



School Breakfast: Making it Work in Large School Districts

February 2016 ■ www.FRAC.org



School Breakfast: Making it Work in Large School Districts

Acknowledgments

Special thanks go to the participating school district nutrition directors and their staffs. This report would not be possible without their responsiveness and willingness to share their experiences with others. We also are grateful to state partners — Maryland Hunger Solutions and the Texas Hunger Initiative — that collected and provided data for districts in their states for this report.

The Food Research & Action Center (FRAC) gratefully acknowledges major dedicated support of its work to expand and improve the School Breakfast Program from the following:

- ConAgra Foods Foundation
- Entertainment Industry Foundation
- Eos Foundation
- Kellogg Company Fund
- National Dairy Council/Dairy Management, Inc.
- Newman's Own Foundation
- The Albertsons Companies Foundation
- Walmart Foundation



Additional support for our breakfast and child nutrition work has been provided by the following:

- Anonymous
- Bainum Family Foundation
- Annie E. Casey Foundation
- General Mills Foundation
- JPB Foundation
- MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger

This report was written by FRAC Child Nutrition Policy Analyst, Mieka Sanderson.

The findings and conclusions presented in this report are those of FRAC alone.

About FRAC

The Food Research & Action Center (FRAC) is the leading national organization working for more effective public and private policies to eradicate domestic hunger and undernutrition. For more information about FRAC, or to sign up for FRAC's Weekly News Digest and monthly School Breakfast Newsletter, go to: www.frac.org.

Introduction

There is good news for school breakfast: participation keeps growing as more and more school districts are adopting innovative ways of serving breakfast to low-income students. The Food Research & Action Center's (FRAC) *Large School District Report* examines participation in 73 of America's largest school districts, taking an in-depth look at how they are increasing breakfast to reduce hunger and boost the health and academic outcomes of the nation's most vulnerable children.

The results are clear: among the 73 school districts included in this report, 136,022 more low-income students ate a nutritious morning meal on an average day in school year 2014–2015 compared to the previous school year, with 50 districts showing gains in participation. Twenty-three school districts are recognized as “top performers” in this report — more than double from the previous year's report — because they served school breakfast to at least 70 low-income students for every 100 who ate school lunch.

Gains are being made, but still too many students across the nation do not start their day with this important morning meal. FRAC's *School Breakfast Scorecard* — released concurrently with this report and looking at the national and state data — finds that for every 100 students eligible to receive free or reduced-price meals who participated in the National School Lunch Program (NSLP), only 54.3 participated in the School Breakfast Program (SBP) on an average day in the 2014–2015 school year.¹

This report provides critical insights on what's working with school breakfast by showing how America's largest school districts are combating hunger and ensuring that low-income students are receiving the nutrition necessary to succeed in the classroom. It analyzes the reach of the School Breakfast Program among America's most vulnerable children, those who qualify for free or

reduced-price school meals, and finds that school districts that are reaching more of their low-income students with school breakfast do so by concurrently moving breakfast into the classroom and offering breakfast at no charge to all students. These strategies overcome the common barriers to participation in the program, including financial constraints, inconvenience, and social stigma. Every surveyed district, with the exception of one, reported operating a breakfast after the bell program in some or all schools, offering free meals to all students in some or all schools, or implementing both strategies in school year 2014–2015.

Still, many school districts fall short. Districts that have limited breakfast participation miss out on substantial amounts of federal funding. This report identifies and quantifies this missed opportunity.

Children who skip breakfast show increased errors, have slower memory recall, and are more likely to repeat a grade.^{2,3} Conversely, the benefits of having school breakfast have been well-documented: improved concentration, alertness, comprehension, memory, and learning.^{4,5,6}

The national rollout of the Community Eligibility Provision began in school year 2014–2015, making this the first year that its positive impact on school breakfast participation has been fully reflected in the *Large School District Report*. Its popularity is evidenced by the fact that 51 districts in this report leveraged the option to offer breakfast and

lunch at no charge to their students in some or all of their eligible schools. This powerful new federal option for high-poverty schools eliminates the need for individual school meal applications, alleviates the administrative burden to process this paperwork, and results in significant cost savings. Community eligibility also breaks down barriers to program participation by removing the social stigma that is often associated with being identified as receiving a free or reduced-price school breakfast. Additionally, it lays the foundation for schools to better leverage alternative breakfast service models such as breakfast in the classroom, “grab and go,” and second chance breakfast. These models increase the convenience of school breakfast by making it available outside of the cafeteria and at the beginning of the school day, which significantly boosts program participation. These strategies, when implemented simultaneously, spark substantial growth in the School Breakfast Program.

Poor access to school breakfast is a social justice issue and an upstream contributor to the widening achievement gap observed in our nation’s school system. Research has long shown the negative effects of hunger on students in the classroom. Children who skip breakfast show increased errors, have slower memory recall, and are more likely to repeat a grade.^{2,3} Conversely, the benefits of having school breakfast have been well-documented: improved concentration, alertness, comprehension, memory, and learning.^{4,5,6} Students with gains in these areas are better positioned to reach their full academic potential, which should further motivate school districts to use this report and take a closer look at what is being done to maximize the reach of school breakfast programs.

In light of the burgeoning body of research supporting the link between school breakfast and academic success, education stakeholders are making concerted efforts

to improve the reach of the School Breakfast Program. The Breakfast for Learning Education Alliance, a coalition of eight national education groups and FRAC, works to promote successful strategies that boost participation in the School Breakfast Program. Members include the American Federation of Teachers (AFT); the National Education Association Healthy Futures (NEA HF); the National Parent Teacher Association (PTA); the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) Foundation; the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP); AASA, The School Superintendents Association (AASA); the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE); and the Education Trust. These organizations represent teachers, principals, superintendents, school board members, food service staff, custodians, and paraprofessionals — the individuals necessary for implementing a sustainable breakfast in the classroom, “grab and go,” or second chance breakfast model. Additionally, Partners for Breakfast in the Classroom, a Walmart Foundation-funded collaboration among NEA HF, NAESP Foundation, School Nutrition Foundation (SNF) and FRAC, works at the state and district levels to provide grant monies and technical assistance that help boost school breakfast participation. NASSP, through funding from the Kellogg Company Fund, is also leading an effort in partnership with FRAC to increase school breakfast participation among middle and high school students. In November 2015, NASSP and FRAC jointly released a report, ***School Breakfast After the Bell: Equipping Students for Academic Success***, highlighting the overwhelmingly positive experiences of more than 100 secondary school principals who have implemented a breakfast after the bell program. The joint work of these national groups is emblematic of the growing momentum in the education field to ensure that students have the nutrition necessary to start the school day ready to learn.

How the School Breakfast Program Works

Who Operates the School Breakfast Program?

Any public school, nonprofit private school, or residential child care institution can participate in the School Breakfast Program and receive federal funds for each breakfast served. The program is administered at the federal level by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and in each state, typically through the state department of education or agriculture.

Who Can Participate in the School Breakfast Program?

Any student attending a school that offers the program can eat breakfast. What the federal government covers, and what a student pays, depends on family income:

- Children from families with incomes at or below 130 percent of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) are eligible for free school meals.
- Children from families with incomes between 130 to 185 percent FPL qualify for reduced-price meals and can be charged no more than 30 cents per breakfast.
- Children from families with incomes above 185 percent FPL pay fees (referred to as “paid meals”) which are set by the school.

As discussed later in this report, however, schools increasingly are offering breakfast free to all children, or are waiving the copayment for “reduced-price” meals.

How Are Children Certified for Free or Reduced-Price Meals?

Most children are certified for free or reduced-price meals via applications collected by the school district at the beginning of, or during the school year. However, children in households participating in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), and the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR), as well as foster youth, migrant, homeless, or runaway youth, and Head Start participants are “categorically eligible” (automatically eligible) for free school meals and can be certified without submitting a school meal application.

School districts are required to “directly certify” children in households participating in SNAP for free school meals through data matching of SNAP records with school enrollment lists. School districts have the option of directly certifying other categorically eligible children as well. Some categorically eligible children are missed through these processes and can still be certified by submitting an application.

How Are School Districts Reimbursed?

The federal reimbursement amount the school receives for each meal served depends on whether a student is certified to receive free, reduced-price, or paid meals.

For the 2014–2015 school year, schools received:

- \$1.62 per free breakfast;
- \$1.32 per reduced-price breakfast; and
- \$0.28 per “paid” breakfast.

“Severe need” schools received an additional 31 cents for each free or reduced-price breakfast served. Schools are considered “severe need” if at least 40 percent of the lunches served during the second preceding school year were free or reduced in price.

School Districts Meeting FRAC's Goal of 70 Low-Income Children Participating in School Breakfast per 100 Participating in School Lunch

Survey Sample

FRAC surveyed 73 school districts about their school breakfast participation data trends and program practices for school year 2014–2015. Surveyed school districts represented 35 states and ranged in size from the smallest district, Inglewood Unified School District (CA), having a student enrollment of approximately 11,000 students, to the largest district, New York City Department of Education (NY), having more than 1 million students. Fifty-two percent of surveyed school districts enrolled between 30,000 and 100,000 students, and approximately 26 percent of the school districts had student enrollments that exceeded 100,000. Fifty-six percent of represented school districts had 70 percent or more of their students qualifying for free or reduced-price meals. Table A (pages 16-17) shows a full list of enrollment and percentages of students who are eligible to receive free and reduced-price meals.

School Districts Maximizing School Breakfast's Reach

In school year 2014–2015, 23 of the surveyed school districts accomplished FRAC's ambitious, but achievable, goal of reaching 70 low-income students with school breakfast for every 100 who participate in the National School Lunch Program. These school districts are listed in the table (right). A full list of rankings for all 73 districts is in Table B (pages 18-19). These high-performing districts well exceeded the national average of feeding breakfast to 54.3 low-income students for every 100 who ate school lunch.⁶

Among these top performers are a number of school districts that serve a particularly high proportion of economically disadvantaged students such as San Antonio Independent School District (TX), Cincinnati Public Schools (OH), Detroit Public Schools (MI), Rochester City School District (NY), Syracuse City

District	Ratio of Free & Reduced-Price Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP
Los Angeles Unified School District (CA)*	111.7
Jersey City Public Schools (NJ)**	110.2
San Antonio Independent School District (TX)***	103.8
Cincinnati Public Schools (OH)	91.1
Newark Public Schools (NJ)	90.1
Houston Independent School District (TX)	87.5
Detroit Public Schools (MI)	85.7
Buffalo Public Schools (NY)	81.2
Boise School District (ID)	80.8
Kansas City, Kansas Public Schools (KS)	80.4
Albuquerque Public Schools (NM)	79.8
Dallas Independent School District (TX)	77.7
Rochester City School District (NY)	75.5
Inglewood Unified School District (CA)	74.8
Syracuse City School District (NY)	73.4
Guilford County Schools (NC)	72.9
Denver Public Schools (CO)	72.8
Providence Public Schools (RI)	72.7
Pittsburgh Public Schools (PA)	71.8
San Diego Unified School District (CA)	71.6
Little Rock School District (AR)	70.9
Columbus City Schools (OH)	70.3
Shelby County Schools (TN)	70.2

*Los Angeles Unified School District served school breakfasts to more low-income children than it served lunches in school year 2014-2015. The district served breakfast to 289,103 low-income children and served lunch to 258,892 low-income children on an average day, resulting in more than 100 low-income children eating breakfast compared to every 100 low-income children eating lunch.

**Jersey City Public Schools served school breakfasts to more low-income children than it served lunches in school year 2014-2015. The district served breakfast to 14,043 low-income children and served lunch to 12,748 low-income children on an average day, resulting in more than 100 low-income children eating breakfast compared to every 100 low-income children eating lunch.

***San Antonio Independent School District served school breakfasts to more low-income children than it served lunches in school year 2014-2015. The district served breakfast to 44,566 low-income children and served lunch to 42,948 low-income children on an average day, resulting in more than 100 low-income children eating breakfast compared to every 100 low-income children eating lunch.

School District (NY), Columbus City Schools (OH) and Shelby County Schools (TN). By doing an excellent job of maximizing the School Breakfast Program's reach, these districts are not only meeting the nutritional needs of their students but also are helping struggling families stretch budget dollars.

Making Breakfast a Part of the School Day Leads to Success

The school districts highlighted in this report that have turned to non-traditional ways of serving breakfast have been able to maximize the reach of their school breakfast programs. FRAC collected data from 71 school districts to see if breakfast after the bell programs improved school breakfast participation during the 2014–2015 school year. (Two districts did not provide data on their breakfast service model.) Sixty-seven districts, including all 23 top performers, reported using an alternative breakfast service model. In fact, more than half of the top performers had 50 percent or more of their schools operating a breakfast after the bell program. Four school districts reported not offering breakfast after the bell programs in any schools. For a full list of districts operating a breakfast after the bell program and a breakdown of the number of schools by breakfast model, please see Table D (pages 22-23).

Traditionally, schools offer breakfast in the cafeteria well before the school day begins. However, families' hectic morning schedules, late bus arrivals, inconvenient cafeteria locations, or competing morning priorities make it tough for students to get this important meal. Furthermore, the School Breakfast Program's perception as being for "poor kids" often has been a major deterrent for many children. A cornerstone of top-performing school districts' success has been integrating breakfast into the school day. Nationwide, more and more school districts are boosting breakfast participation numbers by adopting

breakfast after the bell programs, which are well-suited to their students' schedules and habits. By serving breakfast directly in the classroom, or from "grab and go" carts located in high-traffic areas, or between first and second periods as a "second chance" opportunity, schools make breakfast a part of the school culture and convenient for all students.

Breakfast After the Bell: How It Works

- **Breakfast in the Classroom:** Meals can either be delivered to the classroom or be served from the cafeteria or carts in the hallway, to be eaten in the classroom at the start of the school day.
- **"Grab and Go":** Children (particularly older students) can easily grab the components of their breakfast quickly from carts or kiosks in the hallway or the cafeteria line, to eat in their classroom.
- **Second Chance Breakfast:** Students are offered a second chance to eat breakfast after homeroom or first period. Many middle and high school students are not hungry first thing in the morning. Serving them breakfast after first period allows them ample time to arrive to class on time or socialize before school, while still providing them with a nutritious start early in the day.

Breakfast at No Charge

Breakfast offered free to all students is another important step to boosting school breakfast participation. FRAC collected data from 71 school districts to see if offering free breakfast to all students boosted school breakfast participation during the 2014–2015 school year. (Two districts did not provide data on offering free breakfast to all students). Sixty-nine school districts, including all 23 top-performing districts, reported offering school

breakfast free to all students in all or some schools in school year 2014–2015. Thirty-two districts reported offering free breakfast to all students in all schools, and 37 districts reported offering free breakfast to all students in some schools. Only two school districts reported not offering free school breakfast in any schools. For a full list of districts offering meals at no charge to students, please see Table E (pages 24-25).

Offering breakfast at no charge to all students is one more way to integrate breakfast into the school culture and boost participation rates. The social stigma typically associated with the School Breakfast Program is lifted because every student can have breakfast for free. School districts are recognizing the importance of making free meals available to their students and are figuring out the finances to do so in all or some of their schools by leveraging multiple federal options that provide additional reimbursements for meals served.

Among survey respondents, 51 districts leveraged the Community Eligibility Provision — the newest federal option to offer free breakfast and lunch to all students in all or some schools — and 18 districts reported using Provision 2 to provide breakfast to students at no charge in all or some schools. Twenty districts used another method, such as nonpricing, to provide meals at no cost to students in some schools. Eighteen districts reported using a combination of the various options to fund free school breakfast for all students in some schools. These findings suggest that districts are critically and creatively thinking about the best ways to offer free meals to all students. For a full list of districts using community eligibility, please see Table F (pages 26-27).

Among the 23 top performing school districts, 15 school districts leveraged community eligibility in school year 2014-2015.

How Schools Can Offer Free Breakfast to All Students:

- **Community Eligibility Provision:** Community eligibility schools offer free breakfast and lunch to all students and do not collect, process, or verify school meal applications, or keep track of meals by fee category, resulting in significant administrative savings and increased participation. For more information on community eligibility, see page 9.
- **Provision 2:** Schools using Provision 2 do not have to collect, process, or verify school meal applications or keep track of meals by fee category for at least three out of every four years. (Schools collect school meal applications and count and claim meals by student eligibility category during year

one of the multi-year cycle, called the “base year.” Those data then are used for future years in the cycle.) Provision 2 schools have the option to serve only breakfast or lunch, or both breakfast and lunch, to all students at no charge, and use economies of scale from increased participation and significant administrative savings to offset the cost of offering free meals to all students.

- **Nonpricing:** No fees are collected from students, while schools continue to receive reimbursements for the meals served under the three-tier federal fee categories (free, reduced-price, and paid).

Across all respondents, only 16 districts did not use community eligibility in school years 2014–2015 and 2015–2016:

- Brentwood Union Free School District (NY)
- Broward County Public Schools (FL)
- Denver Public Schools (CO)
- Inglewood Unified School District (CA)
- Jersey City Public Schools (NJ)
- Little Rock School District (AR)
- Long Beach Unified School District (CA)
- Los Angeles Unified School District (CA)
- Mesa Public Schools (AZ)
- Miami-Dade County Public Schools (FL)
- Montgomery County Public Schools (MD)
- San Bernardino City Unified School District (CA)
- San Diego Unified School District (CA)
- Savannah-Chatham County Public School System (GA)
- School District U-46 (IL)
- Wake County Public School System (NC)

As of September 2015, 17,000 schools serving 8 million students adopted community eligibility. That means an additional 1.6 million students are benefiting from the provision in school year 2015–2016 compared to its nationwide rollout in school year 2014–2015.⁷

School districts adopting community eligibility experience many benefits. Community eligibility eliminates the need for school meal applications, relieving school districts from the administrative and financial burdens of processing and verifying these applications. By allowing all students, regardless of income, to have school breakfast and lunch free, the stigma associated with participating in these programs, especially for school breakfast, disappears and participation in the school meals programs grows. With the administrative burden of processing school meal applications lifted, schools can redirect resources to menu planning, food procurement, improved nutrition, and cafeteria customer service resulting in higher quality school meals.

What is the Community Eligibility Provision?

Authorized in the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010, the Community Eligibility Provision allows high-poverty schools to offer breakfast and lunch free of charge to all students and to realize significant administrative savings by eliminating school meal applications. Any district, group of schools in a district, or school with 40 percent or more “identified students” — children eligible for free school meals who already are identified by other means than an individual household application — can choose to participate.

Identified students include:

- Children directly certified through data matching because their households receive SNAP, TANF, or FDPIR, and in some states and areas, Medicaid benefits.
- Children who are certified for free meals without an application because they are homeless, migrant, enrolled in Head Start, or in foster care.

Reimbursements to the school are calculated by multiplying the percentage of identified students by 1.6 to determine the percentage of meals reimbursed at the federal free rate. For example, a school with 50 percent identified students would be reimbursed for 80 percent of the meals eaten at the free reimbursement rate ($50 \times 1.6 = 80$), and 20 percent at the paid rate.

There are a number of strategies that school districts have used to maximize the reach of community eligibility among their schools. For more information regarding this option and implementing best practices, visit FRAC’s [Community Eligibility](#) web page.

Combining Strategies

Implementing both a breakfast after the bell program and offering school breakfast at no charge to all students is a best practice for boosting breakfast participation rates. These strategies, executed simultaneously, remove financial barriers, lift social stigma, and make eating breakfast more convenient for students by serving it at the start of the school day. By addressing these common barriers, schools can increase breakfast participation

substantially. The tremendous progress made by some school districts studied in this report, such as Reading School District (PA) and Richmond Public Schools (VA), can be attributed to implementing these strategies concurrently. For more information about how Reading School District and Richmond Public Schools leveraged these strategies and grew breakfast participation rates, please see “Success Stories” on page 12.

Room for Improvement

The *School Breakfast Scorecard*, a companion report that discusses national and state-level school breakfast data trends, indicates that there has been a 4.2 percent growth nationwide in the number of low-income children having school breakfast from school year 2013–2014 to 2014–2015.⁶ Nevertheless, there are still numerous districts whose school breakfast programs are not reaching enough students. Indeed, at participation rates below the benchmark of providing school breakfast to 70 low-income children for every 100 participating in the National School Lunch Program, a goal achieved by 23 school districts studied in this report, the 10 districts in the table (right) served school breakfast to fewer than 45 children per 100 who eat school lunch:

A full list of ratios (and rankings) for all 73 school districts is in Table B (pages 18-19).

Although breakfast participation numbers for these underperforming school districts are far too low, a few of the districts are taking positive actions in the 2015–2016 school year. The New York City Department of Education has committed to broadly implementing breakfast in the classroom and has expanded community eligibility to an additional 95 schools for school year 2015–2016. Similarly, Oakland Unified School District has nearly quadrupled the number of schools operating community eligibility from six in the prior year to 23 for school year 2015–2016.

10 Lowest Performing School Districts SY 2014–2015

District	Ratio of Low-Income Children in SBP to NSLP, SY 2014–2015
Fresno Unified School District (CA)	44.7
Long Beach Unified School District (CA)	44.0
Waterbury Public Schools (CT)	42.2
Miami-Dade County Public Schools (FL)	41.8
Broward County Public Schools (FL)	41.8
Salt Lake City School District (UT)	40.9
San Bernardino City Unified School District (CA)	38.5
School District U-46 (IL)	38.5
Oakland Unified School District (CA)	36.2
New York City Department of Education (NY)	35.3

Cost of Low School Breakfast Participation

In addition to missing out on the education and health advantages of nourishing their students, school districts that do not maximize their school breakfast program forgo financial benefits. Districts with low breakfast participation numbers, especially those grappling with poverty, leave a significant amount of federal dollars untapped. Those funds could help districts build stronger nutrition programs and improve the nutritional quality and appeal of their school meals.

By reaching more students with the School Breakfast Program, school districts secure thousands of additional federal dollars through meal reimbursements every day.

Using the benchmark of serving 70 low-income students school breakfast for every 100 participating in school lunch, FRAC measures the amount of federal funding left untouched by school districts that did not achieve this goal. The table below calculates the losses incurred by the 10 school districts studied in this report that would recoup the most federal dollars if they achieved FRAC's benchmark. Among these 10 districts alone, the additional funding would exceed \$100 million. See Table G (pages 28-29) for the number of additional children in each district covered by this report that is necessary to achieve the benchmark and leverage uncaptured federal funding.

Additional Participation and Federal Funding If 70 Low-Income Students Were Served Breakfast per 100 Receiving Lunch

District	Additional Low-Income Students in Breakfast if 70 per 100 in Lunch	Additional Federal Funding if 70 Low-Income Breakfast Students per 100 Receiving Lunch
New York City Department of Education (NY)	185,502	\$54,044,553
Miami-Dade County Public Schools (FL)	47,306	\$13,614,240
Broward County Public Schools (FL)	29,846	\$8,595,689
Chicago Public Schools (IL)	24,448	\$7,049,969
Orange County Public Schools (FL)	17,215	\$4,958,921
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools (NC)	14,469	\$4,191,728
Fresno Unified School District (CA)	13,671	\$3,985,803
DeKalb County Schools (GA)	13,268	\$3,842,245
Polk County Public Schools (FL)	10,758	\$3,128,145
San Bernardino City Unified School District (CA)	10,688	\$3,071,824

Success Stories

Reading School District, PA

In the 2014–2015 school year, compared to 2013–2014, Reading School District’s breakfast participation numbers nearly doubled, reaching 66.2 low-income students with school breakfast for every 100 who ate school lunch. *Previously* ranked 60 out of 62, Reading School District landed near the bottom of last year’s *Large School District Report* for only reaching 35.6 low-income students with school breakfast for every 100 who ate school lunch in school year 2013–2014. According to Kurt Myers, the Food Service Director at Reading School District, this remarkable increase is due to the simultaneous implementation of breakfast in the classroom and community eligibility districtwide.

With help from a grant from FRAC and Newman’s Own Foundation, Reading School District launched breakfast in the classroom in 13 elementary schools during the 2014–2015 school year. Breakfast in the classroom not only increased accessibility to school breakfast, but it also solved the limited cafeteria space issues that the district faced. Building on this success for school year 2015–2016, the school district continues its work to boost breakfast participation by implementing breakfast in the classroom in four additional middle schools. To date, breakfast participation on an average day in Reading School District has more than quadrupled, growing from 530 students to 2,230 students.

Improving breakfast participation has produced many benefits for the district. Principals reported fewer behavioral referrals, trips to the school nurse, and cases of tardiness and absenteeism. Principals also found that students now start the day in a more calm, orderly fashion. For those looking to replicate Reading School District’s success, Myers notes that improving school breakfast participation is a “team effort” and recommends gaining the support of administrators, teachers, custodians, and paraprofessionals to implement a breakfast after the bell

program. Myers emphasizes that engaging stakeholders at every level is critical to incorporating breakfast into the school culture so that students can easily access this important morning meal.

Richmond Public Schools, VA

In school year 2014–2015, Richmond Public Schools made huge strides in boosting school breakfast participation. The district experienced a 16 percent increase in overall breakfast participation and a 26 percent increase in the number of low-income students who ate school breakfast on an average morning.

Susan Roberson, the Food Service Director at Richmond Public Schools, attributes these impressive increases to districtwide implementation of the Community Eligibility Provision in all 44 schools in the 2014–2015 school year. Additionally, the district doubled the number of schools operating breakfast after the bell programs from five to 10. Roberson indicated that community eligibility and breakfast in the classroom were a “winning combination” that streamlined program operations and placed breakfast front and center for students. She noted that her district’s average daily breakfast participation in school year 2014–2015 was 20 percentage points higher in community eligibility schools operating a breakfast after the bell program than community eligibility schools without the program.

The expansion of breakfast after the bell programs in the district was in part facilitated through a Partners for Breakfast in the Classroom grant. The district worked closely with the Partners for Breakfast in the Classroom to educate teachers and other stakeholders on the importance of breakfast for academic achievement and develop a comprehensive, customized plan for program rollout. Through technical assistance, funds, and district support, school breakfast has become a critical component of Richmond Public Schools’ strategy for cultivating strong academic performance among its students.

Conclusion

The School Breakfast Program plays an integral role in supporting students' academic pursuits by providing students with the nutrition they need to be successful pupils. Anti-hunger advocates have found two winning breakfast strategies to reduce hunger and support children's health and learning: offer school breakfast at no charge to every student; and move breakfast

into the classroom. Leveraging both of these approaches significantly increases school breakfast participation, and this is evidenced by the significant gains made by districts surveyed for this report. For more information on how to improve school breakfast participation, please visit FRAC's [School Breakfast](#) web page.



Technical Notes

In the fall of 2015, FRAC distributed an electronic survey to 94 of the largest school districts in the nation, using an online tool called Survey Monkey. Districts of varying enrollment sizes were selected in order to capture school districts from a variety of geographical locations. The survey, composed primarily of 20 multiple-choice questions, asked school districts about school breakfast participation trends and practices.

The findings of this report are based on the data of 73 school districts. FRAC received completed surveys from 70 school districts' food service staff between September 2015 and January 2016, and three school districts' data were provided by two state anti-hunger groups: Maryland Hunger Solutions and the Texas Hunger Initiative. Brief follow-up interviews were conducted with two districts to develop the success stories' content.

The survey sought to:

- Determine the extent to which school districts reach children, especially impoverished students, with the School Breakfast Program;
- Assess the amount of federal funding missed by school districts that fail to maximize the reach of the School Breakfast Program among their low-income students;
- Uncover the best practices and strategies school districts are using to improve the reach of the School Breakfast Program, including offering breakfast for free to all students, and breakfast after the bell programs, and implementing the Community Eligibility Provision; and
- Gather innovative practices from districts that can be used as blueprints for other districts looking to improve school breakfast participation.

Participation in the school breakfast and lunch programs was determined by using self-reported numbers provided by the school districts. For each program, the total of meals served in school year 2014–2015 was divided by the total number of serving days to determine the average daily participation.

The amount of federal funding left uncaptured by school districts was calculated by first determining the average daily participation of low-income children that should be met if a school district were to serve 70 low-income students school breakfast for every 100 served school lunch. The district's actual free and reduced-price average daily participation was subtracted from this number to determine the number of unreached children. The number of unreached children was then multiplied by the reimbursement rate and the number of serving days. FRAC assumed that each district's proportion of students qualifying for free and reduced-price meals would remain the same. FRAC also conservatively assumed that districts were located in the contiguous U.S. (reimbursement rates are higher in Alaska and Hawaii) and that no additional student meals would qualify for the higher "severe need" rate.

Endnotes

- ¹Hewins, J. (2016). *School Breakfast Scorecard: School Year 2014–2015*. Food Research & Action Center. Available at: http://frac.org/pdf/School_Breakfast_Scorecard_SY_2014_2015.pdf.
- ²Pollitt, E., Cueto, S., & Jacoby, E.R. (1998). Fasting and Cognition in Well and Undernourished Schoolchildren: A Review of Three Experimental Studies. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 67(4), 779S-784S.
- ³Alaimo, K., Olson, C.M., & Frongillo, E.A. Jr. (2001). Food Insufficiency and American School-Aged Children's Cognitive, Academic and Psychosocial Development. *Pediatrics*, 108(1), 44-53.
- ⁴Grantham-McGregor, S., Chang, S., & Walker, S. (1998). Evaluation of School Feeding Programs: Some Jamaican Examples. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 67(4), 785S-789S.
- ⁵Brown, J.L., Beardslee, W.H., & Prothrow-Stith, D. (2008). Impact of School Breakfast on Children's Health and Learning. Sodexo Foundation.
- ⁶Morris, C.T., Courtney, A., Bryant, C.A., & McDermott, R.J., (2010). Grab 'N' Go Breakfast at School: Observation from a Pilot Program. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior*, 42(3), 208-209.
- ⁷United States Department of Agriculture, Office of Communications. (2015). Secretary Vilsack Announces Additional Progress in Addressing Childhood Hunger, Applauds Pediatricians for their Commitment [Press release]. Available at: <http://www.usda.gov/wps/portal/usda/~usdahome?contentid=2015/10/0297.xml&contentidonly=true>. Accessed on January 5, 2016.

Table A**Student Enrollment and Free and Reduced-Price Certification SY 2014–2015***

District	State	Enrollment	Free & Reduced-Price Certified	Free & Reduced-Price % of Enrollment
Albuquerque Public Schools	NM	87,199	50,218	57.6%
Anchorage School District	AK	44,754	24,552	54.9%
Atlanta Public Schools	GA	51,145	38,962	76.2%
Austin Independent School District	TX	83,467	50,443	60.4%
Baltimore City Public Schools	MD	85,018	71,623	84.2%
Boise School District	ID	26,582	11,393	42.9%
Boston Public Schools	MA	57,100	57,100	100.0%
Brentwood Union Free School District	NY	19,254	15,828	82.2%
Broward County Public Schools	FL	223,147	144,752	64.9%
Buffalo Public Schools	NY	36,611	36,611	100.0%
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools	NC	147,596	89,733	60.8%
Chicago Public Schools	IL	356,704	353,315	99.1%
Cincinnati Public Schools	OH	33,185	33,185	100.0%
Cleveland Metropolitan School District	OH	41,196	41,196	100.0%
Columbus City Schools	OH	50,236	50,236	100.0%
Cypress-Fairbanks Independent School District	TX	113,176	53,814	47.5%
Dallas Independent School District	TX	161,266	148,187	91.9%
DeKalb County Schools	GA	101,103	74,395	73.6%
Denver Public Schools	CO	86,508	59,598	68.9%
Des Moines Public Schools	IA	32,674	25,181	77.1%
Detroit Public Schools	MI	62,747	62,747	100.0%
District of Columbia Public Schools	DC	48,642	36,841	75.7%
Durham Public Schools	NC	35,019	23,220	66.3%
Fort Worth Independent School District	TX	86,420	75,769	87.7%
Fresno Unified School District	CA	828,317	788,226	95.2%
Fulton County Schools	GA	91,202	41,535	45.5%
Guilford County Schools	NC	73,512	48,822	66.4%
Hartford Public Schools	CT	23,775	20,634	86.8%
Houston Independent School District	TX	215,122	176,325	82.0%
Indianapolis Public Schools	IN	30,018	30,018	100.0%
Inglewood Unified School District	CA	11,013	7,911	71.8%
Irving Independent School District	TX	34,837	27,482	78.9%
Jackson Public Schools	MS	28,963	28,963	100.0%
Jefferson County Public Schools	KY	100,302	67,123	66.9%
Jersey City Public Schools	NJ	28,392	20,521	72.3%
Kansas City, Kansas Public Schools	KS	22,568	19,815	87.8%
Knox County Schools	TN	58,144	36,628	63.0%

* For districts implementing community eligibility, data provided in the “free & reduced-price certified” column is the free meal claiming percentage multiplied by student enrollment. The free claiming percentage is determined by multiplying the identified student percentage by 1.6 and it provides the basis for reimbursement. For more information on how reimbursement is determined in schools adopting community eligibility, please see page 9.

Table A CONTINUED**Student Enrollment and Free and Reduced-Price Certification SY 2014–2015***

District	State	Enrollment	Free & Reduced-Price Certified	Free & Reduced-Price % of Enrollment
Little Rock School District	AR	24,770	18,510	74.7%
Long Beach Unified School District	CA	78,999	52,456	66.4%
Los Angeles Unified School District	CA	583,027	463,994	79.6%
Mesa Public Schools	AZ	63,892	38,804	60.7%
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools	TN	83,500	83,500	100.0%
Miami-Dade County Public Schools	FL	294,522	224,679	76.3%
Milwaukee Public Schools	WI	77,391	77,391	100.0%
Minneapolis Public Schools	MN	36,377	23,284	64.0%
Montgomery County Public Schools	MD	154,350	54,099	35.0%
New York City Department of Education	NY	1,094,431	723,123	66.1%
Newark Public Schools	NJ	36,703	21,112	57.5%
Norfolk Public Schools	VA	32,651	21,822	66.8%
Oakland Unified School District	CA	40,204	27,454	68.3%
Oklahoma City Public Schools	OK	45,297	32,975	72.8%
Omaha Public Schools	NE	47,919	38,071	79.4%
Orange County Public Schools	FL	179,331	119,210	66.5%
Pittsburgh Public Schools	PA	25,749	16,728	65.0%
Polk County Public Schools	FL	88,398	87,072	98.5%
Portland Public Schools	OR	45,702	16,242	35.5%
Prince George's County Public Schools	MD	128,006	82,687	64.6%
Providence Public Schools	RI	27,384	23,292	85.1%
Reading School District	PA	17,523	17,523	100.0%
Richmond Public Schools	VA	23,079	22,527	97.6%
Rochester City School District	NY	30,632	30,632	100.0%
Salt Lake City School District	UT	25,282	11,996	47.4%
San Antonio Independent School District	TX	53,678	53,368	99.0%
San Bernardino City Unified School District	CA	66,214	47,960	72.4%
San Diego Unified School District	CA	130,947	77,039	58.8%
Savannah-Chatham County Public School System	GA	38,123	24,673	64.7%
School District of Philadelphia	PA	141,072	141,072	100.0%
School District U-46	IL	40,175	23,261	57.9%
Shelby County Schools	TN	117,380	117,380	100.0%
Syracuse City School District	NY	20,632	20,632	100.0%
Toledo Public Schools	OH	21,205	13,838	65.3%
Wake County Public School System	NC	156,730	56,631	36.1%
Waterbury Public Schools	CT	18,938	17,029	89.9%

Table B

Low-Income (Free and Reduced-Price) Student Participation in the School Breakfast Program (SBP) Compared to the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) SY 2014–2015

District	Ratio of Free & Reduced-Price Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	Rank	SBP Free & Reduced-Price Average Daily Participation	NSLP Free & Reduced-Price Average Daily Participation
Albuquerque Public Schools	79.8	11	21,893	27,444
Anchorage School District	58.5	45	8,065	13,790
Atlanta Public Schools	66.3	26	17,934	27,067
Austin Independent School District	49.6	58	18,972	38,239
Baltimore City Public Schools	59.1	43	29,529	49,925
Boise School District	80.8	9	6,491	8,036
Boston Public Schools	62.7	35	24,386	38,899
Brentwood Union Free School District	68.1	25	7,760	11,390
Broward County Public Schools	41.8	68	44,273	105,884
Buffalo Public Schools	81.2	8	22,985	28,314
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools	47.9	61	31,293	65,374
Chicago Public Schools	59.7	42	142,308	238,223
Cincinnati Public Schools	91.1	4	15,689	17,217
Cleveland Metropolitan School District	60.5	41	15,392	25,442
Columbus City Schools	70.3	22	25,802	36,721
Cypress-Fairbanks Independent School District	53.0	51	22,251	41,987
Dallas Independent School District	77.7	12	88,136	113,434
DeKalb County Schools	46.2	63	25,837	55,864
Denver Public Schools	72.8	17	30,465	41,844
Des Moines Public Schools	58.8	44	11,294	19,216
Detroit Public Schools	85.7	7	36,429	42,522
District of Columbia Public Schools	65.8	29	15,610	23,731
Durham Public Schools	55.1	50	8,895	16,153
Fort Worth Independent School District	52.3	52	30,275	57,851
Fresno Unified School District	44.7	64	24,129	54,000
Fulton County Schools	56.1	49	18,240	32,522
Guilford County Schools	72.9	16	27,607	37,871
Hartford Public Schools	47.0	62	7,481	15,928
Houston Independent School District	87.5	6	104,721	119,688
Indianapolis Public Schools	60.8	40	15,028	24,715
Inglewood Unified School District	74.8	14	4,239	5,663
Irving Independent School District	61.6	39	14,129	22,949
Jackson Public Schools	58.4	46	14,458	24,737
Jefferson County Public Schools	65.5	33	37,485	57,258
Jersey City Public Schools*	110.2	2	14,043	12,748
Kansas City, Kansas Public Schools	80.4	10	11,651	14,488
Knox County Schools	51.5	54	11,732	22,771
Little Rock School District	70.9	21	9,108	12,841
Long Beach Unified School District	44.0	65	16,123	36,627
Los Angeles Unified School District**	111.7	1	289,103	258,892

Table B CONTINUED

Low-Income (Free and Reduced-Price) Student Participation in the School Breakfast Program (SBP) Compared to the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) SY 2014–2015

District	Ratio of Free & Reduced-Price Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	Rank	SBP Free & Reduced-Price Average Daily Participation	NSLP Free & Reduced-Price Average Daily Participation
Mesa Public Schools	52.2	53	15,505	29,715
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools	62.3	36	34,232	54,968
Miami-Dade County Public Schools	41.8	67	70,198	167,863
Milwaukee Public Schools	62.2	37	34,210	55,006
Minneapolis Public Schools	57.7	48	9,648	16,718
Montgomery County Public Schools	65.7	30	24,739	37,653
New York City Department of Education	35.3	73	188,274	533,965
Newark Public Schools	90.1	5	16,426	18,233
Norfolk Public Schools	63.9	34	10,798	16,901
Oakland Unified School District	36.2	72	6,123	16,903
Oklahoma City Public Schools	57.9	47	14,766	25,486
Omaha Public Schools	48.6	59	14,710	30,253
Orange County Public Schools	49.8	56	42,584	85,427
Pittsburgh Public Schools	71.8	19	12,132	16,907
Polk County Public Schools	49.6	57	26,205	52,803
Portland Public Schools	65.6	32	9,664	14,737
Prince George's County Public Schools	65.6	31	40,854	62,259
Providence Public Schools	72.7	18	12,625	17,364
Reading School District	66.2	27	9,127	13,781
Richmond Public Schools	69.3	24	11,397	16,441
Rochester City School District	75.5	13	16,605	21,982
Salt Lake City School District	40.9	69	4,674	11,420
San Antonio Independent School District***	103.8	3	44,566	42,948
San Bernardino City Unified School District	38.5	71	13,086	33,963
San Diego Unified School District	71.6	20	38,410	53,635
Savannah-Chatham County Public School System	66.2	28	12,808	19,350
School District of Philadelphia	62.0	38	56,617	91,280
School District U-46	38.5	70	6,559	17,018
Shelby County Schools	70.2	23	60,680	86,425
Syracuse City School District	73.4	15	10,874	14,818
Toledo Public Schools	51.3	55	7,010	13,658
Wake County Public School System	48.2	60	19,233	39,925
Waterbury Public Schools	42.2	66	5,601	13,262

* Jersey City Public Schools served school breakfasts to more low-income children than it served lunches in school year 2014-2015. The district served breakfast to 14,043 low-income children and served lunch to 12,748 low-income children on an average day, resulting in more than 100 low-income children eating breakfast compared to every 100 low-income children eating lunch.

** Los Angeles Unified School District served school breakfasts to more low-income children than it served lunches in school year 2014-2015. The district served breakfast to 289,103 low-income children and served lunch to 258,892 low-income children on an average day, resulting in more than 100 low-income children eating breakfast compared to every 100 low-income children eating lunch.

*** San Antonio Independent School District served school breakfasts to more low-income children than it served lunches in school year 2014-2015. The district served breakfast to 44,566 low-income children and served lunch to 42,948 low-income children on an average day, resulting in more than 100 low-income children eating breakfast compared to every 100 low-income children eating lunch.

Table C**Change in Low-Income Student Participation SY 2013–2014 to SY 2014–2015**

District	Average Daily Participation in the School Breakfast Program — Free & Reduced-Price		School Year 2013-2014 to School Year 2014-2015	
	SY 2014-2015	SY 2013-2014	Increase in Number of Students	Percent Change in Number of Students
	Albuquerque Public Schools	21,893	20,474	1,419
Anchorage School District	8,065	5,793	2,273	39.2%
Atlanta Public Schools	17,934	18,309	-375	-2.0%
Austin Independent School District	18,972	18,069	903	5.0%
Baltimore City Public Schools	29,529	27,894	1,635	5.9%
Boise School District	6,491	6,124	367	6.0%
Boston Public Schools	24,386	25,398	-1,012	-4.0%
Brentwood Union Free School District	7,760	7,104	657	9.2%
Broward County Public Schools	44,273	45,341	-1,067	-2.4%
Buffalo Public Schools	22,985	23,678	-693	-2.9%
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools	31,293	28,677	2,615	9.1%
Chicago Public Schools	142,308	135,891	6,416	4.7%
Cincinnati Public Schools	15,689	13,314	2,374	17.8%
Cleveland Metropolitan School District	15,392	15,327	64	0.4%
Columbus City Schools	25,802	19,316	6,485	33.6%
Cypress-Fairbanks Independent School District	22,251	22,966	-715	-3.1%
Dallas Independent School District	88,136	74,385	13,751	18.5%
DeKalb County Schools	25,837	26,289	-452	-1.7%
Denver Public Schools	30,465	24,573	5,892	24.0%
Des Moines Public Schools	11,294	9,592	1,702	17.7%
Detroit Public Schools	36,429	35,020	1,409	4.0%
District of Columbia Public Schools	15,610	15,723	-113	-0.7%
Durham Public Schools	8,895	7,970	925	11.6%
Fort Worth Independent School District	30,275	22,985	7,290	31.7%
Fresno Unified School District	24,129	22,517	1,612	7.2%
Fulton County Schools	18,240	18,763	-523	-2.8%
Guilford County Schools	27,607	22,181	5,426	24.5%
Hartford Public Schools	7,481	6,634	847	12.8%
Houston Independent School District	104,721	100,842	3,878	3.8%
Indianapolis Public Schools	15,028	13,369	1,660	12.4%
Inglewood Unified School District	4,239	4,446	-208	-4.7%
Irving Independent School District	14,129	14,802	-673	-4.5%
Jackson Public Schools	14,458	13,045	1,412	10.8%
Jefferson County Public Schools	37,485	33,379	4,106	12.3%
Jersey City Public Schools	14,043	13,018	1,025	7.9%
Kansas City, Kansas Public Schools	11,651	11,904	-253	-2.1%
Knox County Schools	11,732	11,929	-197	-1.7%
Little Rock School District	9,108	8,682	426	4.9%

Table C CONTINUED

Change in Low-Income Student Participation SY 2013–2014 to SY 2014–2015

District	Average Daily Participation in the School Breakfast Program — Free & Reduced-Price		School Year 2013-2014 to School Year 2014-2015	
	SY 2014-2015	SY 2013-2014	Increase in Number of Students	Percent Change in Number of Students
	Long Beach Unified School District	16,123	18,015	-1,893
Los Angeles Unified School District	289,103	270,188	18,916	7.0%
Mesa Public Schools	15,505	15,918	-413	-2.6%
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools	34,232	25,422	8,810	34.7%
Miami-Dade County Public Schools	70,198	72,023	-1,825	-2.5%
Milwaukee Public Schools	34,210	29,133	5,077	17.4%
Minneapolis Public Schools	9,648	9,613	35	0.4%
Montgomery County Public Schools	24,739	19,591	5,149	26.3%
New York City Department of Education	188,274	186,295	1,979	1.1%
Newark Public Schools	16,426	18,267	-1,841	-10.1%
Norfolk Public Schools	10,798	10,657	141	1.3%
Oakland Unified School District	6,123	6,014	109	1.8%
Oklahoma City Public Schools	14,766	14,580	186	1.3%
Omaha Public Schools	14,710	13,339	1,371	10.3%
Orange County Public Schools	42,584	44,800	-2,216	-4.9%
Pittsburgh Public Schools	12,132	9,688	2,444	25.2%
Polk County Public Schools	26,205	22,234	3,970	17.9%
Portland Public Schools	9,664	8,112	1,552	19.1%
Prince George’s County Public Schools	40,854	33,258	7,596	22.8%
Providence Public Schools	12,625	12,633	-8	-0.1%
Reading School District	9,127	4,570	4,557	99.7%
Richmond Public Schools	11,397	9,017	2,380	26.4%
Rochester City School District	16,605	16,192	412	2.5%
Salt Lake City School District	4,674	4,673	1	0.02%
San Antonio Independent School District	44,566	36,002	8,564	23.8%
San Bernardino City Unified School District	13,086	14,432	-1,346	-9.3%
San Diego Unified School District	38,410	39,919	-1,509	-3.8%
Savannah-Chatham County Public School System	12,808	12,067	741	6.1%
School District of Philadelphia	56,617	50,189	6,428	12.8%
School District U-46	6,559	8,848	-2,289	-25.9%
Shelby County Schools	60,680	63,310	-2,630	-4.2%
Syracuse City School District	10,874	10,625	249	2.3%
Toledo Public Schools	7,010	6,698	312	4.7%
Wake County Public School System	19,233	19,492	-259	-1.3%
Waterbury Public Schools	5,601	4,620	981	21.2%

Table D
Breakfast Service Models Operated SY 2014–2015*

District	Number of Schools Using Alternative Service Models						
	Total Schools	Cafeteria before school	Served in the classroom	Grab and go to the classroom	“Second chance” or brunch	Vending machine	Other
Albuquerque Public Schools	137	78	53	6	0	0	0
Anchorage School District	84	46	17	4	0	0	0
Atlanta Public Schools	76	32	28	16	0	0	0
Austin Independent School District**	114	109	5	0	0	0	0
Boise School District	45	27	18	14	13	0	0
Boston Public Schools	128	128	45	0	0	0	0
Brentwood Union Free School District	18	6	12	8	2	0	0
Broward County Public Schools	231	231	5	15	0	31	0
Buffalo Public Schools	70	32	49	15	0	0	0
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools	168	140	0	28	0	0	0
Chicago Public Schools	650	0	500	150	0	6	0
Cincinnati Public Schools	53	53	1	3	0	14	0
Cleveland Metropolitan School District	96	96	0	10	0	0	0
Columbus City Schools	107	103	4	0	0	0	0
Cypress-Fairbanks Independent School District	83	83	1	50	0	1	0
Dallas Independent School District	219	25	164	38	0	2	0
DeKalb County Schools	124	124	0	0	0	0	0
Denver Public Schools	185	42	86	12	0	0	55
Des Moines Public Schools	60	38	0	22	0	0	0
Detroit Public Schools	141	15	116	10	0	0	0
District of Columbia Public Schools	109	89	77	15	15	0	0
Durham Public Schools	54	30	7	0	0	0	1
Fresno Unified School District	105	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fulton County Schools	94	94	0	27	0	0	0
Guilford County Schools	126	126	32	25	0	0	0
Houston Independent School District	283	56	222	5	0	0	0
Indianapolis Public Schools	62	62	0	0	0	0	0
Inglewood Unified School District	18	10	8	0	0	0	0
Irving Independent School District	40	14	26	0	0	0	0
Jackson Public Schools	60	60	20	0	0	0	0
Jefferson County Public Schools	146	116	30	19	0	0	0
Jersey City Public Schools	48	0	32	16	0	0	0
Kansas City, Kansas Public Schools	56	32	23	1	0	0	0
Knox County Schools	86	67	12	7	2	2	0
Little Rock School District	45	20	25	0	0	0	0
Long Beach Unified School District	87	85	1	0	11	0	0
Los Angeles Unified School District	694	0	636	19	37	0	0
Mesa Public Schools	78	50	19	0	0	0	0

Table D CONTINUED

Breakfast Service Models Operated SY 2014–2015*

District	Number of Schools Using Alternative Service Models						
	Total Schools	Cafeteria before school	Served in the classroom	Grab and go to the classroom	“Second chance” or brunch	Vending machine	Other
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools	138	Data not provided	41	2	0	0	0
Miami-Dade County Public Schools	351	351	10	20	0	5	0
Milwaukee Public Schools	158	75	82	1	0	19	0
Minneapolis Public Schools	60	34	0	26	0	0	0
Montgomery County Public Schools	202	0	78	0	0	0	2
New York City Department of Education	2,486	2,402	218	110	0	0	0
Newark Public Schools	62	13	49	0	0	0	0
Norfolk Public Schools	51	19	0	32	0	0	0
Oakland Unified School District	84	Data not provided	1	4	1	0	0
Oklahoma City Public Schools	79	51	9	19	0	0	0
Omaha Public Schools	92	55	49	36	0	0	0
Orange County Public Schools	226	226	2	75	0	0	0
Pittsburgh Public Schools	54	54	2	3	0	0	0
Polk County Public Schools	130	122	8	20	0	0	0
Portland Public Schools	84	53	0	23	0	0	0
Prince George’s County Public Schools	204	86	93	25	0	0	0
Providence Public Schools	61	39	22	0	0	0	0
Reading School District	22	9	10	11	0	0	0
Richmond Public Schools	44	0	10	0	0	0	0
Rochester City School District	56	20	36	0	0	0	0
Salt Lake City School District	38	37	0	0	0	0	0
San Antonio Independent School District***	Data not provided		some	Data not provided		Data not provided	
San Bernardino City Unified School District	80	80	0	0	1	3	0
San Diego Unified School District	239	177	62	0	7	0	0
Savannah-Chatham County Public School System	53	29	0	24	0	0	0
School District of Philadelphia	276	276	154	64	0	0	0
School District U-46	56	0	2	5	0	6	0
Shelby County Schools	220	115	102	3	0	0	0
Syracuse City School District	34	17	19	2	0	4	0
Toledo Public Schools	50	46	2	2	0	0	0
Wake County Public School System	169	0	14	2	0	0	2
Waterbury Public Schools	30	30	4	0	0	0	0
Hartford Public Schools	51	51	4	7	0	0	0

* Data not reported for Baltimore, and Fort Worth.

** Data reported for Austin Independent School District may be underrepresented because numbers represent serving sites and not school campuses.

*** Data reported for San Antonio is based on information found on the district website: <https://www.saisd.net/dept/foodnutrition/programs/96>

Table E
Districts Offering Free Breakfast to All Students SY 2014–2015

District	Total Schools	Does the District Serve Breakfast in All Schools?	If “No,” the Number of Schools Without Breakfast	Does the District Offer Free Breakfast in All or Some *Schools?	If “Some,” How Many Schools Offer Free Breakfast?
Albuquerque Public Schools	137	Yes	—	some	74
Anchorage School District	84	No	21	some	30
Atlanta Public Schools	76	Yes	—	none	—
Austin Independent School District*	114	Yes	—	some	65
Baltimore City Public Schools	186	Yes	—	all	—
Boise School District	45	Yes	—	some	16
Boston Public Schools	128	Yes	—	all	—
Brentwood Union Free School District	18	Yes	—	some	17
Broward County Public Schools	231	Yes	—	all	—
Buffalo Public Schools	70	Yes	—	all	—
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools	168	Yes	—	all	—
Chicago Public Schools	650	Yes	—	all	—
Cincinnati Public Schools	53	Yes	—	some	52
Cleveland Metropolitan School District	96	Yes	—	all	—
Columbus City Schools	107	Yes	—	all	—
Cypress-Fairbanks Independent School District	83	Yes	—	some	8
Dallas Independent School District	219	Yes	—	all	—
DeKalb County Schools	124	No	2	some	16
Denver Public Schools	185	No	7	all	—
Des Moines Public Schools	60	Yes	—	some	35
Detroit Public Schools	141	Yes	—	all	—
District of Columbia Public Schools	109	Yes	—	some	77
Durham Public Schools	54	Yes	—	some	10
Fort Worth Independent School District**	131	Data not provided	Data not provided	some	86
Fresno Unified School District	105	No	2	all	—
Fulton County Schools	94	Yes	—	some	2
Guilford County Schools	126	Yes	—	some	81
Houston Independent School District	283	Yes	—	all	—
Indianapolis Public Schools	62	Yes	—	all	—
Inglewood Unified School District	18	Yes	—	all	—
Irving Independent School District	40	Yes	—	some	3
Jackson Public Schools	60	Yes	—	all	—
Jefferson County Public Schools	146	Yes	—	some	96
Jersey City Public Schools	48	Yes	—	all	—
Kansas City, Kansas Public Schools	56	Yes	—	some	24
Knox County Schools	86	Yes	—	some	52
Little Rock School District	45	Yes	—	some	32
Long Beach Unified School District	87	No	2	some	9

Table E CONTINUED**Districts Offering Free Breakfast to All Students SY 2014–2015**

District	Total Schools	Does the District Serve Breakfast in All Schools?	If “No,” the Number of Schools Without Breakfast	Does the District Offer Free Breakfast in All or Some *Schools?	If “Some,” How Many Schools Offer Free Breakfast?
Los Angeles Unified School District	694	Yes	—	some	618
Mesa Public Schools	78	No	9	some	19
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools	138	Yes	—	all	—
Miami-Dade County Public Schools	351	Yes	—	all	—
Milwaukee Public Schools	158	Yes	—	all	—
Minneapolis Public Schools	60	Yes	—	all	—
Montgomery County Public Schools	202	No	1	some	78
New York City Department of Education	2,486	No	43	all	—
Newark Public Schools	62	Yes	—	some	17
Norfolk Public Schools	51	Yes	—	some	32
Oakland Unified School District	84	No	6	some	40
Oklahoma City Public Schools	79	Yes	—	some	53
Omaha Public Schools	92	No	1	all	—
Orange County Public Schools	226	Yes	—	some	19
Pittsburgh Public Schools	54	Yes	—	all	—
Polk County Public Schools	130	Yes	—	some	77
Portland Public Schools	84	No	6	some	47
Prince George’s County Public Schools	204	Yes	—	Data not provided	Data not provided
Providence Public Schools	61	No	2	some	8
Reading School District	22	Yes	—	all	—
Richmond Public Schools	44	Yes	—	all	—
Rochester City School District	56	Yes	—	all	—
Salt Lake City School District	38	No	1	none	—
San Antonio Independent School District***	93	Data not provided	Data not provided	some	90
San Bernardino City Unified School District	80	Yes	—	Data not provided	Data not provided
San Diego Unified School District	239	No	24	some	1
Savannah-Chatham County Public School System	53	Yes	—	all	—
School District of Philadelphia	276	Yes	—	all	—
School District U-46	56	Yes	—	some	2
Shelby County Schools	220	Yes	—	all	—
Syracuse City School District	34	Yes	—	all	—
Toledo Public Schools	50	Yes	—	some	45
Wake County Public School System	169	Yes	—	some	12
Waterbury Public Schools	30	Yes	—	all	—
Hartford Public Schools	51	Yes	—	some	36

* Data reported for Austin Independent School District may be underrepresented because numbers represent serving sites and not school campuses.

** Data reported for Fort Worth is based on information provided by Texas Hunger Initiative. Through community eligibility, the district offered free breakfast and lunch in 86 schools in SY 2014 - 2015, however this data does not capture non-CEP schools that may have offered free breakfast to all students too.

*** Data reported for San Antonio is based on information provided by Texas Hunger Initiative. Through community eligibility, the district offered free breakfast and lunch in 90 schools in SY 2014 - 2015, however this data does not capture non-CEP schools that may have offered free breakfast to all students too.

Table F
Districts Using the Community Eligibility Provision

District	Number of Community Eligibility Provision Schools in SY 2014–2015 (if applicable)	Community Eligibility Provision in SY 2015-2016?	Number of Community Eligibility Provision Schools in SY 2015-2016
Albuquerque Public Schools	74	Yes	76
Anchorage School District	30	Yes	30
Atlanta Public Schools	—	Yes	64
Austin Independent School District*	—	Yes	2
Baltimore City Public Schools**	186	Yes	186
Boise School District	15	Yes	22
Boston Public Schools	128	Yes	125
Brentwood Union Free School District	—	No	—
Broward County Public Schools	—	No	—
Buffalo Public Schools	70	Yes	71
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools	74	Yes	78
Chicago Public Schools	650	Yes	650
Cincinnati Public Schools	—	Yes	46
Cleveland Metropolitan School District	96	Yes	96
Columbus City Schools	107	Yes	107
Cypress-Fairbanks Independent School District	2	Yes	2
Dallas Independent School District	219	Yes	222
DeKalb County Schools	14	Yes	20
Denver Public Schools	—	No	—
Des Moines Public Schools	35	Yes	37
Detroit Public Schools	141	Yes	144
District of Columbia Public Schools	77	Yes	82
Durham Public Schools	10	Yes	10
Fort Worth Independent School District	86	Yes	87
Fresno Unified School District	98	Yes	101
Fulton County Schools	2	Yes	22
Guilford County Schools	58	Yes	58
Hartford Public Schools	36	Yes	50
Houston Independent School District	168	Yes	177
Indianapolis Public Schools	62	Yes	66
Inglewood Unified School District	—	No	—
Irving Independent School District	3	Yes	3
Jackson Public Schools	60	Yes	60
Jefferson County Public Schools	96	Yes	128
Jersey City Public Schools	—	No	—
Kansas City, Kansas Public Schools	—	Yes	40
Knox County Schools	52	Yes	53
Little Rock School District	—	No	—

Table F CONTINUED
Districts Using the Community Eligibility Provision

District	Number of Community Eligibility Provision Schools in SY 2014–2015 (if applicable)	Community Eligibility Provision in SY 2015-2016?	Number of Community Eligibility Provision Schools in SY 2015-2016
Long Beach Unified School District	—	No	—
Los Angeles Unified School District	—	No	—
Mesa Public Schools	—	No	—
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools	138	Yes	138
Miami-Dade County Public Schools	—	No	—
Milwaukee Public Schools	158	Yes	156
Minneapolis Public Schools	4	Yes	14
Montgomery County Public Schools	—	No	—
New York City Department of Education	699	Yes	794
Newark Public Schools	17	No	—
Norfolk Public Schools	8	Yes	23
Oakland Unified School District	6	Yes	23
Oklahoma City Public Schools	53	Yes	53
Omaha Public Schools	9	Yes	9
Orange County Public Schools	19	Yes	20
Pittsburgh Public Schools	54	Yes	54
Polk County Public Schools	77	Yes	107
Portland Public Schools	25	Yes	25
Prince George’s County Public Schools	Data not provided	Yes	9
Providence Public Schools	8	Yes	9
Reading School District	22	Yes	21
Richmond Public Schools	44	Yes	43
Rochester City School District	56	Yes	56
Salt Lake City School District	—	Yes	2
San Antonio Independent School District	90	Yes	90
San Bernardino City Unified School District	—	No	—
San Diego Unified School District	—	No	—
Savannah-Chatham County Public School System	—	No	—
School District of Philadelphia	276	Yes	276
School District U-46	—	No	—
Shelby County Schools	220	Yes	220
Syracuse City School District	34	Yes	34
Toledo Public Schools	42	Yes	42
Wake County Public School System	—	No	—
Waterbury Public Schools	30	Yes	30

* Data reported for Austin Independent School District may be underrepresented because numbers represent serving sites and not school campuses.

** Data provided for Baltimore City Public Schools is based on information provided by Maryland Hunger Solutions. In June of SY 2014 - 2015, Baltimore City Public Schools implemented community eligibility district wide: http://www.mdhungersolutions.org/pdf/cep_eligible_schools2015-2016.pdf

Table G**Additional Participation and Federal Funding if 70 Low-Income Students Were Served Breakfast per 100 Receiving Lunch**

District	Additional Low-Income Students in Breakfast if 70 per 100 in Lunch	Additional Federal Funding if 70 Low-Income Breakfast Students per 100 Receiving Lunch
Albuquerque Public Schools	met goal	met goal
Anchorage School District	1,587	\$440,339
Atlanta Public Schools	1,013	\$304,824
Austin Independent School District*	7,795	\$2,206,363
Baltimore City Public Schools**	5,419	\$1,398,476
Boise School District	met goal	met goal
Boston Public Schools	2,843	\$828,992
Brentwood Union Free School District	213	\$58,350
Broward County Public Schools	29,846	\$8,595,689
Buffalo Public Schools	met goal	met goal
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools	14,469	\$4,191,728
Chicago Public Schools	24,448	\$7,049,969
Cincinnati Public Schools	met goal	met goal
Cleveland Metropolitan School District	2,418	\$705,135
Columbus City Schools	met goal	met goal
Cypress-Fairbanks Independent School District	7,140	\$2,010,578
Dallas Independent School District	met goal	met goal
DeKalb County Schools	13,268	\$3,842,245
Denver Public Schools	met goal	met goal
Des Moines Public Schools	2,157	\$627,427
Detroit Public Schools	met goal	met goal
District of Columbia Public Schools	1,002	\$296,292
Durham Public Schools	2,412	\$680,680
Fort Worth Independent School District	10,220	\$2,856,240
Fresno Unified School District	13,671	\$3,985,803
Fulton County Schools	4,525	\$1,260,819
Guilford County Schools	met goal	met goal
Hartford Public Schools	3,669	\$1,079,500
Houston Independent School District	met goal	met goal
Indianapolis Public Schools	2,272	\$662,581
Inglewood Unified School District	met goal	met goal
Irving Independent School District	1,936	\$542,522
Jackson Public Schools	2,858	\$819,520
Jefferson County Public Schools	2,595	\$734,036
Jersey City Public Schools	met goal	met goal
Kansas City, Kansas Public Schools	met goal	met goal
Knox County Schools	4,207	\$1,118,281
Little Rock School District	met goal	met goal

Table G CONTINUED

Additional Participation and Federal Funding if 70 Low-Income Students Were Served Breakfast per 100 Receiving Lunch

District	Additional Low-Income Students in Breakfast if 70 per 100 in Lunch	Additional Federal Funding if 70 Low-Income Breakfast Students per 100 Receiving Lunch
Long Beach Unified School District	9,517	\$2,698,761
Los Angeles Unified School District	met goal	met goal
Mesa Public Schools	5,295	\$1,518,692
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools	4,245	\$1,203,586
Miami-Dade County Public Schools	47,306	\$13,614,240
Milwaukee Public Schools	4,294	\$1,210,257
Minneapolis Public Schools	2,055	\$579,503
Montgomery County Public Schools	1,618	\$442,176
New York City Department of Education	185,502	\$54,044,553
Newark Public Schools	met goal	met goal
Norfolk Public Schools	1,033	\$284,283
Oakland Unified School District	5,709	\$1,644,145
Oklahoma City Public Schools	3,074	\$874,395
Omaha Public Schools	6,467	\$1,750,832
Orange County Public Schools	17,215	\$4,958,921
Pittsburgh Public Schools	met goal	met goal
Polk County Public Schools	10,758	\$3,128,145
Portland Public Schools	652	\$182,332
Prince George's County Public Schools	2,728	\$772,446
Providence Public Schools	met goal	met goal
Reading School District	520	\$140,604
Richmond Public Schools	112	\$30,909
Rochester City School District	met goal	met goal
Salt Lake City School District	3,320	\$937,850
San Antonio Independent School District	met goal	met goal
San Bernardino City Unified School District	10,688	\$3,071,824
San Diego Unified School District	met goal	met goal
Savannah-Chatham County Public School System	737	\$211,373
School District of Philadelphia	7,280	\$2,099,122
School District U-46	5,354	\$1,534,768
Shelby County Schools	met goal	met goal
Syracuse City School District	met goal	met goal
Toledo Public Schools	2,550	\$680,606
Wake County Public School System	8,715	\$2,488,151
Waterbury Public Schools	3,682	\$1,091,530

* Data reported for Austin Independent School District may be underrepresented because numbers represent serving sites and not school campuses.

** Data provided for Baltimore City Public Schools is based on information provided by Maryland Hunger Solutions. In June of SY 2014 - 2015, Baltimore City Public Schools implemented community eligibility district wide: http://www.mdhungersolutions.org/pdf/cep_eligible_schools2015-2016.pdf

Table H School District Contacts

District	State	Contact	Title	Phone	Email
Albuquerque Public Schools	NM	Sandra Kemp	Executive Director Food & Nutrition	505-345-5661	kemp_s@aps.edu
Anchorage School District	AK	Jim Anderson	Director, Student Nutrition	907-348-5140	thern_alden@asdsk12.org
Atlanta Public Schools	GA	Dr. Marilyn Hughes	Nutrition Department Director	404-802-1599	mhhughes@atlantapublicschools.us
Austin Independent School District	TX	Anneliese Tanner	Food Service Director	512-414-0251	anneliese.tanner@austinisd.org
Baltimore City Public Schools	MD	Elizabeth Marchetta	Food and Nutrition Service Director	410-396-8755	EAMarchetta@bcps.k12.md.us
Boise School District	ID	Peggy Bodnar	Supervisor Food & Nutrition Services	208-854-4104	peggy.bodnar@boiseschools.org
Boston Public Schools	MA	Deborah Ventricelli	Acting Director, Food and Nutrition Services	617-635-9158	dventricelli@bostonpublicschools.org
Brentwood Union Free School District	NY	Nancy Ann Padrone, RDN	Coordinator School Food Service	631-434-2316	npadrone@bufsd.org
Broward County Public Schools	FL	Mary Mulder	Food Nutrition Service Director	754-321-0215	mary.mulder@browardschools.com
Buffalo Public Schools	NY	Bridget O'Brien Wood	Director	716-816-3731	bwebmaster@buffaloschools.org
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools	NC	Catherine Beam, CNS	Executive Director	980-343-6041	c.beam@cms.k12.nc.us
Chicago Public Schools	IL	Crystal Cooper	Claims Manager	773-553-1283	ctcooper@cps.edu
Cincinnati Public Schools	OH	Jessica Shelly	Food Service Director	513-363-0800	shellyj@cps-k12.org
Cleveland Metropolitan School District	OH	Joseph K. Vaughn	Executive Director Food and Child Nutrition Services	216-838-0434	Joseph.Vaughn@ClevelandMetroSchools.org
Columbus City Schools	OH	Joseph Brown	Food Service Director	614-365-5671	jbrown@columbus.k12.oh.us
Cypress-Fairbanks Independent School District	TX	Darin Crawford	Food Service Director	281-897-4540	darin.crawford@cfisd.net
Dallas Independent School District	TX	Jennifer DeHoog	Nutrition Initiatives Coordinator	214-932-5525	jdehoog@dallasisd.org
DeKalb County Schools	GA	Joyce R. Wimberly	Executive Director School Nutrition	678-676-0162	joyce_r_wimberly@dekalbschoolsga.org
Denver Public Schools	CO	Theresa Pena	Regional Coordinator of Outreach and Engagement	720-423-5657	theresa_pena@dpsk12.org
Des Moines Public Schools	IA	Sandy Huisman	Director, Food and Nutrition Management	515-242-7636	sandy.huisman@dmschools.org
Detroit Public Schools	MI	Betti Wiggins	Executive Director, Office of School Nutrition	313-408-5723	betti.wiggins@detroitk12.org
District of Columbia Public Schools	DC	Kate Wobbekind	Program Coordinator	202-821-6548	kate.wobbekind@dc.gov
Durham Public Schools	NC	James Keaten	Executive Director School Nutrition Services	919-560-3657	James.Keaten@dpsnc.net
Fort Worth Independent School District	TX	Glenn Headlee	Director of Child Nutrition Services	817-814-3500	roy.headlee@fwisd.org
Fresno Unified School District	CA	Jose Alvarado	Food Services Director	559-457-6250	jose.alvarado@fresnounified.org
Fulton County Schools	GA	Alyssia Wright	Executive Director of School Nutrition	470-254-8967	wrightal@fultonschools.org
Guilford County Schools	NC	James Faggione	Director, School Nutrition Services	336-370-3257	faggioj@gcsnc.com
Hartford Public Schools	CT	Lonnie Burt	Senior Director	860.695.8490	burty001@hartfordschools.org
Houston Independent School District	TX	Mark Welch	General Manager of Operations, Nutrition Services	713-491-5700	mwelch@houstonisd.org
Indianapolis Public Schools	IN	Jane Cookson, RD	Director of Foodservices	317-226-4772	cooksonj@myips.org
Inglewood Unified School District	CA	Rosa Orosemame	Director of Food Services	310-680-4870	tthomas@inglewood.k12.ca.us
Irving Independent School District	TX	Michael Rosenberger	Director, Food & Nutrition Services	972-600-6900	mrosenberger@irvingisd.net
Jackson Public Schools	MS	Holly Price	Food Service Supervisor II	601-960-8979	hprice@jackson.k12.ms.us
Jefferson County Public Schools	KY	Hannah Lehman	Coordinator, Records and Reports	502-485-3186	hannah.lehman@jefferson.kyschools.us
Jersey City Public Schools	NJ	Karen A. De LaMater	Food Service Director	201-413-6925	kdelamater@jcboe.org
Kansas City, Kansas Public Schools	KS	Josh Mathiasmeier	Director of Nutritional Services	913-627-3900	joshua.mathiasmeier@kckps.org
Knox County Schools	TN	Wanda McCown	Executive Director	865-594-3640	Wanda.mccown@knoxschools.org

Table H CONTINUED
School District Contacts

District	State	Contact	Title	Phone	Email
Little Rock School District	AR	Lilly Bouie, Ph.D.	Nutrition Director	501-447-2450	lilly.bouie@lrstd.org
Long Beach Unified School District	CA	Tiffanie Bas	Administrative Dietitian	562-427-7923	twbas@lbschools.net
Los Angeles Unified School District	CA	Laura Benavidez	Co-Director of Food Services	213-241-2993	laura.benavidez@lausd.net
Mesa Public Schools	AZ	Loretta Zullo	Director of Food and Nutrition	480-472-0909	lzullo@mpsaz.org
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools	TN	Spencer Taylor	Executive Director	615-259-8472	Spencer.Taylor@mnpss.org
Miami-Dade County Public Schools	FL	Susan Rothstein	Director Food and Menu Management	786-275-0446	srothstein@dadeschools.net
Milwaukee Public Schools	WI	Tina Barkstrom	Administrator, Department of School Nutrition Services	414-475-8362	barksttm@milwaukee.k12.us
Minneapolis Public Schools	MN	Michele Carroll	Business Manager	612-668-2823	michele.carroll@mpls.k12.mn.us
Montgomery County Public Schools	MD	Marla R. Caplon	Director, Food and Nutrition Services	301-284-4946	marla_r_caplon@mcpsmd.org
New York City Department of Education	NY	Robert Deschak	Deputy Chief, Office of School Support Services	718-707-4334	rdeschak@schools.nyc.gov
Newark Public Schools	NJ	Tonya Riggins	Director	973-733-7172	triggins@nps.k12.nj.us
Norfolk Public Schools	VA	Helen E. Phillips	Senior Director, School Nutrition	757-628-2760	hphillips@nps.k12.va.us
Oakland Unified School District	CA	Zenaida Perea	Financial Accountant II	510-434-2252	zenaida.perea@ousd.k12.ca.us
Oklahoma City Public Schools	OK	Carole Peters	Nutrition Specialist	405-587-1022	crpeters@okcps.org
Omaha Public Schools	NE	Tammy Yarmon	Director	402-557-2230	tammyyarmon@ops.org
Orange County Public Schools	FL	Lora Gilbert	Sr. Director, Food and Nutrition Services	407-317-3963	lora.gilbert@ocps.net
Pittsburgh Public Schools	PA	Curtistine Walker	Food Service Director	412-529-3302	cwalker2@pghboe.net
Polk County Public Schools	FL	Susan Ehrhart	School Nutrition Director	863-534-0590	susan.ehrhart@polk-fl.net
Portland Public Schools	OR	Gitta Grether-Sweeney	Sr. Director, Nutrition Services	503-916-3399	gsweeney@pps.net
Prince George's County Public Schools	MD	Joan Shorter	Director, Food and Nutrition Services	301-952-6580	jshorter@pgcps.org
Providence Public Schools	RI	Eric Hamilton	Program Manager	401-453-8679	eric.hamilton@sodexo.com
Reading School District	PA	Kurt D. Myers	Director, Food Services	610-371-5607	myersk@readingsd.org
Richmond Public Schools	VA	Susan Roberson, SNS	Director,	804-780-8240	sroberso@richmond.k12.va.us
Rochester City School District	NY	David Brown	Food Service Director	585-336-4162	david.a.brown@rcsd.k12.org
Salt Lake City School District	UT	Kelly Orton	Director	801-974-8380	kelly.orton@slcschools.org
San Antonio Independent School District	TX	Jennifer Sides	Assistant Director of Quality Assurance	210-554-2200	jsides1@saisd.net
San Bernardino City Unified School District	CA	Joanna Nord	Interim Business Manager	909-881-8000	joanna.nord@sbcusd.com
San Diego Unified School District	CA	Jennifer Marrone	Business Manager, Food Services	858-627-7332	jmarrone@sandi.net
Savannah-Chatham County Public School System	GA	Lydia Martin	SNP Director	912-395-5548	lydia.martin@sccpps.com
School District of Philadelphia	PA	Amy Virus	Acting, Sr. Vice President, Division of Food Services	215-400-5972	alvir@philasd.org
School District U-46	IL	Claudie L. Phillips	Director of Food and Nutrition Services	847-888-5000	claudiephillips@u-46.org
Shelby County Schools	TN	Frank Cook	Interim Director of Nutrition Services	901-416-5550	cookf@scsk12.org
Syracuse City School District	NY	Ken Warner	Director Food and Nutrition	315-435-4207	kwarnar@scsd.us
Toledo Public Schools	OH	Reynald Debroas	Director of Child Nutrition	419-671-8585	rdebroas@tps.org
Wake County Public School System	NC	Paula De Lucca	Senior Director Child Nutrition Services	919-856-2918	pdelucca@wcpss.net
Waterbury Public Schools	CT	Linda Franzese	Food Service Director	203-574-8210	LFranzese@Waterbury.k12.ct.us



Food Research & Action Center
1200 18th Street, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036

202.986.2200
www.frac.org

Copyright © 2016 Food Research & Action Center



[@fractweets](https://twitter.com/fractweets)



[@fracgram](https://www.instagram.com/fracgram)



[facebook.com/
foodresearchandactioncenter](https://www.facebook.com/foodresearchandactioncenter)



[linkedin.com/company/
food-research-and-action-center](https://www.linkedin.com/company/food-research-and-action-center)