. These provisions allow schools to provide breakfasts (and lunches) for several years at no charge to all students without collecting meal applications, and still

receive federal school meals funding. At least 40 states take some advantage of Provision 2 and/or Provision 3.

Under Provisions 2 and 3, the results of the school meal application process for one year – the proportions of students in free, reduced price and paid categories – are then used as the baseline for calculating a school’s reimbursements for free, reduced price and paid meals for the following three or four years, depending on the provision selected. The school can use this approach for breakfast, or lunch, or both, but schools have found the most dramatic positive effects in breakfast. By providing breakfast at no charge to children regardless of family income, schools save money through eliminating the laborious tasks of collecting, handling and verifying applications for discounted meals as well as daily collection of payments from students. If schools can demonstrate to USDA that local economic conditions have not substantially changed at the end of the 3- or 4-year cycle of the provision, they may be able to continue universal breakfasts for another cycle without collecting applications from families again.

By both eliminating forms that parents complete and inviting all students to eat for free, schools can remove several barriers to participation. Targeting the entire student body for breakfast decreases the stigma of school breakfast being for “poor kids” only. In addition, offering breakfast to all students at no charge allows breakfast to be served in the classroom, an innovation that is winning over even reluctant educators once the educational and behavioral benefits are seen. Classroom breakfasts also eliminate problems with bus schedules. Teachers find classroom breakfasts have not interfered with class schedules. In fact, educators find students more alert and ready to learn after in-the-classroom breakfasts. Support staff find this way of serving breakfast easier than preparing the cafeteria early in the morning and cleaning it twice in one day, a concern often raised about school breakfast before classroom service is tried.

Offering some form of universal free breakfast is the most important way states, school districts, and schools can expand school breakfast to ensure that every child starts the day with a healthy meal. FRAC’s survey of state child nutrition officials who oversee the School Breakfast Program asked them to identify what they feel are the two most effective strategies for increasing participation in the School Breakfast Program. Of the 42 states (including the District of Columbia) that responded, 64.3 percent listed universal free breakfast and 50.0 percent listed breakfast in the classroom (another form of universal breakfast) as the most

effective strategies for increasing participation. Nineteen percent responded that serving breakfast later in the morning is one of the two most effective strategies, and 19 percent listed “grab ‘n go” breakfast, a variant of breakfast in the classroom (and also a form of universal breakfast).

Direct Certification

Direct certification allows students from families participating in food stamps or Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) to be deemed eligible (or certified) for free school meals without filling out a separate application for the school. To determine who is eligible, state or school officials cross-reference their student files (taking precautions to ensure students’ privacy) with participant files at food stamp and/or TANF offices. The school or state agency then notifies the food stamp- and/or TANF-eligible families that their children are eligible for free meals. In some states, a parent must sign the letter and return it to the school in order for the child to participate. Some states only use TANF applications to certify eligible families, not food stamp applications.

Direct certification greatly simplifies the process for both families and school officials. Over the years, state officials have attributed the participation of millions of children in school food programs to direct certification. However, some states still report local problems implementing direct certification, and it is clear that headway can still be made with this tool for expanding participation. For instance, more than a dozen states still only use Food Stamp or TANF applications, not both, to certify eligible families. Moreover, fewer than half the states reported that 100 percent of schools are participating, and several states reported no private schools participating.

When FRAC asked state officials about barriers to improving direct certification, the most common responses related to data problems: changes in family names (e.g., separated families) or the use of nicknames, which often confounds matching. In addition, some schools do not have lists in electronic or other format that agencies can use for matching. Another frequent problem cited is the lack of school staff trained or assigned to handle direct certification.

As a result of the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004, new rules will be phased in (over three years) that will require all schools to use food stamp applications for direct certification, and parents receiving food stamps will not need to

return a letter or complete any paperwork for their child to receive free meals. See the next section on reauthorization changes for more details (see page 18).

State Funding and Breakfast Requirements

To guarantee that the School Breakfast Program is widely available, at least in schools with significant concentrations of poor students, 26 states had laws for the 2003-2004 school year mandating that certain schools participate in the program. Generally, requirements are linked to a school's percentage of low-income students, defined by the proportion of students who apply and are eligible for free and reduced price meals, or by the proportion of students receiving free and reduced price lunches.

The percentage required before the school must offer school breakfasts varies widely. For example, West Virginia requires all schools to participate, while in Washington State all schools with over 40 percent of lunches served at free or reduced price must offer breakfast. Kentucky and Utah do not require schools to have a breakfast program, but do require schools without one to report why. Kentucky also requires school districts to arrange bus schedules so that all buses arrive in sufficient time for schools to serve breakfast prior to the instructional day.

To assist schools in providing breakfast to students, 22 states provided state funds for one purpose or another related to school breakfast: as additional per meal reimbursements (to supplement the federal per meal reimbursement); as start-up and/or expansion funds to finance costs related to the start of new programs or expansion of participation in existing programs; as payment for the costs of outreach; as incentive grants; or to pay for supervision costs. Some states, such as Pennsylvania, provide additional funding in reimbursements for lunch if breakfast is served.

Three states provide state funding for universal free school breakfast programs in certain schools: Maryland, Massachusetts, and Illinois. North Carolina, not counted in the total number of states providing funding, provides funding for universal breakfasts for kindergarten only. Minnesota used to provide state funding to support universal breakfast to low-income elementary schools in its "Fast Break to Learning" breakfast program, but this program was discontinued after the 2002-2003 school year.

CHANGES TO THE SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAM ENACTED IN THE CHILD NUTRITION AND WIC REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2004

On Wednesday, June 30, 2004, President Bush signed the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 into law (Public Law 108-265). The Act improves many of the federal child nutrition programs, including the School Breakfast Program, by expanding the availability of nutritious meals and snacks for children in school, in outside school hours programs, and in child care; and by improving the quality of food in schools. Below we discuss the changes in the School Breakfast Program.

Severe Need Breakfast. Under existing law, low-income schools can receive additional “severe need” reimbursements to cover higher costs if at least 40 percent of the lunches they serve are free or at a reduced price. For the 2004-2005 school year, severe need schools may receive an additional \$0.24 per free or reduced price breakfast served. For example, severe need schools will be reimbursed a total of \$1.23 plus \$0.24 for each free breakfast served, and \$0.93 plus \$0.24 for each reduced price breakfast served. (See page 43.) One important provision of the new Act reduces paperwork and eliminates the waiting period for schools in low-income areas to receive these extra “severe need” school breakfast reimbursements.

- **Paperwork Reduction:** The new Act removes the requirement that schools document their costs in order to receive severe need assistance. Previously, schools had to document their higher costs of serving breakfast in order to demonstrate that they were “severe need” schools. Schools now may receive severe need breakfast reimbursements as long as they meet the 40 percent free or reduced price requirement.
- **Removal of Waiting Period:** Schools used to qualify for severe need assistance only if at least 40 percent of their lunches were served free or at reduced price during the second preceding school year. The Act now allows severe need eligibility for schools in which no lunches were served during the second preceding year, such as new schools. These schools may qualify for severe need if it is determined that the 40 percent free or reduced price

requirement would have been met during the second preceding school year.

Study of Best Practices in the School Breakfast Program. The Act authorizes a study that would collect and disseminate best practices in overcoming obstacles to participation in school breakfast. However, this study is dependent upon future Congressional funding.

Provisions 2 and 3. The Act allows school districts and groups of schools, in addition to individual schools, to use Provisions 2 or 3 to reduce paperwork and streamline school meal operations (see page 16). Previously, school districts were required to operate Provision 2 or 3 independently in each school. The Act allows schools districts to operate Provision 2 or 3 district-wide or for a group of schools, further simplifying the administrative requirements of school meal program operations under Provisions 2 and 3.

Access to School Meals for Vulnerable Populations. The Act increases the availability of school breakfast and lunch for a number of specific vulnerable populations, including children in food stamp and military households, and homeless, migrant and runaway children, by:

- Simplifying the school meal application process by phasing in mandatory “direct certification” of children in food stamp households as eligible for free school meals. Under the new rules, all schools will be required to use food stamp applications for direct certification, and parents receiving food stamps will not need to return a letter or complete any paperwork for their child to receive free meals. Mandatory direct certification in all school districts will be phased in over three years – in the 2006-2007 school year, direct certification of food stamp households will be required in school districts with enrollments of at least 25,000 students in the preceding year; in 2007-2008, it will be required in school districts with at least 10,000 students in the preceding year; and in 2008-2009, it will be required in all schools nationwide.
- Easing the process for low-income families who do submit school meal applications by extending eligibility for the full school year. Once a family is approved, it retains its free or reduced price meal eligibility through the beginning of the following school year (with a new application due early in the school year), regardless of

changes in income. Previously, income was often determined monthly and children could become ineligible for help during the school year. Also, families now need to fill out only one application for all the children in the household. Previously, a separate application was required for each child.

- Providing migrant, homeless and runaway children with automatic eligibility for free school meals, meaning that those children and their families will no longer need to fill out any paperwork to start receiving free school meals.
- Providing more children from military families with free and reduced price school meals by excluding their households' privatized housing vouchers from being counted as income. (Some military families live in housing covered by the Military Housing Privatization Initiative. Through this initiative, private contractors operate military-owned housing on some military installations, and housing allowances appear on service members' earnings statements.)
- Making it possible for up to five states to offer free school meals to families who are currently eligible for reduced price meals, relieving them of paying the cost of up to 40 cents per meal. However, this part of the Act is dependent upon future Congressional funding. This is a pilot program to be evaluated within three years of implementation.

Nutrition environment. The Act addresses childhood obesity in several ways, including through the school meal programs, by:

- Creating new ways to improve the nutrition environment in schools by requiring school districts to establish wellness policies by the 2006 school year. These wellness policies will involve the community and develop goals and guidelines for school food, nutrition education, physical activity and other ways to promote student wellness. The Act also funds USDA to provide technical assistance and best practices to schools and states.
- Expanding the fresh fruit and vegetable “pilot” programs, which offer children free fresh fruits and vegetables at certain schools. Currently, pilots are in certain Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, and Ohio schools and an Indian reservation in New Mexico. The Act extends the pilots to

certain schools in Mississippi, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Washington and Indian reservations in Arizona and South Dakota, and provides special emphasis in new states on serving children in low-income areas.

CONCLUSION

School breakfast is an important means to move toward many of our society's critical goals for children:

- reducing hunger;
- improving achievement and behavior in school;
- improving health;
- reducing overweight among children; and
- strengthening schools.

Moreover, family lifestyles – work and commuting patterns – increasingly make school breakfast a necessary boost.

Anti-hunger advocates, school officials, and state agencies have developed strategies over the years that have proven effective across the nation in expanding and improving the School Breakfast Program. The improvements to the program enacted in the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 will further boost the opportunity states and schools have to realize the potential of the School Breakfast Program to provide all children a healthy start to the day.

Expanding school and student participation requires sustained, collaborative work over a period of time.

Schools and school districts can help by integrating breakfast into the school day, using mechanisms like “grab ‘n go” to serve it after the bell rings in the classroom. Providing school breakfast at no charge to all children, regardless of income level, eliminates the stigma while ensuring that every child starts the day ready to learn. Failing that, schools can also work to remove any stigma that exists around participation in the breakfast program by marketing it to all children and making sure that their programs do not inadvertently distinguish poor children from their more affluent peers.

States can help expand and improve school breakfast by providing financial support to supplement federal meal reimbursements, to carry out outreach campaigns, and to spread universal breakfast programs. States also can improve the program by requiring certain or all schools to offer breakfast, and by encouraging schools to take full advantage of paperwork-saving methods such as direct certification and Provisions 2 and 3.

The federal government can help by making funds available to support universal and in-classroom programs and to help with

start-up and outreach costs. The federal government also should ensure that states are aware of the improvements to the School Breakfast Program enacted in the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004, including the simplifications of direct certification and improved “severe need” reimbursement. And every stakeholder in the system – USDA, states, school districts, schools, parents and students should realize that an important step in meeting the new school wellness policy requirement is expanding participation in school breakfast.

As a critical nutrition, health, and educational support, school breakfast should be available to every school child in this nation. No child should have to start the school day hungry to learn, but unable to do so because of a hungry stomach.

TECHNICAL NOTES

The data in this report are collected from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) and an annual survey of state child nutrition officials conducted by FRAC. This report does not include students or schools that participate in school meal programs in Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, or Department of Defense schools.

Due to rounding, totals in the tables may not add up to 100 percent.

Student Participation

Student participation data for the 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 school years are based on daily averages of the number of breakfasts and lunches served during the nine months from September through May of each year, as provided by USDA and verified by FRAC with state officials. Prior to the 2003 report, the FRAC School Breakfast Scorecard compared daily student participation from only March of each year. This shift to nine-month averages provides a more accurate representation of student participation in the school meal programs. (The data for 1987-2001 in Figure 1 retain the use of only March numbers.)

States report to USDA the number of meals they serve each month. These numbers may undergo revisions by states as accounting procedures find errors, or other estimates become confirmed. For consistency, all USDA data used in this report are from the states' 90-day revisions of the monthly reports. The 90-day revisions are the final required reports from the states; states have the option to revise numbers further at any time after this point. USDA applies a formula to adjust numbers upwards to account for participation by students who are absent on one or more days or otherwise do not eat meals every day in a month.

School Participation

The number of participating schools is reported by states to the USDA in October of the relevant school year. This report uses the October number, which includes not only public schools but also private schools, residential child care institutions, and other institutions that operate school meal programs but may report separately to USDA rather than to the state agencies.

Unserved Children and Federal Funding

For each state, FRAC calculated the average daily number of children receiving free or reduced-price breakfasts for every 100 children receiving free or reduced-price lunches during the same school year. FRAC thereby determined that the top five states (Kentucky, Oregon, West Virginia, Mississippi, and Texas, which was tied with Oklahoma at 54) reached an average ratio of 55 children receiving free or reduced-price breakfast per 100 receiving free or reduced-price lunch.

FRAC estimated the number of unserved children in each of the 48 states and the District of Columbia with ratios below 55 by calculating the number of additional children who would be reached if each state reached this 55 to 100 ratio. FRAC then multiplied this unserved population by the reimbursement rate for 170 school days of breakfast.¹ FRAC assumed each state's mix of free and reduced-price students would apply to any new participants, and conservatively assumed that no new student's meal is reimbursed at the higher rate that "severe need" schools receive.

¹ While some states served breakfast for more or fewer days during the 2003-2004 school year, 170 was the national average.

MODEL SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAMS

**Contact
Information:**

David Berkowitz,
Director of
SchoolFood
718-707-4240

Toni Liquori,
Community Food
Resource Center
212-894-8078

NEW YORK CITY

Universal Free Breakfast Citywide

New York City's SchoolFood knows that "well-fed, well-nourished children are better equipped to learn," and strives to "feed more kids, with better food, and at lower cost." Universal free school breakfast has helped fulfill this mission: in the 2003-2004 school year, the first year of free breakfasts for all students, New York City saw a 12.8% increase in the number of breakfasts served over the previous year (an increase of 3.3 million breakfasts).

SchoolFood, part of New York City's Office of School Support Services, has been working to improve school meals through nutritional improvements, the overhaul of financial management and increased participation. During the 2002-2003 school year, SchoolFood staff initiated the idea of universal free school breakfast. They recognized its potential to reduce administrative costs associated with collecting and accounting for breakfast fees as well as to increase participation. SchoolFood approached the Chancellor of Education, Joel Klein, who supported the concept. They then proposed the idea to Mayor Michael Bloomberg, who embraced it, telling reporters "A kid comes to school without a decent meal in his or her stomach, they don't learn anything, so we're wasting our money." New York City started offering free breakfast to all students in the 2003-2004 school year.

A key to the success of universal free breakfast in New York City has been an aggressive public education campaign. While the main goal of the campaign was to inform students that school breakfast was now free for everyone, the publicity also raised general awareness of the School Breakfast Program and reduced the stigma associated with it. This effort was so successful in raising awareness that more than half (57 percent) of the 3.3 million additional breakfasts were served to children who were already eligible for free school breakfast. A sign of the improved image of school breakfast is that the largest growth in participation was in high schools, where school breakfast stigma had been strongest. With breakfast free for all students, it was no longer seen as a program just for low-income students. And with fees no longer being collected, students could no longer identify which of their peers were low-income.

Community Food Resource Center (CFRC), a nonprofit organization that has been promoting access to nutritious food for low-income New Yorkers for over twenty years, applauds the New York City Office of SchoolFood for taking the lead in offering

universal school breakfast. CFRC coordinates the SchoolFood Plus Coalition, a working group of government officials and local, state and national organizations, which seeks to increase participation and improve the quality of New York City school meals. According to Toni Liquori, Director of Food and Nutrition Services at CFRC, "the Coalition is a means to engage all of the stakeholders who play a role in changing what our children eat. The Office of SchoolFood anchors a lot of that work."

Martin Osterreich, director of the Office of School Support Services, sees universal free breakfast as a boost for education in New York City. The student representative to the New York City Panel on Educational Priorities (which replaced the Board of Education) reported to Mr. Osterreich that, with universal free breakfast, "kids are now coming to school on time to get breakfast." New York City students are benefiting academically as well as nutritionally, since fewer children are tardy or cutting first classes as a result of universal free breakfast.

Citywide universal free school breakfast "has worked out fantastically and has been successful from every angle," said Mr. Osterreich.

**Contact
Information:**
Jon Janowski,
Director of
Advocacy
414-777-0483

WISCONSIN Support for school breakfast from all levels of government

Wisconsin has perennially ranked last in school breakfast participation. But Wisconsin's Governor Jim Doyle, State Superintendent of Education Elizabeth Burmaster, and U.S. Senator Herb Kohl have all placed their support behind increasing school breakfast participation in the state. The Hunger Task Force, a statewide anti-hunger advocacy organization, is seeing the fruits of their efforts to educate local, state and federal officials on the great need in Wisconsin for action to improve participation. School breakfast participation in Wisconsin increased 7.8 percent in the 2003-2004 school year over the previous school year, one of the largest increases in the nation.

Jon Janowski, Director of Advocacy for the Hunger Task Force, reports that a "huge incentive" for bringing school breakfast to more schools has been Wisconsin's federal school breakfast start-up grants, secured by Senator Herb Kohl. In response to the last-place performance of Wisconsin in the proportion of schools offering breakfast programs, Senator Kohl directed funding for one-time breakfast start-up grants to schools in fiscal years 2001, 2002 and

2003. Over 200 Wisconsin schools have used this funding, which totaled more than \$2 million over 3 years.

Governor Jim Doyle has also been a driving force. Soon after his election in 2002, the Governor learned of Wisconsin's last place ranking in the School Breakfast Scorecard, and the Hunger Task Force started meeting with the Governor's staff to discuss school breakfast and other nutrition programs. In late 2003 the Governor called for a requirement that all schools in Wisconsin offer a school breakfast program: "I am calling for legislation to guarantee that every school in Wisconsin participates in the School Breakfast Program. It is time to stop making excuses, and start taking bold action to ensure that every child gets a healthy start to the school day." Governor Doyle has traveled the state, visiting quality school breakfast programs, and used the bully pulpit and press conferences to press for greater participation and utilization. In addition, the Governor's KidsFirst Initiative, released in April 2004, includes proposals to make it easier for eligible children and families to access nutrition programs and to increase the state subsidy for school breakfast by over 50%.

State Superintendent Elizabeth Burmaster is now proposing to go even further. In her State of Education address in September 2004, she stated: "Good health and nutrition affects a student's behavior, attendance, and test scores. Surveys indicate that cost is still a barrier to breakfast participation." Her current budget proposal reflects the Governor's initiative to increase Wisconsin's state reimbursement for school breakfast from 10 cents to 15 cents per meal. In addition, she also proposes eliminating the reduced price category in school breakfast, allowing all children in families with incomes below 185 percent of poverty to get free breakfasts. "A hungry child cannot learn," Burmaster said.

Contact**Information:**

Dianne Radigan,
Chief Operating
Officer, Children's
Hunger Alliance
614-341-7700, ext
225

**OHIO
Leadership, Partnerships, and Strategies**

Ohio doubled the national average for growth in School Breakfast Programs over the past two school years. While participation across the nation increased an average 4 percent per year from the 2001-2002 school year to the 2003-2004 school year, Ohio increased participation an average 8 percent per year over the same period.

Ohio made especially impressive gains in the 2003-2004 school year – a 10.8 percent increase in free and reduced price breakfast participation and 3.0 million additional free and reduced price breakfasts served. Three words help explain Ohio's success: leadership, partnerships and strategies.

Engaging Leadership at Every Level

The Ohio Legislature is supporting school breakfast with a \$0.06 per meal supplemental reimbursement and a mandate that requires schools to offer school breakfast when at least 33 percent of the students qualify for free meals. In addition, the Legislature appropriated \$1 million to the Children's Hunger Alliance for outreach to school administrators to stress the importance of school breakfast programs and their positive impact on learning and behavior.

With this funding, Children's Hunger Alliance and the Ohio Department of Education work together to increase participation in the School Breakfast Program and secure additional federal and state funding to support school breakfast, such as:

- \$188,000 in state money to reward schools for significant increases in breakfast participation and for maintaining a 75 percent participation rate,
- \$500,000 from USDA's "Start Smart...with School Breakfast" mini-grants to schools starting new breakfast programs, and
- \$100,000 from a \$200,000 USDA Team Nutrition Step Up To The Plate mini-grant to schools starting new breakfast programs or expanding existing programs.

Ohio's state superintendent of public instruction, Susan Tave Zelman, spoke at the Ohio School Food Service Association annual meeting about research that links academic success with breakfast. "The importance of eating a healthy breakfast should be recognized every day," she said. "Breakfast not only increases math, vocabulary

and reading scores, but... also improves behavior and reduces rates of absenteeism and tardiness.”

In the Cincinnati Schools, universal free breakfast had been implemented in a handful of buildings with success, but overall participation had languished at 27%. Former Governor (and current Cincinnati Schools board member) John Gilligan helped engage district leadership, including assistant superintendent Rosa Blackwell and city council member David Crowley. To date, 22 schools have universal free breakfast and 20 more are considering it. Leadership is critical. As Rosa Blackwell said to her principals, “I can think of no reason why children in the Cincinnati Schools would not have breakfast.”

The Power of Partnerships

“A successful School Breakfast Program that ensures all children have the nourishment they need to succeed requires strong partnerships,” said Bill Dolan, CEO of the Children’s Hunger Alliance. The most significant partnerships in Ohio during this past year include the following:

- The American Dairy Association is the driving force to reward districts for implementing three successful strategies: breakfast in the classroom, “grab ‘n go” breakfast, and universal breakfast. The Dairy Association provided mini-grants to test these strategies and to provide schools with incentive items (stickers, pencils, key chains) to give to children and teachers to promote participation, as well as coolers worth tens of thousands of dollars.
- Action for Healthy Kids is a national initiative to help make schools healthier places for children. In Ohio, one of the three goals of this initiative is to expand access to school breakfast. Currently, 65 state and local organizations are engaged in the initiative. In Ohio, the initiative is divided into ten zones that align with superintendent regions and foster grassroots efforts to provide information, improvement plans and technical assistance to school districts.
- The Children’s Hunger Alliance facilitates monthly media events promoting school breakfast. These media events provide an opportunity for legislators, superintendents, principals, and food service staff to bask in the glow of positive media coverage of school successes. The positive

press also serves as an incentive for other local school districts to follow suit.

The University of Cincinnati is conducting a formal evaluation of the Children's Hunger Alliance's initiative to expand school breakfast. Preliminary data from 889 teachers, principals, superintendents and custodial staff reveal the following:

- All respondents reported that breakfast is very important or important in preparing a child to learn,
- Over 80 percent of superintendents, principals and teachers reported that breakfast supported efforts to reduce hunger,
- Over 80 percent noted that the breakfast program succeeded in increasing student academic achievement and student attentiveness, and
- 74 percent noted that the breakfast program promoted students' well-being.

Additional data are being collected and analyzed and a final report will be available in Spring 2005.

Successful Strategies for Making the Case for Expanding School Breakfast

- Do whatever it takes to get the attention of key people, from the superintendent and the curriculum director, to teachers, food service staff, and the custodial staff.
- Link the breakfast program to continuous education improvement plans and learning. In Ohio, school districts are now encouraged to include improved school climate as an element of their district continuous improvement plans, with healthy nutrition environment and high quality school food service identified as key components.
- Link the breakfast program to improved attendance and performance, and reduced tardiness. Research has shown that the School Breakfast Program increases attendance, tardiness and performance.
- Link the breakfast program to financial viability of the school food service department.
- Use Census and school district data on school breakfast eligibility and participation to determine areas of greatest need and potential.
- Identify specific barriers to participation. Is it because the cafeteria is too small, because of boring food choices or an unpleasant environment, or is it due to a lack of awareness of the program or students' eligibility? Use this information to target efforts.

Successful Implementation Strategies for Expanding School Breakfast

Universal breakfast can be effective even in districts with low percentages of students eligible for free and reduced price breakfasts, if the school food service is efficient and has some individual schools with high percentages of free and reduced price students.

Breakfast in the classroom can overcome the space limitations of a small cafeteria, and can also lead to better attendance and truancy statistics. And teachers love breakfast in the classroom once any concerns for cleanliness and time constraints are resolved. In fact, teachers report that it not only decreases behavior problems and helps children focus on learning but also helps create a community in the classroom. When the children and the teacher eat together a positive bond is formed that carries over into the school day.

“Grab ‘n go” breakfast, with kiosks in hallways, is a perfect strategy for older youth who don’t always stop by the cafeteria before going to class. Cleveland Municipal School District high schools already used Provision 2 to offer universal free breakfast, but participation in the high schools and middle schools was dropping off. So the school district implemented “grab ‘n go” breakfast, and participation increased more than 200 percent.

**Table 1: LOW-INCOME STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL LUNCH (NSLP) AND BREAKFAST (SBP),
School Years 2002-2003 and 2003-2004**

| State | School Year 2002-03 | | | | School Year 2003-04 | | | | Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation |
|----------------|---|----------------------|---------------------------------------|------|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|------|--|
| | Free & Reduced Price (F&RP) NSLP Students | F&RP SBP Students | Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP | Rank | F&RP NSLP Students | F&RP SBP Students | Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP | Rank | |
| Alabama | 334,608 | 142,429 | 42.6 | 20 | 340,606 | 148,636 | 43.6 | 18 | 1.1 |
| Alaska | 30,144 | 9,237 | 30.6 | 47 | 30,859 | 9,746 | 31.6 | 47 | 0.9 |
| Arizona | 339,895 | 140,048 | 41.2 | 24 | 365,271 | 148,382 | 40.6 | 24 | -0.6 |
| Arkansas | 197,348 | 104,927 | 53.2 | 6 | 202,474 | 108,743 | 53.7 | 7 | 0.5 |
| California | 2,030,009 | 786,769 | 38.8 | 28 | 2,096,190 | 839,087 | 40.0 | 28 | 1.3 |
| Colorado | 163,019 | 50,884 | 31.2 | 46 | 172,108 | 57,416 | 33.4 | 44 | 2.1 |
| Connecticut | 128,996 | 43,062 | 33.4 | 44 | 133,158 | 44,884 | 33.7 | 43 | 0.3 |
| D.C. | 41,507 | 17,414 | 42.0 | 22 | 38,266 | 15,574 | 40.7 | 23 | -1.3 |
| Delaware | 35,064 | 14,717 | 42.0 | 21 | 36,336 | 16,051 | 44.2 | 16 | 2.2 |
| Florida | 951,987 | 409,175 | 43.0 | 19 | 984,164 | 430,275 | 43.7 | 17 | 0.7 |
| Georgia | 627,517 | 322,127 | 51.3 | 8 | 663,074 | 346,589 | 52.3 | 11 | 0.9 |
| Hawaii | 64,719 | 24,806 | 38.3 | 29 | 60,866 | 25,402 | 41.7 | 21 | 3.4 |
| Idaho | 77,779 | 27,009 | 34.7 | 39 | 81,131 | 32,005 | 39.4 | 30 | 4.7 |
| Illinois | 674,573 | 190,581 | 28.3 | 48 | 675,487 | 188,271 | 27.9 | 48 | -0.4 |
| Indiana | 275,044 | 104,700 | 38.1 | 30 | 291,522 | 111,946 | 38.4 | 33 | 0.3 |
| Iowa | 127,409 | 45,938 | 36.1 | 36 | 132,996 | 47,344 | 35.6 | 40 | -0.5 |
| Kansas | 140,169 | 60,403 | 43.1 | 18 | 147,213 | 59,987 | 40.7 | 22 | -2.3 |
| Kentucky | 279,674 | 150,649 | 53.9 | 4 | 290,879 | 159,383 | 54.8 | 3 | 0.9 |
| Louisiana | 403,427 | 202,061 | 50.1 | 12 | 411,037 | 210,281 | 51.2 | 12 | 1.1 |
| Maine | 47,940 | 19,184 | 40.0 | 26 | 49,606 | 20,085 | 40.5 | 25 | 0.5 |
| Maryland | 224,669 | 93,096 | 41.4 | 23 | 216,166 | 87,347 | 40.4 | 27 | -1.0 |
| Massachusetts | 221,621 | 97,185 | 43.9 | 17 | 226,276 | 98,238 | 43.4 | 19 | -0.4 |
| Michigan | 432,670 | 175,732 | 40.6 | 25 | 450,350 | 182,330 | 40.5 | 26 | -0.1 |
| Minnesota | 194,885 | 73,636 | 37.8 | 31 | 204,300 | 77,164 | 37.8 | 36 | 0.0 |
| Mississippi | 289,454 | 157,508 | 54.4 | 3 | 295,094 | 161,356 | 54.7 | 4 | 0.3 |
| Missouri | 298,994 | 136,385 | 45.6 | 15 | 308,460 | 140,677 | 45.6 | 15 | 0.0 |
| Montana | 37,748 | 13,858 | 36.7 | 35 | 38,832 | 14,845 | 38.2 | 34 | 1.5 |
| Nebraska | 88,563 | 28,263 | 31.9 | 45 | 91,424 | 29,637 | 32.4 | 46 | 0.5 |
| Nevada | 86,573 | 32,594 | 37.6 | 32 | 92,996 | 36,110 | 38.8 | 31 | 1.2 |
| New Hampshire | 28,624 | 9,680 | 33.8 | 42 | 31,805 | 10,461 | 32.9 | 45 | -0.9 |
| New Jersey | 312,755 | 76,387 | 24.4 | 50 | 316,285 | 82,220 | 26.0 | 50 | 1.6 |
| New Mexico | 152,640 | 77,526 | 50.8 | 9 | 156,676 | 83,063 | 53.0 | 8 | 2.2 |
| New York | 1,134,820 | 383,004 | 33.8 | 43 | 1,139,526 | 403,890 | 35.4 | 41 | 1.7 |
| North Carolina | 494,092 | 243,350 | 49.3 | 13 | 517,254 | 252,753 | 48.9 | 13 | -0.4 |
| North Dakota | 26,960 | 9,350 | 34.7 | 40 | 26,763 | 9,434 | 35.3 | 42 | 0.6 |
| Ohio | 471,450 | 174,284 | 37.0 | 34 | 498,356 | 193,063 | 38.7 | 32 | 1.8 |
| Oklahoma | 241,823 | 129,203 | 53.4 | 5 | 249,911 | 134,830 | 54.0 | 6 | 0.5 |
| Oregon | 164,884 | 91,427 | 55.4 | 1 | 172,980 | 96,822 | 56.0 | 1 | 0.5 |
| Pennsylvania | 467,220 | 167,293 | 35.8 | 37 | 486,731 | 175,429 | 36.0 | 38 | 0.2 |
| Rhode Island | 42,664 | 16,048 | 37.6 | 33 | 49,976 | 18,894 | 37.8 | 35 | 0.2 |
| South Carolina | 295,661 | 148,950 | 50.4 | 11 | 302,723 | 158,824 | 52.5 | 9 | 2.1 |
| South Dakota | 42,684 | 14,945 | 35.0 | 38 | 43,034 | 15,881 | 36.9 | 37 | 1.9 |
| Tennessee | 353,990 | 167,452 | 47.3 | 14 | 370,489 | 177,886 | 48.0 | 14 | 0.7 |
| Texas | 1,842,303 | 970,704 | 52.7 | 7 | 1,922,409 | 1,038,136 | 54.0 | 5 | 1.3 |
| Utah | 122,860 | 33,891 | 27.6 | 49 | 129,023 | 35,838 | 27.8 | 49 | 0.2 |
| Vermont | 21,784 | 11,026 | 50.6 | 10 | 22,465 | 11,747 | 52.3 | 10 | 1.7 |
| Virginia | 305,697 | 135,589 | 44.4 | 16 | 308,767 | 132,557 | 42.9 | 20 | -1.4 |
| Washington | 273,502 | 109,340 | 40.0 | 27 | 283,756 | 113,288 | 39.9 | 29 | -0.1 |
| West Virginia | 116,177 | 63,614 | 54.8 | 2 | 114,260 | 63,932 | 56.0 | 2 | 1.2 |
| Wisconsin | 209,188 | 49,771 | 23.8 | 51 | 216,054 | 53,646 | 24.8 | 51 | 1.0 |
| Wyoming | 21,843 | 7,488 | 34.3 | 41 | 22,060 | 7,928 | 35.9 | 39 | 1.7 |
| TOTAL | 15,989,626 | 6,764,699 | 42.3 | | 16,508,440 | 7,118,313 | 43.1 | | 0.8 |

**Table 2: SCHOOL PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL LUNCH (NSLP)
AND BREAKFAST (SBP), School Years 2002-2003 and 2003-2004**

| State | School Year 2002-03 | | | | School Year 2003-04 | | | | Percentage Point Change from SY 2002-03 to SY 2003-04 |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|------|---------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|------|--|
| | NSLP Schools | SBP Schools | SBP Schools as % of NSLP Schools | Rank | NSLP Schools | SBP Schools | SBP Schools as % of NSLP Schools | Rank | |
| Alabama | 1,537 | 1,228 | 79.9% | 31 | 1,548 | 1,292 | 83.5% | 29 | 3.6 |
| Alaska | 431 | 274 | 63.6% | 42 | 442 | 270 | 61.1% | 45 | -2.5 |
| Arizona | 1,429 | 1,245 | 87.1% | 21 | 1,512 | 1,337 | 88.4% | 22 | 1.3 |
| Arkansas | 1,271 | 1,235 | 97.2% | 6 | 1,270 | 1,242 | 97.8% | 4 | 0.6 |
| California | 10,491 | 8,301 | 79.1% | 32 | 10,732 | 8,390 | 78.2% | 32 | -0.9 |
| Colorado | 1,555 | 968 | 62.3% | 44 | 1,619 | 1,060 | 65.5% | 43 | 3.2 |
| Connecticut | 1,099 | 547 | 49.8% | 49 | 1,110 | 563 | 50.7% | 49 | 0.9 |
| Delaware | 226 | 222 | 98.2% | 4 | 221 | 218 | 98.6% | 3 | 0.4 |
| D.C. | 186 | 171 | 91.9% | 11 | 193 | 168 | 87.0% | 26 | -4.9 |
| Florida | 3,271 | 2,997 | 91.6% | 13 | 3,370 | 3,177 | 94.3% | 10 | 2.6 |
| Georgia | 2,160 | 2,150 | 99.5% | 2 | 2,122 | 2,070 | 97.5% | 6 | -2.0 |
| Hawaii | 279 | 252 | 90.3% | 18 | 298 | 280 | 94.0% | 11 | 3.6 |
| Idaho | 662 | 557 | 84.1% | 27 | 632 | 578 | 91.5% | 15 | 7.3 |
| Illinois | 4,412 | 2,542 | 57.6% | 46 | 4,389 | 2,608 | 59.4% | 46 | 1.8 |
| Indiana | 2,162 | 1,370 | 63.4% | 43 | 2,241 | 1,624 | 72.5% | 36 | 9.1 |
| Iowa | 1,606 | 1,424 | 88.7% | 20 | 1,559 | 1,390 | 89.2% | 21 | 0.5 |
| Kansas | 1,599 | 1,322 | 82.7% | 29 | 1,593 | 1,319 | 82.8% | 30 | 0.1 |
| Kentucky | 1,521 | 1,394 | 91.7% | 12 | 1,507 | 1,392 | 92.4% | 14 | 0.7 |
| Louisiana | 1,709 | 1,572 | 92.0% | 10 | 1,702 | 1,575 | 92.5% | 12 | 0.6 |
| Maine | 728 | 586 | 80.5% | 30 | 727 | 597 | 82.1% | 31 | 1.6 |
| Maryland | 1,516 | 1,371 | 90.4% | 17 | 1,529 | 1,398 | 91.4% | 16 | 1.0 |
| Massachusetts | 2,369 | 1,563 | 66.0% | 40 | 2,357 | 1,542 | 65.4% | 44 | -0.6 |
| Michigan | 4,023 | 3,014 | 74.9% | 33 | 4,000 | 3,030 | 75.8% | 33 | 0.8 |
| Minnesota | 1,989 | 1,348 | 67.8% | 36 | 2,073 | 1,432 | 69.1% | 38 | 1.3 |
| Mississippi | 921 | 833 | 90.4% | 16 | 950 | 850 | 89.5% | 19 | -1.0 |
| Missouri | 2,569 | 2,146 | 83.5% | 28 | 2,537 | 2,144 | 84.5% | 28 | 1.0 |
| Montana | 807 | 557 | 69.0% | 35 | 803 | 579 | 72.1% | 37 | 3.1 |
| Nebraska | 1,024 | 540 | 52.7% | 47 | 1,023 | 554 | 54.2% | 47 | 1.4 |
| Nevada | 472 | 420 | 89.0% | 19 | 483 | 432 | 89.4% | 20 | 0.5 |
| New Hampshire | 511 | 378 | 74.0% | 34 | 506 | 376 | 74.3% | 34 | 0.3 |
| New Jersey | 2,653 | 1,157 | 43.6% | 51 | 2,701 | 1,316 | 48.7% | 50 | 5.1 |
| New Mexico | 816 | 759 | 93.0% | 9 | 819 | 757 | 92.4% | 13 | -0.6 |
| New York | 5,948 | 5,063 | 85.1% | 26 | 5,920 | 5,057 | 85.4% | 27 | 0.3 |
| North Carolina | 2,272 | 2,197 | 96.7% | 7 | 2,277 | 2,218 | 97.4% | 8 | 0.7 |
| North Dakota | 434 | 268 | 61.8% | 45 | 427 | 281 | 65.8% | 42 | 4.1 |
| Ohio | 4,139 | 2,172 | 52.5% | 48 | 4,192 | 2,257 | 53.8% | 48 | 1.4 |
| Oklahoma | 1,852 | 1,607 | 86.8% | 23 | 1,887 | 1,723 | 91.3% | 17 | 4.5 |
| Oregon | 1,412 | 1,291 | 91.4% | 14 | 1,340 | 1,272 | 94.9% | 9 | 3.5 |
| Pennsylvania | 3,864 | 2,581 | 66.8% | 37 | 3,869 | 2,650 | 68.5% | 39 | 1.7 |
| Rhode Island | 387 | 369 | 95.3% | 8 | 448 | 442 | 98.7% | 2 | 3.3 |
| South Carolina | 1,096 | 1,092 | 99.6% | 1 | 1,109 | 1,103 | 99.5% | 1 | -0.2 |
| South Dakota | 676 | 448 | 66.3% | 39 | 657 | 437 | 66.5% | 41 | 0.2 |
| Tennessee | 1,751 | 1,597 | 91.2% | 15 | 1,692 | 1,518 | 89.7% | 18 | -1.5 |
| Texas | 7,041 | 6,871 | 97.6% | 5 | 7,126 | 6,962 | 97.7% | 5 | 0.1 |
| Utah | 808 | 536 | 66.3% | 38 | 823 | 601 | 73.0% | 35 | 6.7 |
| Vermont | 347 | 298 | 85.9% | 25 | 332 | 289 | 87.0% | 25 | 1.2 |
| Virginia | 1,970 | 1,709 | 86.8% | 24 | 2,015 | 1,762 | 87.4% | 23 | 0.7 |
| Washington | 2,054 | 1,784 | 86.9% | 22 | 2,066 | 1,806 | 87.4% | 24 | 0.6 |
| West Virginia | 779 | 770 | 98.8% | 3 | 776 | 756 | 97.4% | 7 | -1.4 |
| Wisconsin | 2,465 | 1,127 | 45.7% | 50 | 2,483 | 1,172 | 47.2% | 51 | 1.5 |
| Wyoming | 375 | 247 | 65.9% | 41 | 368 | 252 | 68.5% | 40 | 2.6 |
| TOTAL | 97,674 | 76,470 | 78.3% | | 98,375 | 78,118 | 79.4% | | 1.1 |

**Table 3: TOTAL STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAM (SBP)
School Year 2003-2004**

| State | Free (F) SBP Students | | Reduced Price (RP) SBP Students | | Total F&RP SBP Students | | Paid SBP Students | | Total SBP Students |
|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | |
| Alabama | 135,184 | 77.2% | 13,452 | 7.7% | 148,636 | 84.9% | 26,367 | 15.1% | 175,002 |
| Alaska | 8,263 | 67.1% | 1,483 | 12.0% | 9,746 | 79.1% | 2,573 | 20.9% | 12,318 |
| Arizona | 132,084 | 74.7% | 16,298 | 9.2% | 148,382 | 83.9% | 28,519 | 16.1% | 176,901 |
| Arkansas | 97,489 | 73.9% | 11,254 | 8.5% | 108,743 | 82.4% | 23,200 | 17.6% | 131,944 |
| California | 734,283 | 78.2% | 104,805 | 11.2% | 839,087 | 89.4% | 99,501 | 10.6% | 938,588 |
| Colorado | 50,647 | 69.7% | 6,770 | 9.3% | 57,416 | 79.0% | 15,276 | 21.0% | 72,692 |
| Connecticut | 41,182 | 78.9% | 3,702 | 7.1% | 44,884 | 86.0% | 7,285 | 14.0% | 52,169 |
| Delaware | 14,326 | 64.5% | 1,724 | 7.8% | 16,051 | 72.2% | 6,172 | 27.8% | 22,223 |
| D.C. | 14,630 | 83.3% | 944 | 5.4% | 15,574 | 88.7% | 1,990 | 11.3% | 17,565 |
| Florida | 381,350 | 72.4% | 48,924 | 9.3% | 430,275 | 81.6% | 96,701 | 18.4% | 526,976 |
| Georgia | 305,472 | 69.3% | 41,117 | 9.3% | 346,589 | 78.6% | 94,508 | 21.4% | 441,098 |
| Hawaii | 21,134 | 54.2% | 4,267 | 11.0% | 25,402 | 65.2% | 13,564 | 34.8% | 38,965 |
| Idaho | 27,395 | 66.6% | 4,610 | 11.2% | 32,005 | 77.8% | 9,151 | 22.2% | 41,156 |
| Illinois | 176,481 | 82.0% | 11,790 | 5.5% | 188,271 | 87.5% | 26,862 | 12.5% | 215,132 |
| Indiana | 99,142 | 70.9% | 12,803 | 9.2% | 111,946 | 80.0% | 27,942 | 20.0% | 139,887 |
| Iowa | 40,145 | 55.5% | 7,199 | 10.0% | 47,344 | 65.5% | 24,950 | 34.5% | 72,295 |
| Kansas | 49,856 | 64.0% | 10,131 | 13.0% | 59,987 | 77.0% | 17,902 | 23.0% | 77,889 |
| Kentucky | 140,487 | 68.4% | 18,896 | 9.2% | 159,383 | 77.6% | 45,946 | 22.4% | 205,330 |
| Louisiana | 193,119 | 78.7% | 17,162 | 7.0% | 210,281 | 85.7% | 35,181 | 14.3% | 245,462 |
| Maine | 17,142 | 59.2% | 2,942 | 10.2% | 20,085 | 69.3% | 8,894 | 30.7% | 28,979 |
| Maryland | 73,602 | 62.6% | 13,746 | 11.7% | 87,347 | 74.3% | 30,222 | 25.7% | 117,569 |
| Massachusetts | 91,139 | 78.1% | 7,099 | 6.1% | 98,238 | 84.1% | 18,527 | 15.9% | 116,765 |
| Michigan | 165,954 | 74.5% | 16,376 | 7.4% | 182,330 | 81.9% | 40,313 | 18.1% | 222,644 |
| Minnesota | 63,123 | 55.5% | 14,042 | 12.3% | 77,164 | 67.8% | 36,591 | 32.2% | 113,755 |
| Mississippi | 148,299 | 81.8% | 13,056 | 7.2% | 161,356 | 89.0% | 19,911 | 11.0% | 181,266 |
| Missouri | 123,816 | 68.0% | 16,861 | 9.3% | 140,677 | 77.3% | 41,405 | 22.7% | 182,082 |
| Montana | 12,914 | 66.6% | 1,930 | 10.0% | 14,845 | 76.6% | 4,539 | 23.4% | 19,384 |
| Nebraska | 25,292 | 60.7% | 4,344 | 10.4% | 29,637 | 71.1% | 12,055 | 28.9% | 41,691 |
| Nevada | 31,965 | 72.2% | 4,144 | 9.4% | 36,110 | 81.6% | 8,138 | 18.4% | 44,248 |
| New Hampshire | 8,900 | 44.5% | 1,561 | 7.8% | 10,461 | 52.3% | 9,557 | 47.7% | 20,018 |
| New Jersey | 73,205 | 73.5% | 9,014 | 9.0% | 82,220 | 82.5% | 17,407 | 17.5% | 99,627 |
| New Mexico | 73,268 | 73.8% | 9,795 | 9.9% | 83,063 | 83.6% | 16,264 | 16.4% | 99,327 |
| New York | 364,398 | 74.3% | 39,493 | 8.1% | 403,890 | 82.4% | 86,415 | 17.6% | 490,306 |
| North Carolina | 223,126 | 70.2% | 29,627 | 9.3% | 252,753 | 79.6% | 64,924 | 20.4% | 317,677 |
| North Dakota | 7,995 | 53.2% | 1,440 | 9.6% | 9,434 | 62.8% | 5,580 | 37.2% | 15,015 |
| Ohio | 177,210 | 76.2% | 15,853 | 6.8% | 193,063 | 83.0% | 39,434 | 17.0% | 232,497 |
| Oklahoma | 117,429 | 71.1% | 17,401 | 10.5% | 134,830 | 81.7% | 30,256 | 18.3% | 165,086 |
| Oregon | 85,164 | 69.9% | 11,659 | 9.6% | 96,822 | 79.5% | 24,937 | 20.5% | 121,760 |
| Pennsylvania | 157,100 | 70.2% | 18,329 | 8.2% | 175,429 | 78.4% | 48,429 | 21.6% | 223,858 |
| Rhode Island | 17,288 | 75.8% | 1,605 | 7.0% | 18,894 | 82.8% | 3,918 | 17.2% | 22,812 |
| South Carolina | 143,984 | 77.2% | 14,840 | 8.0% | 158,824 | 85.1% | 27,768 | 14.9% | 186,592 |
| South Dakota | 14,040 | 69.1% | 1,841 | 9.1% | 15,881 | 78.1% | 4,440 | 21.9% | 20,321 |
| Tennessee | 158,719 | 72.2% | 19,167 | 8.7% | 177,886 | 80.9% | 42,091 | 19.1% | 219,977 |
| Texas | 942,801 | 76.8% | 95,335 | 7.8% | 1,038,136 | 84.6% | 189,522 | 15.4% | 1,227,658 |
| Utah | 30,920 | 71.7% | 4,918 | 11.4% | 35,838 | 83.1% | 7,301 | 16.9% | 43,138 |
| Vermont | 9,737 | 54.8% | 2,009 | 11.3% | 11,747 | 66.1% | 6,018 | 33.9% | 17,764 |
| Virginia | 115,342 | 65.4% | 17,215 | 9.8% | 132,557 | 75.2% | 43,831 | 24.8% | 176,388 |
| Washington | 97,273 | 71.2% | 16,015 | 11.7% | 113,288 | 82.9% | 23,323 | 17.1% | 136,612 |
| West Virginia | 53,861 | 61.3% | 10,071 | 11.5% | 63,932 | 72.8% | 23,871 | 27.2% | 87,803 |
| Wisconsin | 46,050 | 62.7% | 7,596 | 10.3% | 53,646 | 73.0% | 19,843 | 27.0% | 73,489 |
| Wyoming | 6,605 | 63.0% | 1,323 | 12.6% | 7,928 | 75.7% | 2,550 | 24.3% | 10,478 |
| TOTAL | 6,340,333 | 69.2% | 777,980 | 9.3% | 7,118,313 | 78.5% | 1,561,865 | 21.5% | 8,680,178 |

**Table 4: ADDITIONAL PARTICIPATION AND FUNDING IN EACH STATE IF
55 LOW-INCOME STUDENTS WERE SERVED SCHOOL
BREAKFAST (SBP) PER 100 SERVED SCHOOL LUNCH (NSLP)
School Year 2003-2004**

| | Actual Total Free & Reduced Price (F&RP) SBP Students | Additional F&RP Students if 55 SBP per 100 NSLP | Total F&RP Students if 55 SBP per 100 NSLP | Additional Annual Funding if 55 SBP per 100 NSLP F&RP Students |
|----------------|--|--|---|---|
| Alabama | 148,636 | 38,697 | 187,333 | \$7,715,666 |
| Alaska | 9,746 | 7,227 | 16,973 | \$2,290,429 |
| Arizona | 148,382 | 52,517 | 200,899 | \$10,419,239 |
| Arkansas | 108,743 | 2,617 | 111,361 | \$520,089 |
| California | 839,087 | 313,817 | 1,152,905 | \$62,019,656 |
| Colorado | 57,416 | 37,243 | 94,660 | \$7,373,687 |
| Connecticut | 44,884 | 28,353 | 73,237 | \$5,664,798 |
| Delaware | 16,051 | 3,934 | 19,985 | \$781,018 |
| D.C. | 15,574 | 5,472 | 21,046 | \$1,099,314 |
| Florida | 430,275 | 111,016 | 541,290 | \$22,003,393 |
| Georgia | 346,589 | 18,101 | 364,691 | \$3,583,146 |
| Hawaii | 25,402 | 8,075 | 33,477 | \$1,838,903 |
| Idaho | 32,005 | 12,616 | 44,622 | \$2,481,083 |
| Illinois | 188,271 | 183,247 | 371,518 | \$36,797,178 |
| Indiana | 111,946 | 48,391 | 160,337 | \$9,589,566 |
| Iowa | 47,344 | 25,803 | 73,148 | \$5,063,739 |
| Kansas | 59,987 | 20,980 | 80,967 | \$4,099,259 |
| Kentucky* | 159,383 | 600 | 159,983 | \$118,773 |
| Louisiana | 210,281 | 15,789 | 226,070 | \$3,155,307 |
| Maine | 20,085 | 7,198 | 27,283 | \$1,414,678 |
| Maryland | 87,347 | 31,544 | 118,891 | \$6,181,839 |
| Massachusetts | 98,238 | 26,214 | 124,452 | \$5,251,028 |
| Michigan | 182,330 | 65,362 | 247,692 | \$13,034,430 |
| Minnesota | 77,164 | 35,201 | 112,365 | \$6,854,262 |
| Mississippi* | 161,356 | 946 | 162,302 | \$189,115 |
| Missouri | 140,677 | 28,976 | 169,653 | \$5,734,076 |
| Montana | 14,845 | 6,513 | 21,358 | \$1,285,435 |
| Nebraska | 29,637 | 20,647 | 50,283 | \$4,057,539 |
| Nevada | 36,110 | 15,038 | 51,148 | \$2,979,790 |
| New Hampshire | 10,461 | 7,032 | 17,493 | \$1,380,994 |
| New Jersey | 82,220 | 91,737 | 173,956 | \$18,201,384 |
| New Mexico | 83,063 | 3,109 | 86,172 | \$615,448 |
| New York | 403,890 | 222,849 | 626,739 | \$44,349,855 |
| North Carolina | 252,753 | 31,737 | 284,490 | \$6,284,640 |
| North Dakota | 9,434 | 5,285 | 14,720 | \$1,037,075 |
| Ohio | 193,063 | 81,033 | 274,096 | \$16,191,286 |
| Oklahoma* | 134,830 | 2,621 | 137,451 | \$517,508 |
| Oregon* | 96,822 | --- | --- | --- |
| Pennsylvania | 175,429 | 92,273 | 267,702 | \$18,332,010 |
| Rhode Island | 18,894 | 8,593 | 27,487 | \$1,715,742 |
| South Carolina | 158,824 | 7,673 | 166,497 | \$1,528,822 |
| South Dakota | 15,881 | 7,788 | 23,669 | \$1,542,748 |
| Tennessee | 177,886 | 25,883 | 203,769 | \$5,137,894 |
| Texas* | 1,038,136 | 19,189 | 1,057,325 | \$3,824,609 |
| Utah | 35,838 | 35,125 | 70,963 | \$6,919,651 |
| Vermont | 11,747 | 609 | 12,356 | \$118,960 |
| Virginia | 132,557 | 37,265 | 169,822 | \$7,355,157 |
| Washington | 113,288 | 42,777 | 156,066 | \$8,418,111 |
| West Virginia* | 63,932 | --- | --- | --- |
| Wisconsin | 53,646 | 65,183 | 118,830 | \$12,826,690 |
| Wyoming | 7,928 | 4,204 | 12,133 | \$821,928 |
| TOTAL | 7,118,313 | 1,964,102 | 9,082,415 | \$390,716,948 |

**The ratio of 55 free and reduced price SBP students per 100 F&RP NSLP students is the average of the top 5 ratios, and therefore an attainable goal. Oregon and West Virginia are excluded from the table because their ratio exceeded 55 per 100, reaching 56 per 100. The other states with ratios in the top 5 were Kentucky (54.8), Mississippi (54.7), and Texas (54.0). Oklahoma also had a ratio of 54.0.*

Table 5: STATE LEGISLATION PROMOTING SCHOOL BREAKFAST

Types of state school breakfast legislation included in this table:

State mandate (M) – State law requiring that all or certain schools participate in the School Breakfast Program (SBP)

State funding (\$) – State funds for one purpose or another related to the SBP

Universal breakfast funding (U) – State funding for universal free school breakfast in certain schools

Reporting requirement (R) – State law that schools or districts report reasons for nonparticipation in the SBP

Scheduling requirement (S) – State law that school schedules allow students time to eat breakfast

Outreach requirement (O) – State law that requires outreach related to the SBP

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Alabama | NONE |
| Alaska | NONE |
| Arizona | R Schools that have 35 percent or more free or reduced price (F&RP) eligible students and that do not participate in the School Breakfast Program (SBP) must report the reasons for nonparticipation. HR 2211, 45 th Leg., 1 st Reg. Sess. (Az. 2001). In effect since September 2001, this act was repealed effective January 1, 2004. |
| Arkansas | M School breakfast is required in schools with 20 percent or more F&RP eligible students. ARK. CODE ANN. § 6-18-705. |
| California | M Public schools must provide at least one free or reduced price meal daily to all F&RP eligible students. CAL. EDUC. CODE § 49558. \$ Grants of up to \$15,000 are available per school, on a competitive basis, up to the annual appropriation (\$1,010,000 for school year 2004-05), for nonrecurring breakfast start-up and expansion expenses where 20 percent or more of students are approved for F&RP meals. CAL. EDUC. CODE § 49550.3. The State provides an additional reimbursement, adjusted annually. The 2004-05 rate is \$.1356 per meal served in public and private schools. CAL. EDUC. CODE §49536. |
| Colorado | \$ The State may appropriate moneys for the creation, expansion, or enhancement of the SBP in low performing schools (any school that received an academic performance rating of low or unsatisfactory the preceding school year). COL. REV. STAT. § 22-54-123.5. |
| Connecticut | M School breakfast is required in K-8 schools where 80 percent of lunches served are F&RP eligible. CONN. GEN. STAT. ANN. § 10-266w. \$ Within the limits of annual appropriation, the State offers a \$3,000 flat grant to each severe need school (those where 40 percent or more of the lunches served in the second preceding year were to F&RP eligible students), and up to \$0.10 reimbursement per breakfast served in each severe need school. CONN. GEN. STAT. ANN. § 10-266w. |
| Delaware | NONE |
| District of Columbia | NONE |
| Florida | M School breakfast is required in all public elementary schools. FLA. STAT. § 1006.06. \$ The State provides the difference between the federal reimbursement and the average statewide school breakfast cost for every school breakfast served in public elementary schools. FLA. STAT. § 1006.06. |

Table 5: STATE LEGISLATION PROMOTING SCHOOL BREAKFAST

| | | |
|-----------|---|---|
| Georgia | M | School breakfast is required in K-8 schools with 25 percent or more F&RP eligible students and in all other schools with 40 percent or more F&RP eligible students. GA. CODE ANN. § 20-2-66. |
| Hawaii | S | The State provides approximately \$0.14 per breakfast. |
| Idaho | | NONE |
| Illinois | S | <p>The State provides start-up funds of up to \$3,500 per school for nonrecurring costs; priority is given to schools with at least 50 percent F&RP eligible students. IL. STAT. § 105 ILCS 125/2.5.</p> <p>The State also provides \$0.15 per free breakfast served. Schools are eligible for an additional \$0.10 reimbursement for each free, reduced price and paid breakfast served if breakfast participation increases; the additional reimbursement is automatic if the number of breakfasts served in the month exceeds the number of breakfasts served in the same month of the previous year by 10 percent. IL. STAT. § 105 ILCS 125/2.5.</p> <p>The State may reduce or disapprove state funding if it is found that the total income for the free SBP or SBP exceeds expenditures. IL. STAT. § 105 ILCS 125/6.</p> |
| | U | The State provides funding for a universal breakfast pilot program for schools with 80 percent or more F&RP lunch eligible students. IL. STAT. § 105 ILCS 125/2.5. |
| | R | The State Board of Education is required to provide the Governor and the General Assembly lists of schools that have started breakfast programs during the past year, that have utilized the above grant funds, and that have exercised Provisions 2 or 3 . In 2005, the State Board shall also report on parental interest in the SBP and barriers to establishing SBPs. IL. STAT. § 105 ILCS 125/4. |
| Indiana | M | School breakfast is required in public schools with 25 percent or more F&RP eligible students. IND. CODE ANN. § 20-5-13.5-4 |
| Iowa | S | In school year 2003-04, the State provided \$0.03 per breakfast until appropriated funds were depleted. |
| Kansas | M | School breakfast is required in schools with 35 percent or more F&RP eligible students. KAN. STAT. ANN. § 72-5125 |
| Kentucky | S | School districts are required to arrange bus schedules so that all buses arrive in sufficient time for schools to serve breakfast prior to the instructional day. KY. REV. STAT. ANN. § 158.070. |
| | R | All schools without breakfast must report the reasons and any problems that inhibit participation by September 15 th of the particular school year. Furthermore, the state shall inform the school of the value of the SBP (its favorable effects on attendance and performance) and the availability of funds. KY. REV. STAT. ANN. § 157.065. |
| Louisiana | M | The school board must operate the breakfast program if at least 25 percent of the students enrolled in one or more schools in the system are F&RP eligible. LA. REV. STAT. ANN. §17:192. |
| Maine | | NONE |
| Maryland | M | School breakfast is required in public elementary schools, but those schools with less than 15 percent F&RP eligible students may be exempted. MD. CODE. ANN. EDUC. § 7-701 and §7-702. |

M: State mandate
S: State funding

R: Reporting requirement
S: Scheduling requirement

U: Universal breakfast funding
O: Outreach requirement

Table 5: STATE LEGISLATION PROMOTING SCHOOL BREAKFAST

| | | |
|---------------|---|---|
| | S | The State provides \$0.1325 for F&RP breakfasts in non-severe need schools and \$0.05 in severe need schools (those where 40 percent or more of the lunches served in the second preceding year were to F&RP eligible students). |
| | U | The State sponsors Maryland Meals for Achievement, an in-classroom universal free school breakfast program. MD. CODE. ANN., EDUC. § 7-704. For 2003-04, \$1.928 million was allocated for Maryland Meals for Achievement. |
| Massachusetts | M | School breakfast is required in public schools in severe need schools (those where 40 percent or more of the lunches served in the second preceding year were to F&RP eligible students) and where more than 50 F&RP meal applications are on file from the preceding school year. MASS. GEN. LAWS ch.69 §1C. |
| | S | The State allocates \$2.2 million for start-up and outreach grants for the breakfast and summer food programs, and for a state mandate reimbursement. Mandated schools may receive an additional \$0.10 for F&RP meals if breakfast costs exceed federal severe need reimbursements. |
| | U | The State provided \$2.5 million for fiscal year 2004 for universal breakfast, allocated for meal reimbursement. This results in approximately \$0.30 reimbursement per breakfast if costs exceed other reimbursements (this reimbursement is separate from the additional \$0.10 for mandated schools). |
| Michigan | M | School breakfast is required in schools with 20 percent or more F&RP eligible students during the immediately preceding school year. MICH. COMP. LAWS § 380.1272a. |
| | S | The State provides per meal reimbursements, subject to annual appropriation, to cover the lesser of actual costs or 100 percent of the cost of an efficiently operated program. MICH. COMP. LAWS § 380.1272d. |
| | | School breakfast funding appropriated for FY 2004 is \$10,370,000. |
| Minnesota | M | School breakfast is required in public schools at which 33 percent of school lunches are served free or at reduced price. MINN. STAT. ANN. § 124D.117. |
| | S | The State provides each elementary and secondary school that participates in the SBP with a state reimbursement of \$0.30 for each reduced price breakfast and \$0.55 for each paid breakfast. Breakfasts must be provided at no charge to students who qualify for reduced price breakfasts. MINN. SEC. LAWS §124D.1158. |
| | U | The final year of the “Fast Break to Learning” breakfast program was school year 2002-03. “Fast Break to Learning” provided state reimbursements to support universal free breakfast at elementary schools at which at least 33 percent of school lunches were served free or at reduced price in the previous year. |
| Mississippi | | NONE |
| Missouri | M | School breakfast is required in schools with 35 percent or more F&RP eligible students. A school may receive a waiver from this requirement through a majority vote of the school board. MO. REV. STAT. § 191.803. |
| | O | Agencies responsible for administering food programs, including the SBP, shall collaborate in designing and implementing outreach programs focused on populations at risk of hunger, that |

M: State mandate
S: State funding

R: Reporting requirement
S: Scheduling requirement

U: Universal breakfast funding
O: Outreach requirement

Table 5: STATE LEGISLATION PROMOTING SCHOOL BREAKFAST

effectively describe the programs, their purposes, and how to apply for them. These programs shall be culturally and linguistically appropriate for the populations most at risk. § 191.813.

§ Subject to appropriations, the state board of education shall establish a hardship grant program to provide state supplemental funding for the federal SBP. Any school that participates in the SBP can apply for a hardship grant. Hardship grants will be awarded to schools with the highest need factor. MO. ANN. STAT. § 191.805.

Montana § Schools may apply for breakfast program start-up funds. MONT CODE ANN. § 20-10-208 This funding was terminated effective June 30, 2003.

Nebraska § The State provides \$0.05 per breakfast in those public schools that also participate in a lunch program. NEB. REV. STAT. § 79-10,138.

Nevada NONE

New Hampshire M The state board of education shall make a meal available during school hours to every pupil and shall provide free and reduced price meals to any needy children. Schools may receive waivers from the state school board, but the state is then directed to study and formulate a plan to implement the above requirement in those schools that have been granted waivers. § 189:11-a.

New Jersey M Any elementary school (pre-K – 6th grade) that has 20% or more students eligible for free or reduced price lunch must participate in the SBP, beginning in September 2004. Any secondary school (7th – 12th grades) with 20% or more students eligible for free or reduced price lunch must implement the SBP by September 2005. N. J. STAT. § 18A:33-10.

One-year waivers may be granted by the New Jersey Department of Agriculture to schools that lack the staff, facilities, or equipment to offer the SBP. One-year waivers may also be granted to high schools where 50 percent or more of the eligible students decline to participate in the SBP. N. J. 210TH LEG, 2ND REG. SESSION, NO. 1498.

§ For school years 2003-04 and 2004-05, the State appropriated \$1,588,000 and \$3,212,000, respectively, to provide \$0.10 for all breakfasts served: free, reduced price and paid.

New Mexico NONE

New York M School breakfast is required in elementary schools; in schools located in school districts with at least 125,000 inhabitants; and in schools that participate in the school lunch program and have 40 percent or more of lunches served to F&RP eligible students. N.Y. COMP. CODES R. & REGS. tit. 8, § 114.2.

§ The State provides reimbursements of no less than \$0.11 for free breakfasts, \$0.17 for reduced price breakfasts, and \$0.0025 for paid breakfasts.

The State also provides reimbursement of all expenses exceeding revenues in first year of breakfast implementation in a public school.

North Carolina U The State provided \$2,120,745 per year for 2003-04 and 2004-05 to provide free universal school breakfast to kindergarten students in districts where 50% or more of the kindergarten students are eligible for F&RP school meals.

M: State mandate
S: State funding

R: Reporting requirement
S: Scheduling requirement

U: Universal breakfast funding
O: Outreach requirement

Table 5: STATE LEGISLATION PROMOTING SCHOOL BREAKFAST

| | |
|----------------|---|
| North Dakota | NONE |
| Ohio | <p>M School breakfast is required in schools with either at least 33 percent of students eligible for free meals, or where 50 percent or more of the students' parents have requested a SBP. OHIO REV. CODE ANN. § 3313.81.3.</p> <p>§ For FY 2003-04 the State appropriated \$3.8 million for SBPs, including \$1 million for outreach. \$2.3 million is to supplement reimbursements at approximately \$0.07 per breakfast. The remaining \$500,000 is available as a Breakfast Incentive Program to reward schools for significantly increasing breakfast participation, for starting a new breakfast program with a certain level of participation, or for schools that maintain a 75 percent participation rate.</p> |
| Oklahoma | NONE |
| Oregon | M School breakfast is required in all schools where 25 percent or more of the students are F&RP eligible, and in Chapter I schools. OR. REV. STAT. §327.535. |
| Pennsylvania | § The State provides no less than \$0.10 per breakfast and lunch served. The State provides an additional \$0.02 (\$0.12 total) per lunch to schools that participate in both lunch and breakfast. The State also provides an additional \$0.04 (\$0.14 total) per lunch to schools that have over 20 percent student enrollment in school breakfast. 22 PA. STAT. § 13-1337.1 (2003). |
| Rhode Island | <p>M School breakfast is required in all public schools. R.I. GEN. LAWS § 16-8-10.1.</p> <p>§ The State appropriated \$700,000 in school year 2003-2004 for breakfast supervision costs.</p> |
| South Carolina | <p>M School breakfast is required in all public schools. SC CODE ANN. §59-63-790.</p> <p>The State Board of Education may grant a waiver from SC CODE ANN. §59-63-790 if the school lacks equipment or facilities to implement such a program, if the program is not cost-effective, or if implementation creates substantial scheduling difficulties. SC CODE ANN. §59-63-800.</p> |
| South Dakota | NONE |
| Tennessee | M School breakfast is required in K-8 schools with 25 percent or more F&RP eligible students and in all other schools with 40 percent or more F&RP eligible students. TENN. CODE ANN. § 49-6-2302. |
| Texas | M School breakfast is required in public schools and open-enrollment charter schools with 10 percent or more F&RP eligible students. TEX. EDUC. CODE ANN. § 33.901. |
| Utah | <p>R The State requires elementary schools without breakfast to report reasons for nonparticipation every three years. UTAH CODE ANN. § 53A-19-301.</p> <p>The State requires that each local school board, at least once every three years, review the reasons why the elementary school in its district does not participate in the School Breakfast Program. UTAH CODE ANN. § 53A-19-301.</p> |
| Vermont | <p>M Starting in 2004, school breakfast will be required in all public schools unless the commissioner grants a waiver or the district is exempt from the requirement. VT. STAT. ANN. § 1264.</p> <p>Exemptions are granted for one year if the voters of the district vote for exemption at an annual or</p> |

M: State mandate
S: State funding

R: Reporting requirement
S: Scheduling requirement

U: Universal breakfast funding
O: Outreach requirement

Table 5: STATE LEGISLATION PROMOTING SCHOOL BREAKFAST

| | | |
|---------------|------|--|
| | | special meeting, and the school board must review the exemption annually. VT. STAT. ANN. § 1265. |
| | § | The State appropriated \$135,339 in FY 2005 for breakfast reimbursements. The per plate reimbursement rate is determined by dividing total funds by total number of breakfasts served. |
| Virginia | M | School breakfast is required in public schools with 25 percent or more F&RP eligible students. VA. CODE ANN. § 22.1-207.3. |
| Washington | M | School districts where at least 40 percent of lunches served to students (the second preceding year) are free or at reduced price shall implement a SBP no later than July 1 of the current school year. WASH. REV. CODE § 28A.235.140(3)(a). |
| | § | For 2003-05, the State provides approximately \$220,000 per year for schools meals start-up, expansion and improvement grants and \$2.28 million per year for breakfast reimbursements, which results in approximately \$0.11 reimbursement per F&RP breakfast served, but is adjusted at the end of the year to utilize the entire appropriation. |
| | | The superintendent of public instruction may grant additional funds for breakfast start-up and expansion grants, when appropriated. WASH. REV. CODE § 28A.235.150. |
| West Virginia | M | School breakfast is required in all schools. Waivers, of up to two years, may be granted to schools with compelling circumstances. W. VA. CODE § 18-5-37. |
| | S | The Board of Education requires that students be afforded at least 10 minutes to eat after receiving their breakfast. W. VA. CODE ST. R. tit. 126, § 86-7. |
| Wisconsin | § | The State provided \$1,055,400 in 2003-04 to reimburse up to \$0.10 per breakfast served that meets the nutritional requirements of 7 CFR § 220.8 or 220.8a, in both public and private schools. WIS. STAT. §115.341. |
| Wyoming | NONE | |

TABLE 6
INCOME GUIDELINES AND REIMBURSEMENT RATES FOR
THE SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAM, 2003-2004

Income Guidelines for the School Breakfast Program¹
Effective July 1, 2003 - June 30, 2004

| Household Size | Federal Poverty Guidelines | Free Meals Maximum Household Income (130% of Poverty) | | | Reduced Price Meals Maximum Household Income (185% of Poverty) | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|---|---------|--------|--|----------|--------|
| | Annual | Annual | Monthly | Weekly | Annual | Monthly | Weekly |
| 1 | \$ 8,980 | \$ 11,674 | \$ 973 | \$ 225 | \$ 16,613 | \$ 1,385 | \$ 320 |
| 2 | 12,120 | 15,756 | 1,313 | 303 | 22,422 | 1,869 | 432 |
| 3 | 15,260 | 19,838 | 1,654 | 382 | 28,231 | 2,353 | 543 |
| 4 | 18,400 | 23,920 | 1,994 | 460 | 34,040 | 2,837 | 655 |
| 5 | 21,540 | 28,002 | 2,334 | 539 | 39,849 | 3,321 | 767 |
| 6 | 24,680 | 32,084 | 2,674 | 617 | 45,658 | 3,805 | 879 |
| 7 | 27,820 | 36,166 | 3,014 | 696 | 51,467 | 4,289 | 990 |
| 8 | 30,960 | 41,248 | 3,354 | 774 | 57,276 | 4,773 | 1,102 |
| Add for each additional | + 3,140 | + 4,082 | + 341 | + 79 | + 5,809 | + 485 | + 112 |

School Breakfast: Federal Per Meal Reimbursement Rates²
July 1, 2003 - June 30, 2004³

| School Breakfast Program | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | Non-Severe Need | Severe Need ⁴ | Amount Child Pays |
| Free | \$1.20 | \$1.43 | \$0 |
| Reduced Price | \$0.90 | \$1.13 | \$0.30 (maximum school can charge) |
| Paid | \$0.22 | \$0.22 | varies ⁵ |

¹ Federal Register, Vol. 68, No. 49, 3/13/03, pp. 12028-12030. [Adjusted annually based on the Consumer Price Index.] These guidelines apply to the 48 contiguous United States, the District of Columbia, Guam and the Territories. Alaska and Hawaii have higher maximum income limits.

² These reimbursement rates apply to the 48 contiguous United States, the District of Columbia, Guam and the Territories. Alaska and Hawaii receive higher rates.

³ Federal Register, Vol. 68, No. 130, 7/8/03, pp. 40623-40626. [Adjusted annually based on the Consumer Price Index.]

⁴ Schools where at least 40 percent of the lunches served during the second preceding school year were free or reduced price may qualify for extra "severe need" school breakfast reimbursements if their costs exceed the standard federal reimbursement [7 C.F.R. 220.9 (e)].

⁵ According to the American School Food Service Association's 1999 Operations Survey, the average charge per "paid" school breakfast in early 1999 was \$0.74 in elementary schools, \$0.78 in middle schools and \$0.81 in high schools. According to the Nebraska Department of Education, the average charge per "paid" school lunch in the first semester of the 2001-02 school year was \$1.43 in grades K-8 and \$1.58 in grades 9-12.

TABLE 7
INCOME GUIDELINES AND REIMBURSEMENT RATES FOR
THE SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAM, 2004-2005

Income Guidelines for the School Breakfast Program¹
Effective July 1, 2004 - June 30, 2005

| Household Size | Federal Poverty Guidelines | Free Meals Maximum Household Income (130% of Poverty) | | | Reduced Price Meals Maximum Household Income (185% of Poverty) | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|---|----------|--------|--|----------|--------|
| | Annual | Annual | Monthly | Weekly | Annual | Monthly | Weekly |
| 1 | \$ 9,310 | \$ 12,103 | \$ 1,009 | \$ 233 | \$ 17,224 | \$ 1,436 | \$ 332 |
| 2 | 12,490 | 16,237 | 1,354 | 313 | 23,107 | 1,926 | 445 |
| 3 | 15,670 | 20,371 | 1,698 | 392 | 28,990 | 2,416 | 558 |
| 4 | 18,850 | 24,505 | 2,043 | 472 | 34,873 | 2,907 | 671 |
| 5 | 22,030 | 28,639 | 2,387 | 551 | 40,756 | 3,397 | 784 |
| 6 | 25,210 | 32,773 | 2,732 | 631 | 46,639 | 3,887 | 897 |
| 7 | 28,390 | 36,907 | 3,076 | 710 | 52,522 | 4,377 | 1,011 |
| 8 | 31,570 | 41,041 | 3,421 | 790 | 58,405 | 4,868 | 1,124 |
| Add for each additional | + 3,180 | + 4,134 | + 345 | + 80 | + 5,883 | + 491 | + 114 |

School Breakfast: Federal Per Meal Reimbursement Rates²
July 1, 2004 - June 30, 2005³

| School Breakfast Program | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | Non-Severe Need | Severe Need ⁴ | Price of Meals |
| Free | \$1.23 | \$1.47 | \$0 |
| Reduced Price | \$0.93 | \$1.17 | \$0.30 (maximum school can charge) |
| Paid | \$0.23 | \$0.23 | varies ⁵ |

¹ Federal Register, Vol. 69, No. 60, 3/29/04, pp. 16226-16229. [Adjusted annually based on the Consumer Price Index.] These guidelines apply to the 48 contiguous United States, the District of Columbia, Guam and the Territories. Alaska and Hawaii have higher maximum income limits.

² These reimbursement rates apply to the 48 contiguous United States, the District of Columbia, Guam and the Territories. Alaska and Hawaii receive higher rates.

³ Federal Register, Vol. 69, No. 135, 7/15/04, pp. 42415-42417. [Adjusted annually based on the Consumer Price Index.]

⁴ Schools where at least 40 percent of the lunches served during the second preceding school year were free or reduced price may qualify for extra "severe need" school breakfast reimbursements if their costs exceed the standard federal reimbursement [7 C.F.R. 220.9 (e)].

⁵ According to the American School Food Service Association's 1999 Operations Survey, the average charge per "paid" school breakfast in early 1999 was \$0.74 in elementary schools, \$0.78 in middle schools and \$0.81 in high schools. According to the Nebraska Department of Education, the average charge per "paid" school lunch in the first semester of the 2001-02 school year was \$1.43 in grades K-8 and \$1.58 in grades 9-12.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alaimo K, Olson CM, Frongillo EA Jr. "Food Insufficiency and American School-Aged Children's Cognitive, Academic and Psychosocial Development." *Pediatrics* 2001;108(1):44-53.

Basiotis PP, Lino M, Anand R. "Eating Breakfast Greatly Improves Schoolchildren's Diet Quality." *Family Economics and Nutrition Review* 1999;12(3&4):81-83.

Bhattacharya J, Currie J, Haider SJ. "Evaluating the Impact of School Nutrition Programs: Final Report." U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, Washington, DC, 2004.

Cook JT, Ohri-Vachaspati P, Kelly GL. "Evaluation of a Universally-Free School Breakfast Program Demonstration Project, Central Falls, Rhode Island." Center on Hunger, Poverty and Nutrition Policy, Tufts University, Medford, MA, 1996.

Dalaker J. "Poverty in the United States." Current Population Reports, Series P60-226, U.S. Census. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, 2004.

Kleinman RE, Murphy JM, Little M, Pagano M, Wehler CA, Regal K, Jellinek MS. "Hunger in Children in the United States: Potential Behavioral and Emotional Correlates." *Pediatrics* 1998;101(1):E3.

Minnesota Department of Children, Families and Learning. "School Breakfast Programs Energizing the Classroom." Minnesota Department of Children, Families and Learning, Roseville, MN, 1998.

Murphy JM, Pagano M, Bishop SJ. "Impact of a Universally Free, In-Classroom School Breakfast Program on Achievement; Results from the Abell Foundation's Baltimore Breakfast Challenge Program." Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, 2001.

Murphy JM, Pagano M, Nachmani J, Sperling P, Kane S, Kleinman R. "The Relationship of School Breakfast to Psychosocial and Academic Functioning." *Archives of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine* 1998;152:899-907.

Murphy JM, Pagano ME, Patton K, Hall S, Marinaccio J, Kleinman R. "The Boston Public Schools Universal Breakfast Program; Final Evaluation Report." Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, 2000.

Murphy JM, Wehler CA, Pagano ME, Little M, Kleinman RF, Jellinek MS. "Relationship Between Hunger and Psychosocial Functioning in Low-Income American Children." *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry* 1998;37:163-170.

Nord M, Andrews M, Carlson S. "Household Food Security in the United States, 2002." Food Assistance and Nutrition Research Report Number 35. Economic Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture. October 2003.

Pollitt E, Cueto S, Jacoby ER. "Fasting and Cognition in Well- and Undernourished Schoolchildren: A Review of Three Experimental Studies." *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 1998;67(4):779S-784S.

Vaisman N, Voet H, Akivis A, Vakil E. "Effects of Breakfast Timing on the Cognitive Functions of Elementary School Students." *Archives of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine* 1996;150:1089-1092.