

School Breakfast Program Start-Up and Expansion Grants

An Analysis of Grants Awarded by the
California Department of Education from
2005-2009

Markell Lewis
Susan Haley
Tia Shimada

December 2011



California Food Policy Advocates

California Food Policy Advocates (CFPA) is a statewide public policy and advocacy organization dedicated to improving the health and well being of low-income Californians by increasing their access to nutritious, affordable food.

For more information about this report, please contact Markell Lewis at markell@cfpa.net or 510.433.1122 ext. 107.

For more information about CFPA, please visit cfpa.net.

Acknowledgments

Thank you to the California Department of Education's Nutrition Services Division staff for their support of this analysis. A great thanks as well to the school food service directors, principals, superintendent, administrative assistant, and chief business officer who gave their time to be interviewed and particularly to those who were able to provide participation data.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Recommendations	1
Introduction	3
Methodology	3
About the Grants	3
Requirements and Scoring	3
Grant Distribution	4
Overview of Data	4
Study Sample	4
Grants Outcomes	4
Overview of Results	5
Figure 1	6
Figure 2	6
Key Findings	7
Innovative Service Models	7
Classroom Breakfast.....	7
Second Chance Breakfast	7
Grab n’ Go Breakfast	7
Healthy Vending.....	8
Outreach & Promotion Efforts	8
Figure 3	9
Figure 4	10
Point of Sale Improvements	10
Support of School Principal	11
Figure 5	12
Summary of Key Findings	12
Recommendations	13
District Participation Data	14
Table 1: Percent Participation - School Meal Participation among FRP-Eligible Students and Total Enrolled Students	14
Table 2: Percent Participation - School Meal Participation among Free-, Reduced-Price-, and Paid-Eligible Students and Total Enrolled Students	16

Figure 6. School Breakfast Participation.....	18
Appendix A	19
CDE Grant Details.....	19
Appendix B	20
Recommended Criteria Ranking for Grant Awards	20
Appendix C	21
Sample Grant Reporting Form.....	21
Appendix D	22
Statewide SBP and NSLP Average Daily Participation from 2005-06 to 2008-09	22

Executive Summary

Since 1990, the California Department of Education (CDE) has awarded competitive grants, up to \$15,000 per school site, to public school districts, direct funded charter schools, and county superintendents of school for the one-time-only equipment, outreach, and training costs associated with starting or expanding the School Breakfast Program (SBP) or Summer Food Service Program (SFSP). California Food Policy Advocates (CFPA) analyzed a sample of SBP grants awarded from 2005-06 SY through 2008-09 SY. The purpose of this analysis was to assess the impact of the grants on access, participation, and nutritional quality in the School Breakfast Program at recipient sites.

This report details the results of the grant analysis, which included interviews with district Nutrition Services Directors regarding grant award details, meal quality and appeal, and an assessment of school-level participation data that were collected before and after the grants were awarded.

The key findings of this analysis:

1. Suggest that the grants increase access to and participation in the School Breakfast Program. In the schools that provided quantitative data for this analysis, 16 percent of students participated in SBP before the grant award while 33 percent of students participated during 2009-10 (after the grant award).
2. Support the use of innovative breakfast service models to increase participation,
3. Demonstrate the importance of thoughtful and comprehensive strategies for school breakfast promotion and outreach,
4. Highlight the need for support of school breakfast programs among teachers, students, parents, staff, and especially site administrators, and
5. Show that electronic POS systems are a valuable tool in strengthening school breakfast programs.

These findings can serve to inform school districts as they apply for grant funding and work to implement new breakfast practices.

Recommendations

1. The governor and legislature should preserve and expand funding for school breakfast startup and expansion grants awarded to school districts by CDE. This small investment of state funds enables schools to draw down significant, on-going federal funds through per meal reimbursements.
2. CDE should administer the funds to achieve their statutory purpose: maximum participation of low-income students in the School Breakfast Program. Often this will encourage grants to be made to the schools with the largest number of low-income students. But CDE should not adopt a methodology that excludes any school, particularly schools with low ADA, from consideration. Therefore, CDE should work in conjunction with stakeholders to develop a formula that includes a variety of factors, e.g. cafeteria fund balance, percentage of free or reduced-price

eligible students, average daily attendance, current meal program participation, and other criteria.

3. CDE should continue to prioritize innovative service models, awarding points to grant applications with well articulated plans to implement or expand such models as Classroom Breakfast, Second Chance Breakfast, and Grab n' Go.
4. CDE should require applicants to use multiple outreach and promotion strategies. To facilitate this important expansion component, CDE should include in the grant applications descriptions of model outreach and promotion plans that use a variety of methods (e.g. flyers, parent meetings, automated phone system) and are developed by a diverse group of stakeholders (e.g. teachers, students, parents).
5. CDE should prioritize grant applications for sites that have secured the support of a school administrator, as demonstrated by the administrator's signature on the application.
6. Grant awardees should maintain and provide to CDE upon request, the following information from each awarded site for the three years following the award: breakfast participation data, average daily attendance, standardized test scores, and a brief description of the breakfast model being operated (e.g. the timing and location of breakfast service).

Introduction

The California Department of Education (CDE) awards grants, up to \$15,000 per school site, to public school districts, direct funded charter schools, and county superintendents of schools for the equipment, outreach, and training costs associated with starting or expanding operation of the School Breakfast Program (SBP) or Summer Food Service Program (SFSP). California Food Policy Advocates (CFPA) analyzed a sample of SBP grants awarded from 2005-06 SY through 2008-09 SY. The purpose of this analysis was to assess the impact of the grants on access, participation, and nutritional quality in the School Breakfast Program at recipient sites.

This report details the results of the grant analysis, which included interviews with district Nutrition Services Directors regarding grant award details, and meal quality and appeal and an assessment of school-level participation data that were collected before and after the grants were awarded.

Methodology

The sample was limited to public school districts awarded grants for SBP start-up or expansion. The sample was selected to include grant recipients diverse in such factors as the district's geographical location, the district's total student population, percent of low-income students at the recipient school site, grade levels at the recipient site, and type of proposed school breakfast project.

Grant applications were reviewed to identify the amount of funding requested for equipment, outreach, and training. CFPA interviewed district personnel about the implementation of the grants, with a focus on the challenges encountered, the solutions developed, and the overall lessons learned. School-level participation data for SBP and the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) were collected to compare participation rates before and after grants were awarded.

About the Grants

Requirements and Scoring

SBP Start-Up and Expansion grants are awarded competitively with applications ranked according to a point system. The grant requirements and application scoring system employed by CDE-Nutrition Services Division are included in [Appendix A](#). Some of the criteria are also discussed below.

Points are automatically awarded to schools applying for funds to initiate the School Breakfast Program but not to schools proposing to expand SBP. In 2009-10, over 417,000 public school students (approximately 7 percent of enrolled public school students statewide) were enrolled at the 760 schools that do not operate SBP. While 91 percent of all public schools in California operate SBP, only 19 percent of all students

(30 percent of low-income students) participate in SBP^a. These data indicate that by far the larger number of unserved students attend schools that offer SBP so that increasing participation at schools with existing breakfast programs is critical to increasing participation across the state.

Serving fresh fruit and vegetables is encouraged in the grant application. However, some strategies for increasing a school’s ability to serve fresh produce, such as purchasing salad bars, are not automatically awarded points.

In 2005-06, grant requirements stipulated that the outreach and promotion budget for each applicant site was to be, at minimum, 10 percent of the requested equipment budget. Currently, the requirement is 3 percent.

Grant Distribution

Currently, grant recipients receive 90 percent of the award up front with the remaining 10 percent provided upon approval of all invoices. During the years included in this analysis (2005-06 through 2008-09), none of the grant award was provided up front. Rather, grants were distributed only in the form of reimbursements. This was a barrier for districts that lacked sufficient resources to make the initial purchases for which they would later be refunded. One district interviewed for the analysis reported that they declined the grant because of this very reason. Five other districts reported delaying implementation of the grant because of this funding burden.

Overview of Data

Study Sample

Year of Application	Number of Districts Interviewed	Number of Districts Selected for the Sample
2005-06	16	28
2006-07	12	14
2007-08	8	11
2008-09	9	11
Total	45	64

Grants Outcomes

	Number of Districts in Sample
District TURNED DOWN grant award because it didn’t have enough capital to pay for equipment up front.	1
District POSTPONED implementation of proposed program	5

^a A CFPA analysis of data provided by CDE for public school districts for the 2009-10 SY

because funds were not available to pay for equipment up front.	
District offers a SECOND CHANCE BREAKFAST (2CB) in at least one of its sites.	14
District offers CLASSROOM BREAKFAST in at least one of its sites.	8
District offers a GRAB-N-GO model (either pre-bell or 2CB) in at least one of its sites.	14
District uses VENDING MACHINES to serve SBP meals (two districts have vending machines available for 2CB).	3
District serves FRESH FRUIT at breakfast daily.	37
District describes the grant as CRITICAL to its ability to improving SBP.	21
District reported VISITING OTHER DISTRICTS to observe models or practices.	3
District had PRINCIPAL SUPPORT at the schools where it was working to improve improving SBP.	23
District had thoughtful PROMOTION strategies, utilizing at least two methods.	23

Overview of Results

Sixty-four districts that were awarded SBP Start-Up or Expansion Grants in the school years 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08 or 2008-09 were selected for the sample. More districts were selected from 2005-06 because of the larger amount of awards granted that year, compared to FY 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09. Of the districts selected for the study, 45 were interviewed, one declined to participate, and 17 did not respond to interview requests. All interviews were with nutrition services directors except for five districts in the sample, whose interviews took place with a principal, chief business officer, administrative assistant, or superintendent. Eighteen districts provided school-level SBP and NSLP participation data from two years: the year prior to the grant award (the baseline year) and 2009-10 SY. Analysis of these data show that, on average, 16 percent of students participated in SBP during the baseline year while 33 percent of students participated during 2009-10. During the same period, the statewide average of participation in SBP went from 18 percent to 20 percent (Table 3, Appendix 2). Two schools did not follow this general trend and showed a decrease in participation from the baseline year to 2009-10.^b

The following charts reflect average daily participation in SBP before and after grants were awarded to the 18 schools that provided data for this analysis. Figure 1 shows the

^b Santa Cruz USD experienced a decrease in SBP participation rate. The Santa Cruz USD Nutrition Service Director reports that this decrease resulted from the elimination of Second Chance Breakfast in favor of only serving breakfast before school. Windsor USD also experienced a slight decrease in SBP participation rate.

percent change of SBP participants in each category of meal eligibility. Overall, average daily participation at the 18 schools doubled after the grants were awarded^c.

Figure 1





Figure 2 shows the average number of students per category of meal eligibility participating in SBP both before and after the grants were awarded. Overall, average daily participation at the 18 schools increased from 119 students per day before the grant awards to 289 students per day following the grant awards.

Figure 2



^c Meal eligibility is determined by a student’s household income. A student with a household income at or below 130 percent of the federal poverty guidelines (FPG) is eligible for free school meals. A student with a household income between 130 and 185 percent of FPG is eligible for reduced-price school meals. Students in the paid category have household incomes above 185 percent of FPG.

Key Findings

While individual districts employ a variety of practices to implement and operate SBP, this analysis identified the following common factors that contributed to the success of grant recipients in strengthening their respective breakfast programs.

Innovative Service Models

Thirty of the 45 interviewed districts currently operate innovative breakfast service models, including Classroom Breakfast, Second Chance Breakfast, Grab-n-Go, and healthy vending machines. The other interviewed districts used their funds to purchase equipment without implementing an innovative model. The use of such models is encouraged by CDE in the request for proposals and grant application. When grants are scored, applicants are given points for proposing “innovative strategies.”

Classroom Breakfast

Since 2006-07, San Diego Unified School District (SDUSD) has received grants to implement Classroom Breakfast in 29 of its elementary schools (10 sites in 2006-07, 11 in 2007-08, 8 in 2008-09). In 2008-09, participation in SBP was 30 percent of enrolled students at SDUSD’s Bayview Terrace Elementary School. In 2009-10, following the implementation of Classroom Breakfast^d with grant funds, participation in SBP was 94 percent of enrolled students. SDUSD’s Nutrition Services Director reports that revenue has also increased - now employees can work more hours and receive more extensive benefits. In addition, SDUSD teachers have reported improvements in classroom behavior and a decrease in student visits to the school nurse since the implementation of Classroom Breakfast.

Second Chance Breakfast

Washington Unified School District in Yolo County expanded its breakfast program to 11 elementary, middle, and high schools, which were awarded grants in 2006-07^e. Norman Elementary School and Evergreen Elementary School expanded their programs by offering Second Chance Breakfast in addition to a traditional breakfast. The Nutrition Services Director reports that school breakfast participation has increased since the district used grant funding to implement Second Chance Breakfast. Since expanding the breakfast program, the Nutrition Services Director has received reports of a decrease in student visits to the school nurse and improved classroom behavior.

Grab n’ Go Breakfast

Stockton Unified School District in San Joaquin County expanded its conventional^f breakfast service to include a Grab n’ Go component at two elementary schools that

^dWith the Classroom Breakfast model, all students are offered breakfast at the start of the school day. Breakfast is served, eaten, and cleared during the first 10-15 minutes of class while teachers conduct administrative activities or begin the day’s lessons.

^eWith the Second Chance Breakfast (2CB) model, school breakfast is offered before school and during morning recess or snack/brunch break.

^fFor this analysis, “conventional breakfast” is defined as a breakfast service that only occurs in the cafeteria before the school day begins.

were included in the sample of this analysis. Students can now pick up breakfast from the cafeteria before school starts and take it to eat outside of the cafeteria, if desired. The use of grant funds to implement Grab n' Go resulted in increased SBP support for SBP. With this support from the school community, the district will be launching Classroom Breakfast at Pittman Elementary School and Commodore Stockton Skills (Elementary) School, both K-8, in 2010-11.

Healthy Vending

Cabrillo Unified School District in San Mateo County purchased vending machines with their grant award, and they are utilized at Half Moon Bay High School to deliver complete school meals. The vending machines are accessible all day, including before and after school, which allows students to eat a full meal when needed and when it is most appropriate for their given schedules.


Outreach & Promotion Efforts

Several school districts interviewed for the analysis used grant funds to implement innovative strategies for promoting SBP. Vigorous, comprehensive promotion plans were common among schools that experienced increased SBP participation, support for SBP from the school community, and sustainable SBP operations. Among the interviewed grant recipients, the most successful promotion strategies included outreach to multiple stakeholders (e.g. teachers, principals, and parents) through multiple media (e.g. flyers, banners, radio ads and meetings).

Three different schools reported using grant funds to purchase a messenger phone system for calling student households. Burbank Unified School District in Los Angeles County uses a messenger system to encourage parents to submit applications for free and reduced price meals, to report low school meal participation, and to send reminders about depositing money into a student's school meal account.

Figure 3 shows the average daily participation in school meals at Burbank's Jordan Middle School before and after the grant was awarded (2005-06 and 2009-10, respectively). As shown in the figure, the percentage of breakfast participants among students eligible for free meals did not change between the baseline year (2005-06) and 2009-10. In contrast, the percentage of breakfast participants among students eligible for reduced price meals increased from 10 percent to 18 percent in the same period of time. The promotion strategies may have strengthened the school lunch program as well. Before the grant award (2005-06), 15 percent of students participated in school lunch. In 2009-10, 34 percent of students participated in school lunch.

Figure 3




Salida Unified School District (SUSD) in Stanislaus County used grant funds to implement a promotion and outreach strategy that targeted students and parents at Salida Middle School. In order to work with the community, Nutrition Services staff members attended parent meetings and church groups to discuss school breakfast and explain the program. Parents were unfamiliar with the program’s requirements and there were concerns about nutritional quality. The staff shared the ways in which they were trying to improve the nutritional quality of breakfasts being served to students, which helped improve the parents’ perception of the program. The Nutrition Services Department surveyed students to get feedback about the breakfast program to help with menu planning and tailoring of promotional material. Banners and posters were displayed at each school site to promote the breakfast program as well.

In addition to funding promotion and outreach efforts, SUSD used the grant award to implement a district-wide universal breakfast program.⁹ SUSD reported that these strategies helped increase SBP participation. The district also reported that promotion and outreach are necessary to garner necessary support from the entire school community to facilitate continued operation of SBP

⁹ With universal breakfast programs, all students are offered breakfast free of charge regardless of their household income status. Universal breakfast is compatible with all service models, including Classroom Breakfast, Second Chance Breakfast, Grab n’ Go, and conventional breakfast.

Figure 4 shows average daily participation in school breakfast at Salida Middle School before and after the grant was awarded (2006-07 and 2009-10, respectively). In 2006-07, prior to the grant award, six percent of SUSD students participated in SBP. In 2009-10, 28 percent of SUSD students participate in SBP. The figure shows the percentage of FRP-eligible students^h and total students participating in SBP.

Figure 4



Point of Sale Improvements

Four school districts interviewed for the analysis emphasized that electronic POS systems were necessary to increase their ability to serve more students at breakfast. With an electronic POS system, students can use their student ID card or ID number to “purchase” a meal and no cash needs to be exchanged on site. Electronic POS systems instantly record how many meals are served and to whom. This helps ensure that students who are eligible to receive free or reduced-price meals receive only one breakfast and lunch per day at the subsidized rate in addition to decreasing the stigma of receiving a free lunch.

Yreka Unified High School District (YUHSD) in Siskiyou County expanded its breakfast program to include Second Chance Breakfast at Yreka High School. The district reported that the success of this model, and the resulting increase in participation, are due to the electronic POS system purchased with grant funds. To be most cost-effective, the YUHSD cafeteria staff used a peer-to-peer training model, teaching each other how to use the new system rather than paying for an external training. In 2008-09, before the grant was implemented, 27 percent of enrolled students at Yreka High School participated in SBP. In 2009-10, participation increased to 36 percent of enrolled students.

^h FRP-eligible students = students eligible for free or reduced-price meals.

Chico Unified School District (CUSD) in Butte County implemented a Second Chance Breakfast model with mobile service carts to allow multiple points of service at Chico Junior High in 2005-06 and Chico Senior High School in 2006-07. CUSD purchased carts, as well as point of sale software and hardware to be used in conjunction with the carts. The mobile carts are also used for serving breakfast before the school day begins. The Nutrition Services Department was able to serve more students by placing carts in areas of high foot traffic rather than requiring students to come to the cafeteria. The electronic POS system enabled CUSD to implement Second Chance Breakfast using mobile carts.

CUSD reported that since implementing Second Chance Breakfast, both breakfast and lunch participation have increased in CUSD. The resulting increase in revenue has allowed the district to hire more Nutrition Services staff. This Nutrition Services department no longer operates at a loss.

Support of School Principal

Many of the districts interviewed reported that principal support for the school breakfast program was a key to success at each site. Districts reported that principal support is particularly important to the sustainability of innovative service models such as Classroom Breakfast and Second Chance Breakfast.


Pajaro Valley Unified School District in Santa Cruz County was awarded an SBP start-up grant for Renaissance High Continuation School in 2007-08. The principal at Renaissance High Continuation School understood the need for a breakfast program, since many students were complaining to the nurse about feeling hungry. With great support from the teachers, students, and particularly the principal, the Nutrition Services staff was able to successfully launch SBP at Renaissance High Continuation School. All of the other schools in the district already operated SBP.

Mount Diablo Unified School District (MDUSD) in Contra Costa County used grant funds to implement a Second Chance Breakfast in many of its elementary schools. At these elementary schools, meals are eaten in a multi-purpose room. The MDUSD Nutrition Services administrator worked with principals at each site to help coordinate the use of the multi-purpose room to accommodate meal times and other campus activities. The director reported that principal support was critical in managing logistics and garnering campus-wide support of the Second Chance Breakfast model.

Figure 5 shows average daily participation in school meals at two Mount Diablo USD Elementary Schools, Mountain View and Fair Oaks, before and after the grant was awarded (2005-06 and 2009-10, respectively). The figure illustrates the percentage of FRP-eligible students, paid students, and total students participating in SBP. In 2005-06, prior to implementing Second Chance Breakfast, 16 percent of students at Mountain View Elementary School participated in SBP. In 2009-10, 28 percent of students participated in SBP. Similarly, in 2005-06, 22 percent of students at Fair Oaks Elementary School participated in SBP. In 2009-10 the number increased to 43 percent of students participating in SBP. Approximately 40 percent of the Mountain View

Elementary School's student body, and 84 percent of Fair Oaks Elementary School's student body were FRP-eligible in 2009-10.

Figure 5



Summary of Key Findings

In summary, the key findings of this analysis:

1. Suggest that the grants increase access to and participation in the School Breakfast Program. In the schools that provided quantitative data for this analysis, 16 percent of students participated in SBP before the grant award while 33 percent of students participated during 2009-10 (after the grant award).
2. Support the use of innovative breakfast service models to increase participation,
3. Demonstrate the importance of thoughtful and comprehensive strategies for school breakfast promotion and outreach,
4. Highlight the need for support of school breakfast programs among teachers, students, parents, staff, and especially site administrators, and
5. Show that electronic POS systems are a valuable tool in strengthening school breakfast programs.

These findings can serve to inform school districts as they apply for grant funding and work to implement new breakfast practices.

Recommendations

1. The governor and legislature should preserve and expand funding for school breakfast startup and expansion grants awarded to school districts by CDE. This small investment of state funds enables schools to draw down significant, on-going federal funds through per meal reimbursements.
2. CDE should administer the funds to achieve their statutory purpose: maximum participation of low-income students in the School Breakfast Program. Often this will encourage grants to be made to the schools with the largest number of low-income students. But CDE should not adopt a methodology that excludes any school, particularly schools with low ADA, from consideration. Therefore, CDE should work in conjunction with stakeholders to develop a formula that includes a variety of factors, e.g. cafeteria fund balance, percentage of free or reduced-price eligible students, average daily attendance, current meal program participation, and other criteria.
3. CDE should continue to prioritize innovative service models, awarding points to grant applications with well articulated plans to implement or expand such models as Classroom Breakfast, Second Chance Breakfast, and Grab n' Go.
4. CDE should require applicants to use multiple outreach and promotion strategies. To facilitate this important expansion component, CDE should include in the grant applications descriptions of model outreach and promotion plans that use a variety of methods (e.g. flyers, parent meetings, automated phone system) and are developed by a diverse group of stakeholders (e.g. teachers, students, parents).
5. CDE should prioritize grant applications for sites that have secured the support of a school administrator, as demonstrated by the administrator's signature on the application.
6. Grant awardees should maintain and provide to CDE upon request, the following information from each awarded site for the three years following the award: breakfast participation data, average daily attendance, standardized test scores, and a brief description of the breakfast model being operated (e.g. the timing and location of breakfast service).

District Participation Data

**Table 1: Percent Participation
School Meal Participation among FRP-Eligible Students and Total Enrolled Students**

Base Year	County	District	School	Year	BREAKFAST		LUNCH	
					Free & Reduced Price	Total	Free & Reduced Price	Total
2005	Contra Costa	Mt Diablo USD	Mountain View ES	base	41%	16%	-	-
				2009-10	44%	28%	86%	61%
2005	Contra Costa	Mt Diablo USD	Mountain View ES	base	29%	22%	-	-
				2009-10	48%	43%	80%	77%
2005	Los Angeles	Burbank USD	Jordan MS	base	29%	12%	33%	15%
				2009-10	29%	12%	61%	34%
2005	Los Angeles	Culver City USD	Culver City MS/HS	base	10%	4%	-	-
				2009-10	33%	17%	70%	43%
2005	Sacramento	Galt Joint Union ESD	Morengo Ranch ES	base	21%	13%	78%	67%
				2009-10	21%	18%	80%	71%
2005	Sonoma	Windsor USD	Windsor Creek ES	base	27%	10%	84%	51%
				2009-10	21%	9%	80%	49%
2006	Orange	Huntington Beach ESD	Joseph R Perry ES	base	34%	16%	81%	55%
				2009-10	55%	29%	83%	58%
2006	Orange	Westminster ESD	Iva Meairs ES	base	30%	26%	88%	85%
				2009-10	88%	87%	87%	84%
2006	Stanislaus	Salida USD	Salida MS	base	13%	6%	45%	30%
				2009-10	32%	28%	58%	49%

Table 1: Percent Participation, continued
 School Meal Participation among FRP-Eligible Students and Total Enrolled Students

Base Year	County	District	School	Year	BREAKFAST		LUNCH	
					Free & Reduced Price	Total	Free & Reduced Price	Total
2007	Fresno	Central USD	Harvest ES	base	27%	22%	74%	70%
				2009-10	56%	45%	78%	71%
2007	Fresno	Central USD	McKinley ES	base	24%	20%	90%	77%
				2009-10	61%	51%	85%	84%
2007	Riverside	Hemet	Hemet HS	base	27%	12%	65%	35%
				2009-10	33%	22%	72%	55%
2008	Fresno	Central USD	Central East HS	base	7%	8%	19%	22%
				2009-10	62%	42%	43%	30%
2008	Los Angeles	Lennox SD	Dolores Huerta	base	29%	12%	33%	15%
				2009-10	29%	12%	61%	34%
2008	San Diego	San Diego USD	Bayview Terrace	base	34%	30%	76%	70%
				2009-10	97%	94%	93%	91%
2008	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz City SD	Mission Hill MS	base	54%	22%	53%	22%
				2009-10	45%	18%	49%	20%
2008	Siskiyou	Yreka UHD	Yreka HS	base	-	27%	-	21%
				2009-10	-	36%	-	33%


**Table 2: Percent Participation
School Meal Participation among Free-, Reduced-Price-, and Paid-Eligible Students and Total Enrolled Students**

Year	County	District	School	BREAKFAST				LUNCH			
				Free	RP	Paid	Total	Free	RP	Paid	Total
2005 (base)	Contra Costa	Mt Diablo USD	Mountain View ES	-	-	5%	16%	-	-	-	-
			2009-10	47%	33%	18%	28%	86%	85%	45%	61%
2005 (base)	Contra Costa	Mt Diablo USD	Mountain View ES	-	-	9%	22%	-	-	-	-
			2009-10	51%	35%	18%	43%	81%	72%	63%	77%
2005 (base)	Los Angeles	Burbank USD	Jordan MS	34%	10%	2%	12%	36%	22%	4%	15%
			2009-10	34%	18%	3%	12%	62%	57%	19%	34%
2005 (base)	Los Angeles	Culver City USD	Culver City MS/HS	-	-	1%	4%	-	-	-	-
			2009-10	36%	27%	7%	17%	73%	63%	27%	43%
2005 (base)	Sacramento	Galt Joint Union ESD	Morengo Ranch ES	23%	18%	8%	13%	78%	79%	61%	67%
			2009-10	21%	20%	16%	18%	80%	79%	61%	71%
2005 (base)	Sonoma	Windsor USD	Windsor Creek ES	30%	19%	2%	10%	86%	75%	34%	51%
			2009-10	23%	12%	2%	9%	83%	64%	29%	49%
2006 (base)	Orange	Huntington Beach ESD	Joseph R Perry ES	39%	12%	2%	16%	86%	63%	36%	55%
			2009-10	63%	24%	7%	29%	88%	64%	37%	58%
2006 (base)	Orange	Westminster ESD	Iva Meairs ES	-	-	14%	26%	-	-	78%	85%
			2009-10	88%	88%	87%	87%	88%	87%	72%	84%
2006 (base)	Stanislaus	Salida USD	Salida MS	16%	4%	2%	6%	48%	38%	19%	30%
			2009-10	36%	24%	23%	28%	61%	50%	40%	49%

Table 2: Percent Participation, continued
School Meal Participation among Free-, Reduced-Price-, and Paid-Eligible Students and Total Enrolled Students

Year	County	District	School	BREAKFAST				LUNCH			
				Free	RP	Paid	Total	Free	RP	Paid	Total
2007 (base)	Fresno	Central USD	Harvest ES	29%	17%	14%	22%	75%	72%	62%	70%
			2009-10	64%	10%	24%	45%	77%	82%	58%	71%
2007 (base)	Fresno	Central USD	McKinley ES	26%	17%	10%	20%	104%	44%	42%	77%
			2009-10	70%	12%	17%	51%	85%	85%	77%	84%
2007 (base)	Riverside	Hemet	Hemet HS	27%	28%	2%	12%	66%	65%	15%	35%
			2009-10	32%	33%	7%	22%	70%	76%	32%	55%
2008 (base)	Fresno	Central USD	Central East HS	12%	1%	9%	8%	30%	5%	44%	22%
			2009-10	70%	12%	18%	42%	45%	28%	15%	30%
2008 (base)	Los Angeles	Lennox SD	Dolores Huerta	34%	10%	2%	12%	36%	22%	4%	15%
			2009-10	34%	18%	3%	12%	62%	57%	19%	34%
2008 (base)	San Diego	San Diego USD	Bayview Terrace	-	-	14%	30%	-	-	43%	70%
			2009-10	86%	188%	80%	94%	83%	180%	78%	91%
2008 (base)	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz City SD	Mission Hill MS	56%	46%	7%	22%	56%	43%	7%	22%
			2009-10	47%	38%	3%	18%	50%	44%	4%	20%
2008 (base)	Siskiyou	Yreka UHD	Yreka HS	-	-	-	27%	-	-	-	21%
			2009-10	-	-	-	36%	-	-	-	33%

Figure 6. School Breakfast Participation



Appendix A

CDE Grant Details

From the California Department of Education's website

<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/nu/sn/mbnsdsnp162010.asp>

"The Annual State Budget appropriates approximately \$1.017 million for this grant program. California *Education Code* Section 49550.3 authorizes the California Department of Education (CDE) to award competitive grants of up to \$15,000 per site for nonrecurring expenses incurred in initiating or expanding an SBP or SFSP. Grants awarded to Public School Districts, Direct Funded Charter Schools, and County Superintendents of Schools

Start-up grants are for per site costs associated with starting an SBP or SFSP.

Expansion grants are for the costs associated with increasing program participation at an existing SBP or SFSP site.

Current Grant Details

"Please note that grant awardees will receive ninety percent of the funding at the time of award with the remaining ten percent awarded upon approval of all invoices. This is a change from prior grant periods, in which we reimbursed grant recipients after providing proof of purchase."

November 1, 2010 DEADLINE

CFPA's Summary of Requirements and Scoring Criteria:

- + 15 pts Detailed Budget (Equipment, Outreach/Promotion, Training)
- 0 pts Agreement to operate the SBP or SFSP for a minimum of three years
- + 5 pts Disclosure of additional (private/public) funding
- + 5 pts Technical Assistance (from NSD)
- + 5 pts Description of existing barrier
- + 25 pts for innovative strategies (Classroom Breakfast...)
- + 20 pts for severe need
- + 20 pts for start-up
- + 5 pts for Program Improvement Schools with >50% FRP
- 3% of budget must be for Outreach and Promotion
- Availability of fruits and vegetable encouraged
- Only for schools with at least 20 percent (20%) of enrolled students approved for free and reduced-price meals

Appendix B

Recommended Criteria Ranking for Grant Awards

Ranking	High FRP or Low FRP	Innovative Model or Cafeteria	Multiple Outreach and Promotion Components?	Expansion or Start-up
#1	<i>High FRP</i>	<i>Innovative</i>	<i>Multiple O&P Components</i>	<i>Expansion</i>
#2	<i>High FRP</i>	<i>Innovative</i>	<i>Multiple O&P Components</i>	Start-up
#3	<i>High FRP</i>	<i>Innovative</i>	Limited O&P	<i>Expansion</i>
#4	<i>High FRP</i>	Cafeteria	<i>Multiple O&P Components</i>	<i>Expansion</i>
#5	<i>High FRP</i>	<i>Innovative</i>	Limited O&P	Start-up
#6	<i>High FRP</i>	Cafeteria	<i>Multiple O&P Components</i>	Start-up
#7	Low FRP	<i>Innovative</i>	<i>Multiple O&P Components</i>	<i>Expansion</i>
#8	Low FRP	<i>Innovative</i>	<i>Multiple O&P Components</i>	Start-up
<u>no funding</u>	Low FRP	Cafeteria	Multiple or Limited O&P	Start-up

Appendix C

Sample Grant Reporting Form

School District: _____ **Date:** ___/___/___

NOTE: Only districts that received a School Breakfast Grant need to complete and return this form.

What year was the grant awarded: _____

What was the total amount awarded to district: _____

Number of schools that received a grant during this grant year: _____

For each school that received an award

Name of School: _____

Grade Levels: _____

Enrollment as of October 31: _____

Average Daily Attendance %: _____

Academic Performance Index Score: _____

Number of Free Eligible: _____

Number of Reduced-Price Eligible _____

Type of Grant (circle one)			
Start-up	Expansion	School Breakfast	Summer Food
SBP service time (circle one)			
Before Bell	After Bell (within 1 st period)	Brunch (after 1 st period)	
SBP service location (circle all that apply)			
Cafeteria	Classroom	School Entrances	
Mobile Carts	Other		
Outreach and Promotion Strategies (circle all that apply)			
Flyers	Radio	Newspaper	Banners
School PA Announcements	Parent Meetings	Teacher Meetings	Community Organizations/Groups
Incorporation into Classroom (e.g., Teachers talk about SBP, and importance of eating breakfast)		Telephone Messenger	Other:
Meal Participation			
SBP Average Daily Participation	Free Eligible Students		
	Reduced-Price Eligible Students		
	Paid (full) Eligible Students		
NSLP Average Daily Participation	Free Eligible Students		
	Reduced-Price Eligible Students		
	Paid (full) Eligible Students		

Appendix D

Statewide SBP and NSLP Average Daily Participation from 2005-06 to 2008-09

Source: Free and Reduced Price Meals Program (FRPM) and California Work Opportunity (CalWORKS) data. <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sh/cw/filesafdc.asp>. Updated Sept 8, 2010.

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
School Year	%of Students FRP Eligible	Average Daily Attendance (ADA)	SBP Average Daily Participation (SBP ADP)	% of ADA Participating in SBP	NSLP Average Daily Participation (NSLP ADP)	% of ADA Participating in NSLP
2005-06	51.15%	5,744,658	1,048,109	18%	2,992,488	52%
2006-07	51.02%	5,719,970	1,078,701	19%	3,046,474	53%
2007-08	51.15%	5,689,707	1,141,569	20%	3,135,837	55%
2008-09	53.69%	5,931,419	1,205,770	20%	3,207,008	54%

Note: the tables below include CDE data for all meals served at participating Public Schools (including Charter Schools), Private Schools, and Child Care Institutions through the Seamless Summer Feeding Option, NSLP, and SBP. Therefore, the percentages in columns E-G in Table 4 may not sum to the total percentage in Column E of Table 3. Likewise, the percentages in columns E-G in Table 5 may not sum to the total percentage in Column G of Table 3.

Source: County data from school districts and local agencies participating in the School Nutrition Program. <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sh/sn/>. Updated October 28, 2010. Accessed November 4, 2010.

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
School Year	% of Total Breakfasts Served as Free Meals	% of Total Breakfasts Served as RP Meals	% of Total Breakfasts Served as Paid Meals	% of ADA Eating Free Breakfast	% of ADA Eating RP Breakfast	% of ADA Eating Paid Breakfast
2005-06	76.80%	11.50%	11.60%	23.40%	3.50%	3.50%
2006-07	76.00%	12.00%	12.00%	14.00%	2.00%	2.00%
2007-08	75.00%	12.00%	13.00%	15.00%	2.00%	3.00%
2008-09	76.76%	11.75%	11.48%	15.61%	2.39%	2.33%

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
School Year	% of Total Lunches Served as Free Meals	% of Total Lunches Served as RP Meals	% of Total Lunches Served as Paid Meals	% of ADA Eating Free Lunch	% of ADA Eating RP Lunch	% of ADA Eating Paid Lunch
2005-06	62.30%	12.60%	25.10%	32.50%	10.90%	21.80%
2006-07	62.00%	13.00%	26.00%	33.00%	7.00%	14.00%
2007-08	62.00%	13.00%	25.00%	34.00%	7.00%	14.00%
2008-09	64.14%	12.86%	23.00%	34.68%	6.95%	12.43%

School Breakfast Program Start-Up and Expansion Grants

An Analysis of Grants Awarded by the
California Department of Education from 2005-2009

For more information about this report, please contact Markell Lewis at
markell@cfpa.net or
510.433.1122 ext. 107.

California Food Policy Advocates
www.cfpa.net

Oakland Office
436 14th Street, Suite 1220
Oakland, California 94612
T: 510.433.1122
F: 510.433.1131

Los Angeles Office
205 S. Broadway Street, Suite 402
Los Angeles, CA 90012
P: 213.482.8200
F: 213.482.8203

