

Evaluation of the Impact of Enhancement Demonstrations on Participation in the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP):

FY 2011

Food and Nutrition Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302

November 2012



The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communications of program information (Braille, large point, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD).

To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Adjudication, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call toll free (866) 632-9992 (Voice). Individuals who are hearing impaired or have speech disabilities may contact USDA through the Federal Relay Service at (800) 877-8339 or (800) 845-6136 (Spanish). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Food and
Nutrition
Service

Summer Food for Children
Demonstrations
November 2012

Evaluation of the Impact of Enhancement Demonstrations on Participation in the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP): FY 2011

Final Report

Authors:

Anne Peterson
Dan Geller
Alexandra Suchman
Benjamin E. Moulton
Dar Haddix

Submitted by:

Insight Policy Research
1901 N. Moore Street
Suite 204
Arlington, VA 22209

Submitted to:

Office of Research and Analysis
Food and Nutrition Service
3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302-1500

Project Director:

Anne Peterson

Project Officer:

Chan Chanhatasilpa, Ph.D.

This study was conducted under Contract Number AG-3198-B-10-0011 with the Food and Nutrition Service.

This report is available on the Food and Nutrition Service website: <http://www.fns.usda.gov/ora>

Suggested Citation:

Peterson, A., Geller, D., Suchman, A., Moulton, B.E., Haddix, D. (2012). Evaluation of the Impact of Enhancement Demonstrations on Participation in the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP): FY 2011. Prepared by Insight Policy Research under Contract No. AG-3198-B-10-0011. Project Officer: Chan Chanhatasilpa. Alexandria, VA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service..

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was prepared by Insight Policy Research, Inc. (Insight) under Contract Number AG-3198-B-10-0011 from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. It represents a team effort in which many individuals made key contributions in addition to the authors. We gratefully acknowledge their assistance. In particular, we would like to recognize the sustained contributions of Chan Chanhatsilpa, Social Science Analyst and FNS Project Officer; Hoke Wilson, Lead Social Science Analyst, Summer Food for Children Evaluations; and Marisa Kirk-Epstein, Project Coordinator, Summer Demonstration Projects, Policy and Program Development Branch. We would also like to thank Melissa Abelev, Chief, Special Nutrition Evaluation Branch. Their insightful comments on the interim deliverables and throughout the study greatly improved this research.

The authors would also like to express our appreciation to the representatives in each of the eight States that participated in the demonstrations. Through the efforts of many dedicated individuals in Arkansas, Arizona, Delaware, Kansas, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New York, and Ohio, we obtained detailed files regarding the operations and the outcomes of the demonstrations.

Finally, the authors would like to acknowledge the invaluable assistance of Brittany McGill and Nicole Tarsi in providing quality assurance on the data analyses and that of Betsy Thorn and Brian Estes on providing additional quality reviews.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
A. BACKGROUND ON THE DEMONSTRATIONS	3
B. STUDY OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY	10
C. DATA LIMITATIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS	15
CHAPTER II: BACKGROUND ON THE SFSP.....	19
A. SUMMER FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM PARTICIPATION.....	19
B. OVERVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION	22
C. SELECTIVE REVIEW OF PAST RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATIONS, AND EVALUATIONS.....	25
CHAPTER III: FINDINGS FROM THE EXTENDING LENGTH OF OPERATION INCENTIVE DEMONSTRATION.....	27
A. DEMONSTRATION DESCRIPTION.....	27
B. OUTCOME MEASURES	30
C. SEAMLESS SUMMER MEASURES	44
D. CONCLUSIONS FOR ARKANSAS.....	45
CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS FROM THE ACTIVITY INCENTIVE DEMONSTRATION.....	47
A. DEMONSTRATION DESCRIPTION.....	47
B. OUTCOME MEASURES	50
C. CONCLUSIONS FOR MISSISSIPPI.....	63
CHAPTER V: FINDINGS FROM THE 2011 MEAL DELIVERY DEMONSTRATION.....	65
A. DEMONSTRATION DESCRIPTION.....	65
B. DELAWARE IMPLEMENTATION AND RESULTS	66
C. MASSACHUSETTS IMPLEMENTATION AND RESULTS.....	70
D. NEW YORK IMPLEMENTATION AND RESULTS	73
E. CONCLUSIONS	78
CHAPTER VI: FINDINGS FROM THE 2011 FOOD BACKPACK DEMONSTRATION	81
A. DEMONSTRATION DESCRIPTION.....	81
B. ARIZONA IMPLEMENTATION AND RESULTS.....	82
C. KANSAS IMPLEMENTATION AND RESULTS.....	87
D. OHIO IMPLEMENTATION AND RESULTS.....	94
E. SEAMLESS SUMMER MEASURES	99
F. CONCLUSIONS	100
CHAPTER VII: CROSS-PROJECT SUMMARY AND OVERALL CONCLUSIONS.....	103

REFERENCES	105
APPENDIX A: SFSP HISTORY.....	A-1
APPENDIX B: EXTENDING LENGTH OF OPERATION INCENTIVE DEMONSTRATION DETAILED TABLES.....	B-1
APPENDIX C: ACTIVITY INCENTIVE DEMONSTRATION DETAILED TABLES.....	C-1
APPENDIX D: MEAL DELIVERY DEMONSTRATION DETAILED TABLES	D-1
APPENDIX E: FOOD BACKPACK DEMONSTRATION DETAILED TABLES	E-1
APPENDIX F: EXAMPLE CALCULATION OF AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE	F-1
APPENDIX G: EXAMPLE CALCULATION OF NSLP FREE AND REDUCED-PRICE AVERAGE DAILY PARTICIPATION DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR	G-1
APPENDIX H: WAVE 2 DEMONSTRATIONS COMPARISON GROUP SELECTION METHODOLOGY	H-2

LIST OF TABLES

Table I.1.	Side-by-Side Demonstration Comparison.....	7
Table I.2.	Research Questions	10
Table I.3.	Number of Demonstration Sites and Sponsors.....	11
Table II.1.	2011 Reimbursement Rates.....	22
Table III.1.	Total Meals Served: Arkansas Demonstration vs. Non-Demonstration Sites	40
Table III.2.	July Average Daily Attendance: Arkansas Demonstration vs. Non-Demonstration Sites	41
Table III.3.	Days Open: Arkansas Demonstration vs. Non-Demonstration Sites	42
Table III.4.	Arkansas: Number of Sponsors and Sites by Year.....	44
Table III.5.	Seamless Summer	45
Table IV.1.	Total Meals Served: Mississippi Demonstration vs. Non-Demonstration Sites.....	60
Table IV.2.	July and June Average Daily Attendance: Mississippi Demonstration vs. Non-Demonstration Sites	61
Table IV.3.	Mississippi: Number of Sponsors and Sites by Year	62
Table V.1.	Meal Delivery Demonstration Sponsors	65
Table V.2.	Percent Change in Average Daily Attendance for Existing Comparison Sites: Meal Delivery Demonstration (Delaware).....	70
Table V.3.	Percent Change in Average Daily Attendance for Existing Comparison Sites: Meal Delivery Demonstration (Massachusetts)	73
Table V.4.	Percent Change in Average Daily Attendance for Existing Comparison Sites: Meal Delivery Demonstration (New York).....	78
Table VI.1.	Food Backpack Demonstration Sponsors.....	81
Table VI.2.	Arizona Demonstration Sponsors.....	84
Table VI.3.	Backpack Demonstration Sites vs. Comparison Sites in Arizona	87
Table VI.4.	Kansas Demonstration Sponsors	90
Table VI.5.	Backpack Demonstration Sites vs. Comparison Sites in Kansas	93
Table VI.6.	Ohio Demonstration Sponsors	96
Table VI.7.	Backpack Demonstration Sites vs. Comparison Sites in Ohio.....	99
Table VI.8.	Seamless Summer: Backpack Demonstration States (Statewide)	100

LIST OF CHARTS

Chart III.1. Arkansas Demonstration Sites	30
Chart IV.1. Mississippi Demonstration Sites	50

LIST OF FIGURES

Chapters I and II

FIGURE I.1.	Arkansas, Mississippi, and the Nation: July SFSP and NSLP ADA as a Percentage of School-Year NSLP ADA, 2007 - 2011	4
FIGURE I.2.	Arizona, Kansas, Ohio, and the Nation: July SFSP and NSLP ADA as a Percentage of School-Year NSLP ADA, 2008 - 2011	5
FIGURE I.3.	Delaware, Massachusetts, New York, and the Nation: July SFSP and NSLP ADA as a Percentage of School-Year NSLP ADA, 2008 - 2011.....	6
FIGURE II.1.	SFSP Participation, SFSP/NSLP Summer Participation, and Free and Reduced-Price NSLP Participation, 1989 - 2011	20
FIGURE II.2.	SFSP/NSLP Summer Participation to Free and Reduced-Price NSLP Participation, 1989 - 2011	21

Chapter III

FIGURE III.1.	Arkansas: SFSP and NSLP Average Daily Attendance, 2007 - 2011	28
FIGURE III.2.	Arkansas: Total SFSP Meals Served, 2007 - 2011	31
FIGURE III.3.	Arkansas: Percent Change in July SFSP Meals Served Compared to Previous Year, 2008 - 2011	32
FIGURE III.4.	Arkansas: Total SFSP Meals Served by Meal Type, 2007 - 2011	33
FIGURE III.5.	Arkansas: Percentage of SFSP Meals Served by Meal Type, 2007 - 2011	33
FIGURE III.6.	Arkansas: Total SFSP Meals Served by Month, 2007 - 2011	34
FIGURE III.7.	Arkansas: Percentage of SFSP Meals Served by Month, 2007 - 2011.....	35
FIGURE III.8.	Arkansas: SFSP July Average Daily Attendance, 2007 - 2011.....	36
FIGURE III.9.	Arkansas: Percent Change in July SFSP Average Daily Attendance Compared to Previous Year, 2008 - 2011.....	36
FIGURE III.10.	Arkansas: SFSP Operating Days Average Daily Attendance, 2007 - 2011	37
FIGURE III.11.	Arkansas: Participation Rate - July SFSP and July NSLP ADA as a Percentage of March and School-Year ADA, 2007 - 2011.....	38
FIGURE III.12.	Arkansas: Percent Change in SFSP and NSLP-Summer Participation Rate Compared to Previous Year: July Over March, 2008 - 2011.....	39

FIGURE III.13.	Arkansas: Percent Change in SFSP and NSLP-Summer Participation Rate Compared to Previous Year: July Over School Year, 2008 - 2011	39
FIGURE III.14.	Arkansas: Percentage of SFSP Sites Open 40 or More Days, 2008 - 2011.....	43
FIGURE III.15.	Arkansas: Percent of Existing SFSP Demonstration and Non-Demonstration Sites by Change in Operating Days, 2011	43

Chapter IV

FIGURE IV.1.	Mississippi: SFSP and NSLP Average Daily Attendance, 2007 - 2011	48
FIGURE IV.2.	Mississippi: Total SFSP Meals Served, 2007 - 2011	51
FIGURE IV.3.	Mississippi: Percent Change in July SFSP Meals Served Compared to Previous Year, 2008 - 2011	52
FIGURE IV.4.	Mississippi: Total SFSP Meals Served by Meal Type, 2007 - 2011	53
FIGURE IV.5.	Mississippi: Percentage of SFSP Meals Served by Meal Type, 2007 - 2011.....	54
FIGURE IV.6.	Mississippi: Total SFSP Meals Served by Month, 2007 - 2011.....	54
FIGURE IV.7.	Mississippi: Percentage of SFSP Meals Served by Month, 2007 - 2011	55
FIGURE IV.8.	Mississippi: SFSP July vs. June Average Daily Attendance, 2007 - 2011.....	56
FIGURE IV.9.	Mississippi: Percent Change in July SFSP Average Daily Attendance in July Compared to Previous Year, 2008 - 2011	57
FIGURE IV.10.	Mississippi: SFSP Operating Days Average Daily Attendance, 2007 - 2011	57
FIGURE IV.11.	Mississippi: Participation Rate - July SFSP and July NSLP ADA as a Percentage of March and School-Year ADA, 2007 - 2011.....	58
FIGURE IV.12.	Mississippi: Percent Change in SFSP and NSLP-Summer Participation Rate Compared to Previous Year: July Over March, 2008 - 2011.....	59
FIGURE IV.13.	Mississippi: Percent Change in SFSP and NSLP-Summer Participation Rate Compared to Previous Year: July Over School Year, 2008 - 2011	59
FIGURE IV.14.	Mississippi: Percentage of Activities Offered by Type, Demonstration Sites, 2011	63

Chapter V

FIGURE V.1.	Delaware: SFSP and NSLP Average Daily Attendance, 2008 - 2011	66
FIGURE V.2.	Delaware: Total SFSP Meals Served, 2008 - 2011	68
FIGURE V.3.	Delaware: Number of Meals Delivered by Month, 2011	69

FIGURE V.4.	Massachusetts: SFSP and NSLP Average Daily Attendance, 2008 - 2011.....	71
FIGURE V.5.	Massachusetts: Total SFSP Meals Served, 2008 - 2011	72
FIGURE V.6.	Massachusetts: Number of Meals Delivered by Month, 2011	73
FIGURE V.7.	New York: SFSP and NSLP Average Daily Attendance, 2008 - 2011.....	74
FIGURE V.8.	New York: Total SFSP Meals Served, 2008 - 2011.....	76
FIGURE V.9.	New York: Number of Meals Delivered by Month, 2011.....	77

Chapter VI

FIGURE VI.1.	Arizona: SFSP and NSLP Average Daily Attendance, 2008 - 2011.....	83
FIGURE VI.2.	Arizona: Total SFSP Meals Served, 2008 - 2011	85
FIGURE VI.3.	Arizona: Number of Meals Provided in Backpacks by Month, 2011	86
FIGURE VI.4.	Arizona: Percent Change in SFSP Average Daily Attendance in July for Existing Demonstration Sites and Comparison Sites, 2010 - 2011	87
FIGURE VI.5.	Kansas: SFSP and NSLP Average Daily Attendance, 2008 - 2011	88
FIGURE VI.6.	Kansas: Total SFSP Meals Served, 2008 - 2011.....	91
FIGURE VI.7.	Kansas: Number of Meals Provided in Backpacks by Month, 2011.....	92
FIGURE VI.8.	Kansas: Percent Change in SFSP Average Daily Attendance in July for Existing Demonstration Sites and Comparison Sites, 2010 - 2011	93
FIGURE VI.9.	Ohio: SFSP and NSLP Average Daily Attendance, 2008 - 2011.....	94
FIGURE VI.10.	Ohio: Total SFSP Meals Served, 2008 - 2011	97
FIGURE VI.11.	Ohio: Number of Meals Provided in Backpacks by Month, 2011	98
FIGURE VI.12.	Ohio: Percent Change in SFSP Average Daily Attendance in July for Existing Demonstration Sites and Comparison Sites, 2010 - 2011	99

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Summer Food Service Program (SFSP), administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Food and Nutrition Service (FNS), is a component of the safety net for the Nation's low-income children, offering nutritious meals to needy children during the summer months when school is not in session. While the number of children participating in the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) has increased significantly over the past 20 years, participation in the SFSP has remained relatively constant.

Pursuant to the 2010 Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies Appropriations Act (P.L. 111-80, 749(g)), FNS initiated and carried out a series of demonstration projects aimed at preventing food insecurity and hunger among children during the summer months, collectively entitled the Summer Food for Children demonstrations. The demonstrations include two efforts: the Enhanced Summer Food Service Program demonstrations (eSFSP), which are assessed in this report, and the Summer Electronic Benefits Transfer for Children (SEBTC) demonstrations, which are addressed in a separate report. Together, the eSFSP demonstrations encompassed four separate initiatives, two of which were implemented in the summer of 2010 (Wave I) and two of which were implemented in the summer of 2011 (Wave II).

Each of the four demonstrations was funded for a 2-year time period. For the Wave 1 demonstrations, one State was chosen to implement each demonstration. The States were selected from among those that displayed high rates of childhood food insecurity and low SFSP participation. For the Wave 2 demonstrations, three States were chosen to implement each demonstration. All States were eligible to apply for these demonstrations, although States applying for the Meal Delivery Project were required to do so for rural areas only. Each demonstration is described briefly below.

Wave	Demonstration Name	State	Description
Wave 1	Extending Length of Operation Incentive Project	Arkansas	This demonstration provided additional funding per lunch to encourage sponsors to operate for additional days to increase access for children during a longer portion of the summer.
	Activity Incentive Project	Mississippi	This demonstration provided funding for sponsors to offer recreational or enrichment activities at sites to encourage more children to come to the sites.
Wave 2	Meal Delivery Project	Delaware, Massachusetts, and New York	This demonstration delivered meals to children in rural areas that, due to long distances and lack of transportation options, have limited access to SFSP sites.
	Food Backpack Project	Arizona, Kansas, and Ohio	This demonstration allowed sites to provide children with backpacks containing meals to take home on the days that SFSP sites were closed, typically on the weekends and holidays.

This report presents final findings from the two Wave 1 demonstrations and the first-year results of the two Wave 2 demonstrations using administrative data reported to FNS by SFSP sites. Key outcome measures include the total number of meals served, the total number of children served (as measured by average daily attendance, or ADA), and the participation rate

(the ratio of children receiving meals through USDA's summer nutrition programs divided by the estimated number of children receiving free and reduced-price meals during the school year). Additional outcome measures are illustrated if they are appropriate to the demonstration. These include the number of SFSP sponsors and sites, the number of days of operation (AR), the number and types of activities (MS), or the number of backpacks or meals delivered. The effects of the eSFSP demonstrations on food insecurity among participating households are the subject of a separate report. Key results for all demonstrations follow.

Extending Length of Operation Incentive Project. The Arkansas demonstration provided an additional 50-cent reimbursement for all lunch meals served at sites that offered meals for 40 or more days in the summer¹ so that the sites could feed children in their communities for a larger portion of the summer. In 2011, a total of 200 sites (out of 421 sites statewide) claimed incentive funding; 139 of these sites operated the SFSP in 2009, before the demonstration.

The median number of meals served at the sites operating in both 2009 and 2011 increased by 16.5 percent at demonstration sites while it remained nearly unchanged at non-demonstration sites. There was a significant relationship between the number of meals served and participation in the demonstration. The analysis was not able to detect a significant relationship between July ADA and participation in the demonstration.

Nearly 43 percent of existing demonstration sites in 2011 increased their operating days from the previous year, as compared to slightly less than a quarter (24.8 percent) of non-demonstration sites. The relationship between increased days of operation and participation in the demonstration was statistically significant, which indicates that the demonstration was successful in keeping sites open longer.

The number of demonstration sites was large enough to have had a potential impact on statewide SFSP participation. Across the 2 years of the demonstration, the number of total meals served increased by 63.6 percent (from 2009 to 2011). Most of this increase occurred during the first demonstration year. In the second demonstration year (from 2010 to 2011), the number of total meals served in Arkansas increased by 16.4 percent. In comparison, meals served increased just 2.9 percent in eight similar States from 2010-2011. Similarly, the ADA in July in Arkansas increased by nearly 69 percent from 2009 to 2011. In contrast, similar States experienced a modest increase of 9.6 percent in July ADA from 2009 to 2010 and 5.0 percent from 2010 to 2011. The participation rate (ratio of children who participate in USDA's summer nutrition programs compared to those who receive free and reduced-price meals during the school year) increased by 48.1 percent from 2009 to 2011, compared to an increase of 3.8 percent from 2009 to 2010 and a decline of 4.0 percent in similar States from 2010 to 2011.

Activity Incentive Project. The Mississippi demonstration awarded sponsors grants to increase enrichment and recreational activities, such as education, tutoring, sports and games,

¹ In 2011, due to inclement weather and flooding, some of these sites had to delay their start date for SFSP operations (beginning of summer) and were unable to operate for 40 or more days. These sites still were considered eligible to receive demonstration funds as long as they were open every weekday during the summer with the exception of the Fourth of July holiday.

arts, and other activities, to help draw children to meal sites. Across the 2 years, a total of 52 SFSP sites (out of 486 SFSP sites statewide) participated in the demonstration; only 10 of these participated in both years. Mississippi encountered significant challenges during the first year of the demonstration, so the summary below illustrates findings from the second year of the demonstration only.

In the past year, the median number of meals served increased by 19.5 percent at demonstration sites (that operated in both 2010 and 2011) and stayed about the same at non-demonstration sites. The relationship between participation in the demonstration and the number of meals served was statistically significant. However, the analysis indicated that there was no significant relationship between participation in the demonstration and July ADA.

Although the demonstration was not large enough to have had an impact on statewide SFSP participation, Mississippi did see some changes in key outcomes over the past year. Meals served across the summer increased by 16.2 percent from 2010 to 2011, a larger increase than for similar States (2.9 percent). July ADA increased by 18.7 percent from 2010 to 2011, compared to 5.0 percent in similar States. The participation rate (ratio of children who participate in USDA's summer nutrition programs compared to those who receive free and reduced-price meals during the school year) increased by 26.0 percent from 2010 to 2011, while declining 4.0 percent in similar States.

Meal Delivery Project. To address the difficulties children in rural areas have in accessing SFSP sites due to distance or lack of transportation issues, the Meal Delivery demonstration worked to develop effective and creative ways to bring meals to children. Three States, Delaware, Massachusetts, and New York, participated in this demonstration. Each State cited difficulties in reaching children in rural areas. Meals were delivered either to individuals' homes or to a central site accessible by multiple children. Each State implemented its activities through a single sponsor except for New York, which utilized two sponsors.

The demonstration was conducted in sparsely populated regions, and was not designed to attract children to the congregate sites. Therefore, a snapshot of SFSP sites nearby the demonstration sites was studied to determine if there was any change in attendance at traditional SFSP sites as a result of the home deliveries. In Delaware, two of the six comparison sites showed decreases in operating days ADA² of 17 and 28 percent, while the remaining four showed operating days ADA increases ranging from 8 to 40 percent. In Massachusetts, the nearest comparison site showed annual changes that were consistent with statewide changes, implying that the children served by the demonstration did not affect the traditional SFSP site. In New York, where the comparison sites were also fairly distant from the delivery area, the analysis of six comparison sites showed mixed results, with four sites having operating days ADA declines ranging from less than 1 percent to nearly 18 percent, while two sites showed increases ranging from 17 percent to 124 percent. Thus, no State showed consistent evidence that the demonstration shifted participants away from congregate sites to meal delivery. This

² Operating days ADA is a method of ADA calculation that yields the average number of SFSP meals served to children per day by dividing the number of "first" meals served for the largest sitting—breakfast, lunch, or supper—by the total number of operating days over the summer for each site.

seems to indicate that the meal delivery demonstrations reached children that had no or limited access to traditional SFSP sites. As this demonstration operated in a small number of areas in each State, it was not expected to have statewide effects.

Food Backpack Project. This demonstration provided backpacks containing food already packaged into meals for children to consume at home on days when SFSP meals were not available (e.g., during the times that SFSP sites were not open for normal operation, typically weekends and holidays). The demonstration was implemented by 16 sponsors at 82 sites in three States: Arizona, Kansas, and Ohio. Each of these States showed a high prevalence rate of food insecurity and each cited difficulties in reaching children through the SFSP during the summer months. These demonstrations took place in geographically small areas and were not expected to have any statewide impact.

The key outcomes (e.g., ADA and percent change in meals served) among demonstration sites were compared to the outcomes among nearby and/or similar comparison sites in addition to all other non-demonstration sites across the State. The results suggests that the backpacks, accompanied by promotional efforts to inform families about them, were highly successful in attracting new children to the SFSP. In each State, there were substantial increases in total meals served and ADA at the demonstration sites compared with much smaller changes, if any, at the comparison sites. For example, the July ADA increases at the demonstration sites were 148 percent in Arizona, 68 percent in Kansas, and 34 percent in Ohio, versus 9 percent, -3 percent, and -9 percent in the comparison sites respectively. Similarly, meals served at demonstration sites served increased 80 percent in Arizona, 63 percent in Kansas, and 36 percent in Ohio, compared to 2 percent, -8 percent, and -12 percent in comparison sites, respectively. The demonstration operated in a limited number of areas in each State and was not expected to have statewide effects.

Conclusions. While the demonstration projects showed mixed-to-notable improvements, it is important to note that there are many extraneous factors that could influence the estimates shown in this report. It is difficult to disaggregate the effects of the demonstrations from confounding factors that may have affected demand for the SFSP such as State outreach efforts, local economic factors, and other issues. The results of this demonstration for the year 2011 need to be carefully viewed in that context. Nonetheless, the demonstration changes observed are consistent with a generally positive impact on measures of SFSP service levels.

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Authorized under the 2010 Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies Appropriations Act (P.L. 111-80, 749(g)), the Summer Food for Children demonstration projects were initiated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) to develop and test methods of providing access to nutritious meals for low-income children when school is not in session. The purpose of these demonstration projects was to reduce or eliminate the food insecurity and hunger of children during the summer. There are two components to the Summer Food for Children demonstration projects: the Enhanced Summer Food Service Program (eSFSP) demonstrations and the Summer Electronic Benefits Transfer for Children (SEBTC) demonstrations.³ This report focuses on the eSFSP demonstration projects, which includes four separate projects to test new, innovative strategies to increase participation in the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP). This report is the second in a series of annual reports designed to assess the progress of these eSFSP projects in meeting their objectives and to provide FNS with critical information about the potential effectiveness of these demonstrations in increasing SFSP participation.

Since 1975, FNS has administered the SFSP, which provides free, nutritious meals to help children in low-income areas obtain the nutrition that they need throughout the summer months when school is not in session. FNS is the primary Federal agency responsible for providing a nutrition safety net to low-income populations across the United States. In addition to SFSP, FNS administers 14 other nutrition assistance programs, including two that specifically target school-age children during the school year: the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) and the School Breakfast Program (SBP). School food authorities (SFAs) that participate in NSLP and SBP also may provide meals during summer school or through the Seamless Summer Option (SSO). Despite ongoing efforts to increase participation, however, the SFSP only reaches a fraction of all eligible children, and substantially fewer children participate in the SFSP during the summer compared to the NSLP during the school year. In July 2011, SFSP/NSLP summer participation was only 16 percent of NSLP participation during the previous school year (USDA FNS National Data Bank (NDB)⁴), at nearly 2.3 million children (USDA, 2012a).

In 2010 and 2011, FNS solicited grant applications from States to implement four eSFSP demonstrations. The demonstrations were designed to encourage attendance at SFSP sites over the summer by mitigating barriers such as a lack of transportation options and limited operating times to

“Our efforts to combat hunger cannot end when the school bell rings on the last day of the school year, which is why these demonstrations will test new and innovative ways to reduce hunger and improve nutrition among children when school is not in session.”

– Tom Vilsack,
Secretary of Agriculture

³ The SEBTC demonstrations take advantage of existing Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) infrastructure to electronically deliver food benefits equivalent to what a child qualifying for the NSLP would receive each month during the school year.

⁴ The USDA FNS National Data Bank provides a single official repository to support the analysis and public release of FNS program information. Through the Food Programs Reporting System (FPRS), data from various FNS programs are extracted and imported into the NDB database.

provide meals. The projects were implemented in two waves; Wave 1 took place in the summers of 2010 and 2011 and Wave 2 took place in the summers of 2011 and 2012. Each of these waves is described below.

Wave 1. In 2010, two demonstrations were funded for a total of 2 years; one State was chosen to implement each demonstration. The two States selected for the demonstrations were Arkansas and Mississippi. These two demonstrations are briefly described below.

- **Extending Length of Operation Incentive Project.** This demonstration provided incentives to encourage sponsors to extend the number of days of program operations to increase access to meals for low-income children during a longer portion of the summer.
- **Activity Incentive Project.** This demonstration provided funding for sponsors to offer new or additional activities at sites as a means of increasing site attendance and SFSP participation.

Wave 2. In 2011, two additional demonstrations were funded for a total of 2 years. Three States were chosen to implement each demonstration. The first of these demonstrations was awarded to sponsors in Delaware, Massachusetts, and New York, and the second was awarded to sponsors in Arizona, Kansas, and Ohio. These two demonstrations are briefly described below.

- **Meal Delivery Project.** This demonstration was designed to develop ways to provide meals to eligible children in rural areas that, due to low population density, long distances, and lack of transportation options, could not financially sustain SFSP sites during the summer months.
- **Food Backpack Project.** This demonstration allowed sites to provide eligible children with backpacks containing meals to take home to eat on the days that SFSP meals were not available, typically on the weekends.

The purpose of this report is to present the year 2 results of the demonstrations; this includes final findings from the two Wave 1 demonstrations and the first year of the two Wave 2 demonstrations. A separate report will address changes in food security in the Wave 2 demonstrations and provide an assessment of implementation costs. Chapter II provides background on the SFSP, including a history of participation rates. Chapters III through VI provide findings from each of the 2011 demonstrations conducted. Appendix A contains a brief history of the SFSP. Appendices B, C, D, and E contain the detailed SFSP tabulations for each demonstration upon which the findings were based. Appendix F contains a description of the formula used to calculate average daily attendance (ADA) and Appendix G contains a description of the formula used to calculate average daily participation in NSLP free and reduced-price meals during the school year. Finally, Appendix H contains a detailed description of the methodology for selecting the comparison groups for the Wave 2 demonstrations.

A. BACKGROUND ON THE DEMONSTRATIONS


The goal of these four SFSP demonstrations was to help children maintain the same nutritional status they receive from the NSLP during the months when school is not in session. Each of the States was required to implement these demonstration projects for a minimum of 2 years (i.e., through the summer of 2011 for Wave 1 States and through the summer of 2012 for Wave 2 States). Each State was invited to submit an application to FNS that included a management plan describing how the demonstration would be implemented and how the incentive funds would be dispersed (and, for backpack and meal delivery States, how outreach to and oversight of sponsors would be conducted, and how sponsor applications would be solicited and reviewed). Additionally, Wave 2 States were required to promote the demonstration statewide prior to submitting their applications, and sponsors were selected by FNS during the competitive process. States were required to 1) manage sponsors; 2) for backpack and meal delivery, help them recruit eligible children; and 3) implement a tracking system for maintaining required data. In addition, the States agreed to submit more-detailed SFSP program data to FNS for the evaluation (i.e., at the site level, rather than at the State level, as is typically required).

Since both of the Wave 2 demonstrations include the distribution of food intended for consumption outside of an SFSP site, FNS specified guidelines for food safety, preparation, assembly, and delivery that were not applicable to the Wave 1 demonstrations. FNS grant funds were used to pay for food, costs associated with contracting and augmenting delivery vehicles, and appropriate packaging materials and supplies (including backpacks for the Food Backpack demonstration⁵). States were required to verify that sponsors met these guidelines prior to submitting their applications to FNS. To do this, States solicited applications from interested sponsors, screened the sponsors to ensure FNS criteria were met, and verified that each sponsor had an implementation plan. FNS retained the authority to select not only which States would receive funding to participate in the demonstration, but also which sponsors within the selected States could participate.

Each of the demonstrations is discussed below.

Wave 1. In 2010, FNS issued a solicitation for applications from 10 States with the highest rates of food insecurity among children and the lowest rates of SFSP participation—Arkansas, Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming—to implement one of two demonstration projects statewide. The two States selected by FNS to implement the Wave 1 demonstrations were Arkansas and Mississippi. These States consistently experience both higher-than-average food insecurity among children and very low SFSP participation levels (Nord, 2009; USDA, 2009). Prior to the start of the demonstration, only 8.1 percent of children eligible for free and reduced-price NSLP meals in Arkansas received summer nutrition assistance through NSLP or SFSP in 2009, compared to the national average of 16.9 percent. In Mississippi, only 4.7 percent of eligible children received summer nutrition assistance in 2009 (NDB; see Figure I.1).

⁵ Although the term backpack is used, in many cases another type of bag was provided containing the take-home meals. The term backpack in this report refers to a variety of different bag types.



Source: NDB.


Note: The percentages were calculated by dividing the ADA in the SFSP and NSLP in July by the ADA in the NSLP from the immediately preceding school year (9-month average). The U.S. NSLP ADA figures include children served in U.S. territories and on military bases.

Supporting data for Figure I.1 can be found in Appendix Tables B.4 and C.4.

Wave 2. Unlike the Wave 1 demonstrations, all States were eligible to apply for participation in the Meal Delivery and Food Backpack demonstrations,⁶ the only stipulation being that the Meal Delivery demonstration could only be implemented in rural areas. Initially, FNS anticipated awarding funding to one or two States for each demonstration. Ultimately, six States were awarded funds, a total of three States for each demonstration.

The three States selected by FNS to implement the Food Backpack demonstrations were Arizona, Kansas, and Ohio. Prior to the start of the demonstration, in Arizona, only 6.9 percent of children eligible for free and reduced-price NSLP meals received summer nutrition assistance through NSLP or SFSP in 2010, compared to the national average of 14.6 percent. In Kansas, only 5.3 percent of eligible children received summer nutrition assistance in 2010. In Ohio, 11.1 percent of eligible children did so (NDB; see Figure I.2).

⁶ Unlike the Wave I demonstrations, eligibility for participation in the Wave II demonstrations was not limited to States with the highest rates of childhood food insecurity combined with the lowest rates of SFSP participation.




Source: NDB.

Note: The percentages were calculated by dividing the ADA in the SFSP and NSLP in July by the ADA in the NSLP from the immediately preceding school year (9-month average). The U.S. NSLP ADA figures include children served in U.S. territories and on military bases.

Supporting data for Figure I.2 can be found in Appendix Table E.5.

The three States selected by FNS to implement the Meal Delivery demonstrations were Delaware, Massachusetts, and New York. All three States show higher participation rates (the percent of children eligible for free and reduced-price NSLP meals who received summer nutrition assistance through NSLP or SFSP) than the national average for the last 2 years (and, with some exceptions, the 2 years before that), as illustrated in Figure I.3. However, the demonstrations delivered meals to children living in rural areas where there were few SFSP sites and less nutrition assistance coverage availability than in other areas of the State.



Source: NDB.

Note: The percentages were calculated by dividing the ADA in the SFSP and NSLP in July by the ADA in the NSLP from the immediately preceding school year (9-month average). The U.S. NSLP ADA figures include children served in U.S. territories and on military bases.

Supporting data for Figure I.3 can be found in Appendix Table D.3.

Table I.1 below provides a side-by-side comparison of the four demonstrations.

**Table I.1
Side-By-Side Demonstration Comparison**

	EXTENDING LENGTH OF OPERATION PROJECT: Arkansas	ACTIVITY INCENTIVE PROJECT: Mississippi	MEAL DELIVERY PROJECT: Delaware, Massachusetts, New York	FOOD BACKPACK PROJECT: Arizona, Kansas, Ohio
Purpose	To determine whether a financial incentive to encourage sponsors to extend the number of days of operation can improve access to meals for low-income children for a greater portion of the summer	To determine whether providing sponsors with additional funding to create new or additional recreational or educational activities at their sites can increase SFSP participation	To provide meals to children in rural areas where low population density, long distances, and transportation issues make it difficult for children to get to SFSP sites, making site and sponsor operation financially unsustainable	To provide meals to children on non-SFSP operating days (weekends and holidays) during the summer
Incentive	An additional \$0.50 reimbursement for <u>each lunch served</u> at demonstration sites	Grants up to \$5,000 per site per year were given to selected sponsors to plan and implement enrichment activities at SFSP meal sites. The funds paid for equipment and other expenses associated with offering new activities at the site.	Funding for sponsors to develop ways of delivering meals to children in rural areas at a sustainable cost	Funding for sponsors to provide children with backpacks of food to take home for meals on non-SFSP operating days
2011 Expense	\$449,609	\$152,949	\$246,210	\$352,393
Sponsor Eligibility	All sponsors in the State that operated at least 1 meal service site were eligible to participate in the demonstration.	All sponsors in the State that operated at least 1 meal service site were eligible to participate in the demonstration.	Any sponsor in the State could apply.	Only existing SFSP sponsors (those with previous SFSP experience) could apply.
Sponsor Requirements	Sponsors that were open for a minimum of 40 days in the summer of 2011 were automatically approved by the State to receive demonstration funds. Sponsors did not have to apply for the demonstration. This number of days was selected because it is a large portion of the typical summer	The State required that only sponsors that were open for a minimum of 30 days during the summer of 2011 could apply to receive the demonstration funds.	Up to 4 days of meals could be delivered at a given time. Additionally, no more than 2 meals per day could be delivered to a particular child. Children who were eligible for free and reduced-price lunches during the preceding school year were eligible to receive meals.	Backpacks could only be provided during weeks when the sponsor was open for normal SFSP operations, and for meals not otherwise provided by the site. SFSP sites must remain open during the majority of the week.

	EXTENDING LENGTH OF OPERATION PROJECT: Arkansas	ACTIVITY INCENTIVE PROJECT: Mississippi	MEAL DELIVERY PROJECT: Delaware, Massachusetts, New York	FOOD BACKPACK PROJECT: Arizona, Kansas, Ohio
	break from the school year. **			All children age 18 and younger who were eligible for SFSP meals could receive backpacks.
Sponsor Selection	<p>There was no selection process; all sites open a minimum of 40 days in the summer were automatically included (with the exception of those weather-affected sites described in the second footnote to this table). However, Arkansas encouraged sponsors that operated for fewer than 40 days to expand program operations to become eligible.</p> <p>Not all sites under a particular sponsor must operate for a minimum of 40 days for the sponsor to be eligible to receive the incentive. However, the incentive was only provided to sites that operated for the required period of time or longer.</p>	<p>State criteria for sponsor selection included a history of successful program operation; number of sites operated; proposed increase in participation; length of program operation; planned activities and plan for implementation of activities; area eligibility; sustainability; and transferability.</p> <p>Sponsors were required to list each site applying for the grant; describe the new activities; how they would be implemented; how they would increase participation; how they would communicate within the community (through outreach and advertisements); and provide an estimate of the number of new children that would be drawn to the site.</p>	Sponsors were selected by FNS based on merit of project design; organizational experience and management; budget appropriateness; and economic efficiency.	Sponsors were selected by FNS based on merit of project design; organizational experience and management; budget appropriateness; and economic efficiency.
Target Areas	Although the demonstration was available statewide, Arkansas's rural Delta Region, whose 42 counties encompass more than half of the State, was the primary target area. This region poses many challenges in terms of serving the State's children.	No specific areas were targeted. However, Mississippi undertook a number of measures to publicize the project and encourage sponsor applications throughout the State.	Rural areas	No specific target areas

	EXTENDING LENGTH OF OPERATION PROJECT: Arkansas	ACTIVITY INCENTIVE PROJECT: Mississippi	MEAL DELIVERY PROJECT: Delaware, Massachusetts, New York	FOOD BACKPACK PROJECT: Arizona, Kansas, Ohio
	Arkansas conducted outreach and promotional activities targeting counties in the Delta Region.			
Data Requirements	Demonstration sponsors were required to submit data to the State more frequently than were non-demonstration sponsors; for example, demonstration sponsors submitted data on lunches served on a weekly basis, as opposed to the usual monthly basis.	Demonstration sponsors were required to submit itemized lists to the State of all expenditures and documentation supporting expenditure claims to receive reimbursement for supplies, and detailed job descriptions and labor rates for reimbursement for additional personnel costs. The sponsors were also asked for information on the activities offered at demonstration sites.	Demonstration sponsors were required to submit to the State data on each delivery route, including number and location of stops on the route; parent or guardian name, address, and phone number for households consenting to participate in meal delivery; frequency of meal delivery; content of meals delivered; daily number of meals delivered; and number of days for which meals are intended to provide food.	Demonstration sponsors were required to submit data on number of backpacks and meals provided, including total participation on distribution days by site each month; number of children given backpacks by site each month; and content of food backpacks.

**Sponsors were eligible to apply for activity incentive funds for each site they operate. Each sponsor was required to list each site applying for the grant; each of these sites was required to be open a minimum of 30 days during the summer of 2011.*

***Weather-related emergencies in early summer 2011 delayed the opening of SFSP operations (beginning of summer) at some sites and resulted in a total summer operating period that was shorter than 40 days. For these sites, the State changed the requirement for receiving demonstration funding from operating for 40 days to operating every weekday, except for the Fourth of July holiday.*

B. STUDY OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

The goal of this study is to assess the impact of the SFSP demonstrations on key outcomes, including participation. Together, these projects provided a means of assessing various methods of improving access to and participation in the SFSP, with the ultimate intent of increasing food security among low-income children. The overarching research questions addressed in the study are presented in Table I.2.

Table I.2
Research Questions

Objective	Demonstration	Research Question
#1	Length of Operation	1) Does the statewide availability of per-meal incentives to SFSP providers who increase the number of days they are open to serve meals to needy children have a meaningful impact on participation/coverage?
#2	Activity Incentive	2) Does the statewide availability of grants to SFSP providers who offer new site activities that are designed to draw and sustain attendees have a meaningful impact on participation/coverage?
#3	Meal Delivery	3) Does providing sponsors with funding for non-congregate meal service increase participation/coverage among rural children?
#4	Food Backpack	4) Does providing children with take-home meals for non-SFSP operating days increase participation/coverage?

Data for this study were obtained primarily from State agency databases and combined with State-level information from the NDB.^{7, 8} The data were obtained for 2007 through 2011 for the Wave 1 demonstration and for 2008 through 2011 for the Wave 2 demonstrations. The administrative data were cleaned, edited, and tabulated, and a comprehensive sponsor-site SFSP database was designed and developed, along with a supporting codebook and documentation. Table I.3 illustrates the number of sites participating for each year of the demonstrations.

⁷ This includes data from forms FNS-418 and FNS-143.

⁸ The SFSP ADA produced by the NDB is calculated by summing the total number of first meals served during a sponsor's primary meal service (usually lunch) during July, and dividing that by the number of operating or meal service days for July. Although FNS provides this definition as guidance, each State is responsible for the calculation and submission of its ADA and there is variation in the application of the definition. As a result, it is difficult to compare the State-reported ADA numbers in the NDB, both to each other and to estimates from other sources.

Table I.3
Number of Demonstration Sites and Sponsors

State	Activity Incentive and Extending Length of Operation: Demonstration Sites	
	2010	2011
Arkansas	163	200
Mississippi	39*	41**
State	Food Backpack: Demonstration Sites	
Arizona	-	18
Kansas	-	14
Ohio	-	50
State	Meal Delivery: Demonstration Sponsors***	
Delaware	-	1
Massachusetts	-	1
New York	-	2

* 39 sites were awarded demonstration funds in 2010, but only 22 actually spent demonstration funds.

** 41 sites were awarded demonstration funds in 2011, but only 40 actually spent demonstration funds.

*** Because there are no congregate meal sites in the Meal Delivery demonstration, all participation outcomes are viewed only at the demonstration sponsor level.

Demonstration Outcome Measures. This report examines a number of outcomes for the four demonstrations. Each of these outcome measures is described briefly below.

- 1. Total meals served.** The total number of SFSP meals served is defined as the sum of the number of breakfasts, lunches, suppers, and snacks served in all operating months (up to five—May, June, July, August, and September). This measure indicates whether the total number of SFSP meals served is increasing or decreasing for the summer as a whole. For the Wave II demonstrations, this measure looks at the number of meals that were provided via meal delivery or take-home backpacks in addition to the total number of meals served at congregate meal sites.
- 2. Average daily attendance (ADA).** FNS measures the number of children served per day by calculating the average daily attendance, or ADA, an approximate measure of participation in the program. This report includes two approaches to calculating this measure: July ADA and Operating Days ADA. Appendix F provides an example of the difference obtained using each of these approaches.
 - **July ADA.** This method yields the number of children receiving SFSP meals on an average day in July. For many States, July is the peak month of SFSP enrollment. July ADA has emerged as a measure used to compare ADA across the States and it has become an accepted measure as a result. For the State, the total number of SFSP “first” lunches served⁹ in July is divided by the number of operating days in July

⁹ SFSP participants can have second and third servings, but only the number of first servings is included in calculating the ADA. SFSP reimburses for a limited number of second meals.

(assumed to be the number of non-holiday weekdays in July, either 21 or 22 depending upon the year).

Ideally, July ADA uses the actual number of operating days at the site level. However, since this varies by site, statewide measures make adjustments to the operating days by using the average or median number of days across sites. Others use an assumed number of operating days, such as the number of non-holiday weekdays in July. The latter tends to lower the July ADA, as the number of assumed days tends to be greater than the actual days.¹⁰ However, it also serves as a consistent measure for comparison across States. In this report, we have used the assumed number of operating days when referring to July ADA, as it can be applied across States.

- **Operating Days ADA.** This method yields the average number of SFSP meals served to children per day. For each SFSP site, the operating days ADA is computed by dividing the number of “first” meals served for the largest sitting—breakfast, lunch, or supper¹¹—by the total number of operating days over the summer. This figure is rounded to the nearest integer value and the ADA is summed across all SFSP sites in the State. This approach has been used in previous research and tends to yield a result that is higher than the result produced by using July ADA, as the number of actual operating days per month tends to be lower than the estimated operating days used for July ADA.

3. **Summer ADA as a percent of school-year ADA (Participation).** This measure reflects the relative coverage of meal service provided by USDA’s summer nutrition programs for low-income children during the summer versus the school year. The measure is calculated as the ratio of the estimated number of children receiving a summer lunch (either SFSP or NSLP summer school or SSO) divided by the estimated number of children receiving free or reduced-price NSLP lunches during the school year. *Note: This indicator is also used in the Office of Management and Budget’s (OMB) Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) reviews of the SFSP.* There are two methods by which FNS calculates this measure:¹²

- **July ADA over NSLP ADA in March.** This method yields the ratio of the number of children receiving SFSP or NSLP meals on an average day in July over the number of children receiving NSLP free and reduced-price meals on an average day in March. This measure is calculated as the July ADA divided by the March ADA.¹³

¹⁰The Food Research Action Center (FRAC) has popularized the use of July ADA and uses the assumed operating days in its calculations.

¹¹For example, if there were 2,000 1st meals for lunch and 1,000 1st meals for breakfast, then the largest sitting would be lunch.

¹²These methods have long been used by FNS to calculate NSLP free and reduced-price participation from NDB data. Additionally, the methods have been detailed in previous USDA Reports to Congress. For more information, please see Appendix C of the 2007 report entitled “Report to Congress: USDA’s Simplified Summer Food Program: 2001-2006” (USDA, 2007).

¹³This measure does not account for all the other months during which school is in session.

$$\frac{[(\text{SFSP lunches for July} + \text{NSLP F/RP lunches for July}) \div \text{the number of operating days in July}]}{[\text{NSLP F/RP price lunches for March} \div \text{the number of operating days in March}]}$$

[Numerator of the ratio]: The average number of lunches served, per day, in July. Note: The number of operating days in July is equal to the number of non-holiday weekdays in July.

[Denominator of the ratio]: The average number of lunches served, per day, during the school year. Note: Since the number of operating days varies across schools and School Food Authorities (SFAs), FNS does not require States to submit this information; thus, the number of operating days in March is not available in the NDB. Instead, FNS calculates the number of operating days in March using an algorithm as follows. The number of operating days in March is computed separately by the State as the State's total number of NSLP lunches served in March divided by its average number of NSLP lunches served per day in March. For example, if the total number of NSLP lunches served in March was 540,000, and the average number of lunches served per day in March was 28,000, then the estimated operating days for May would be $540,000/28,000 = 19.29$. See Appendix G for a more detailed explanation.

- **July ADA over NSLP ADA throughout the school year.** This method yields the ratio of the number of children receiving SFSP or NSLP meals on an average day in July over the number of children receiving NSLP free and reduced-price meals on an average day in the preceding school year.¹⁴ This measure is calculated as the July ADA divided by the school-year ADA.

$$\frac{[(\text{SFSP lunches for July} + \text{NSLP F/RP lunches for July}) \div \text{the number of operating days in July}]}{[\text{NSLP F/RP price lunches for the school year} \div \text{the number of operating days in the school year}]}$$

[Numerator of the ratio]: The average number of lunches served, per day, in July. Note: The number of operating days in July is assumed to be the number of non-holiday weekdays in July.

[Denominator of the ratio]: The average number of lunches served, per day, during the school year. The methodology for calculating this denominator is illustrated in Appendix G.

Both of these methods combine all SFSP lunches with NSLP free or reduced-price lunches to calculate the July ADA.¹⁵ There are two reasons why the measure is computed using the meal counts of both programs in the numerator. First, because NSLP summer meals are part of FNS's overall support for low-income children in the summer, and second, to ensure that the measure of change does not count lunches provided by school sponsors who switched from providing summer nutrition through the NSLP to providing it through the SFSP (or vice versa).¹⁶

¹⁴ The school year includes 9-month averages for October-May and September of the following year. Summer months (June-August) are excluded.

¹⁵ All NSLP ADA figures used in these calculations come from FNS's NDB.

¹⁶ For all participating sites, any person 18 years of age and younger may attend the site. As a result, the SFSP data contained in this report may include preschool-age children.

Additional Wave 1 Outcome Measures

- 1. Number of SFSP sponsors.** The number of sponsors and associated SFSP sites affects the amount of access that low-income children have to the program.
- 2. Number of days of operation.** The number of days that a site is open throughout the entire summer may directly affect children's ability to access meals.
- 3. Number and type of activities.** The Mississippi demonstration determined whether increasing the number and range of activities could have a meaningful impact on participation.

Comparison Groups. Due to the difference in the nature and scope of the Wave 1 demonstrations as compared to the Wave 2 demonstrations (i.e., the Wave 2 demonstrations were implemented through a smaller number of sponsors and were not held statewide), different comparison groups were selected and used for each wave. For the Wave 1 demonstrations, FNS's NDB data were used to form two comparison groups, both at the State level. The first comparison group comprises a set of "similar States," which includes the other eight States that were eligible to apply for the Wave 1 demonstrations in 2010.¹⁷ The second comparison group ("balance of the Nation") includes all States other than Arkansas and Mississippi. Comparisons were also made within the State by comparing the 2011 data from existing sites (those that existed in both 2010 and 2011) to that from previous years for both demonstration sites and non-demonstration sites.

In contrast, selection of comparison groups for the Wave 2 demonstrations were made at the county level. The methods differed for each of the two demonstrations, as is described below.

- **Food Backpack Comparison:** Comparison sites were selected within the same county, if possible, or one or more counties statistically most similar based on five measures associated with food security: population density, median household income, percent below Federal poverty level, unemployment rate, and percent eligible for free and reduced-price lunches. The number of such sites composing the comparison group included all existing non-demonstration sites in the same county (that operated in both 2010 and 2011) or, if the sites were in similar counties, a sufficient number of sites so that the total meals served in comparison sites are comparable to or more than those in total demonstration sites. These comparison sites were examined to determine if their changes were different from the changes shown in the similar demonstration sites.
- **Meal Delivery Comparison:** Comparison sites selected for this analysis were existing non-demonstration sites (that operated in both 2010 and 2011) that were geographically closest to a demonstration location. These "nearby" comparison sites were examined to

¹⁷This comparison group is comprised of States identified by FNS as having a combination of the highest rates of food insecurity among children and the lowest levels of summer meals participation. Initially, FNS invited 10 States to apply for participation in the Wave 1 demonstrations, including Arkansas and Mississippi; the "Similar States" comparison group is made up of the remaining eight States. These eight "similar States" include Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming.

confirm that the demonstrations reached additional children rather than drawing children away from “nearby” sites. No change in these nearby sites would be anticipated as the target population of the meal deliveries would be expected to live relatively far distances from these SFSP sites.

Relationship with Seamless Summer Option. This report also examined the effect of the SFSP demonstrations on the Seamless Summer Option (SSO). The SSO is another child nutrition reimbursement alternative that allows SFAs to provide meals during the summer and over schools breaks of longer than 10 days in areas where at least 50 percent of the students are approved for free or reduced-price school meals. The SSO offers SFAs streamlined administration procedures and reimburses meals at the NSLP/SBP rates; the meals are free to children.¹⁸ For the most part, the SSO is offered at school sites, but State agencies may approve its operation at non-school sites.

One exploratory component of the analysis was to assess whether there was any evidence of SFAs shifting from the SFSP to the SSO or vice versa. If that were the case, the number of children served under the SFSP may have increased, for example, but without any real gain in the total number of children served through both programs. To examine this possibility, States participating in the SFSP demonstrations were asked to provide data for SSO sponsors and sites. Only four demonstration States have SFAs that participated in the SSO, including Arkansas and the three backpack delivery States of Arizona, Kansas, and Ohio. There are no SFAs in Mississippi or any of the meal delivery demonstration States (Delaware, Massachusetts, and New York) that participated in the SSO during 2011. The relevant sections in the later chapters of this report examine SSO outcomes to see if there is any evidence that SFSP participation affected SSO participation in communities that implemented both programs.

C. DATA LIMITATIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

Many factors could influence the estimates shown throughout the report. A brief summary of these factors is provided below.

1. Participation in the demonstration intervention was not randomly assigned at the State, site, or individual participant level. For Wave 1, FNS selected and invited 10 States to apply for the demonstration based on the States’ high prevalence of food insecurity among children and low participation levels in the summer food programs. For Wave 2, all States were invited to apply for the demonstration, and FNS selected States for award based on viability and merit of the grant applications. For the Wave 2 demonstration, FNS also selected the sponsors based on the quality of the program design specified in the sponsors’ applications. Therefore, differences seen in this report may be due to outside factors.

¹⁸The reimbursement rate for NSLP meals for School Year 2011-2012 is lower than the reimbursement rate for SFSP meals for Calendar Year 2011. For example, SFSP lunches are reimbursed at either \$3.2375 (for urban or vended sites) or \$3.2925 (at self-prep or rural sites), while SSO lunches are reimbursed at the NSLP rate of \$2.39 (reduced-price meals) or \$2.79 (free meals). See http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/SFSP_SeamlessComparisonChart.pdf.

2. In some States, existing initiatives or other funding sources were leveraged in implementing the SFSP demonstration, making it difficult to separate the effects of these various inputs on the SFSP measures. It is difficult to disaggregate the effects of the demonstration from competing factors that affect demand for the SFSP, such as strong outreach efforts by the State, financial constraints on the sponsors, local communities' initiatives, local economic factors, and population shifts. For example in 2010, in addition to the \$306,000 in incentive funds distributed to sponsors for this first year of the demonstration, the Arkansas Department of Workforce Services supplied approximately \$1.1 million in additional funding through the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) emergency contingency funds to help sponsors break down barriers that they face in raising participation.¹⁹ Sponsors received funding to help transport food or children to meal sites. Additionally, sponsors were reimbursed costs to feed adults at the SFSP sites so that families and communities could eat together. Since these TANF funds were combined with the SFSP demonstration funds, the effects of these two programs cannot be distinguished.

For the demonstration, Kansas built on the existing infrastructure for a similar initiative it operates in certain school districts during the school year, called the "backsnacks" program. Since many of the SFSP sponsors operated the school-year "backsnacks" program, the infrastructure for the demonstration was already somewhat in place to extend the program into the summer, allowing them to deliver more backpack meals to children this first year than they would have been able to otherwise.

3. Major program changes often take more than 1 to 2 years to demonstrate their full effect. During the initial year, implementation issues arise that may be addressed subsequently. This report covers 2 years of the Wave 1 demonstrations in Arkansas and Mississippi, but only covers the first year of the Wave 2 demonstrations in six States. Future reports will address the second year of Wave 2.
4. Unlike the Wave 1 demonstrations (particularly Arkansas because Mississippi experienced implementation issues in both years), the Wave 2 demonstrations were not implemented on a large scale throughout each State. These demonstrations were restricted to a small number of sites and sponsors in limited geographic areas; therefore, these demonstrations are only expected to affect these small, localized areas. It is unlikely that the impact of these demonstrations can be fully appreciated when analyzing the impact at the State level. Furthermore, it may not be possible to determine the source of any changes noted at the State level. To mitigate this challenge, this report also compares results from demonstration sites to a small group of similar sites within the State.

¹⁹ In 2010 in Arkansas, all SFSP sponsors received transportation funds through TANF of \$30 per day, per site multiplied by the number of days of operation. Only the SFSP sponsors/sites that served adult meals received additional TANF payment for adult meals. SFSP sponsors/sites did not have to apply for the transportation money, but they did have to let the State agencies know they were going to serve adult meals. In 2010, 66 sponsors claimed reimbursements for adult meals, 127 sites served adult meals in July, and 95 sites served adult meals in August. No adults were served in June. There were 40 sponsors and 64 sites that served adult meals (thus receiving TANF funds) and participated in the SFSP demonstration in 2010. These additional TANF funds were not available for 2011.

5. As described earlier in this report, this study reports and interprets two measures of ADA: July ADA and operating days ADA. July ADA is calculated at the State level and is used by FNS to provide a standard enrollment figure across the Nation that is based on data from the month when States typically serve the most SFSP meals; it also uses a standardized denominator of operating days across all States. The second measure is calculated at the site level using data from each site across the summer with the actual number of operating days as the denominator. As such, July ADA is likely to be lower than operating days ADA, especially in States where sites do not operate for the full month of July or where SFSP participation may peak in a month other than July (for example, in June in some southern States).
6. The NSLP figures used in this study were available statewide, but not at the county level, which might have been more suitable for assessing some these demonstrations.
7. New York did not provide an overall monthly operating days measure. Instead, it provided four variables for each site indicating “days of service,” one for each of the four meals, which may vary by meal. The largest value of the "days of service" measures served as a proxy for operating days for a month.
8. In some cases in Arizona and Ohio, separate backpacks were distributed for each meal and the numbers of backpacks distributed per meal differed. While the States confirmed that the “number of backpacks delivered” equals the number of children, the higher of the counts for any delivery date was used as the number of children served.

CHAPTER II: BACKGROUND ON THE SFSP

A. SUMMER FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

For more than 30 years, the SFSP has provided a critical safety net for the Nation's low-income children, offering nutritious meals to sites in low-income areas to help needy children learn, play, and grow during the summer months when they are not in school.²⁰ Families with children who participate in the SFSP consider the program an important source of nutritious food for their children (Felton & Harley Associates, 2006).

One purpose of the SFSP is to prevent hunger among school-age children during the summer months when these children may no longer have access to school meals, which are important to maintaining food security when school is in session. With participation in the SFSP far lower than free and reduced-price school meal participation, the reach of the SFSP is limited. Efforts to increase SFSP participation, and thus the meals served to children during the summer months, may forestall a decline in food security during the summer months.

Locally, the SFSP is run by approved sponsors, including school districts, local government agencies, camps, or private nonprofit organizations. Sponsors provide free meals to a group of children at a central site, such as a school, a park, or a community center. In July 2011, more than 4,750 local agencies (sponsors) served an average of more than 2.31 million children per day at 39,063 meal sites nationwide (USDA, 2011). From May through September of 2011, more than 136 million meals (including breakfast, lunch, supper, and snack) were provided through SFSP sites across the country (USDA, 2012a). Exact dates of program operation vary across locations in accordance with the local school calendar, but the SFSP is typically operational between May and September.

"The Summer Food Service Program is a vital nutrition resource during the months students are not in school. We know that there are many children who need nutritious food but don't have access to a program in their area."


– Kevin Concannon,
USDA Under Secretary of
Food, Nutrition, and
Consumer Services

Despite the many changes the program has undergone with respect to eligibility criteria, administrative procedures, and funding levels (see Appendix A for details), the SFSP has been unable to attain the same level of program participation that the NSLP achieves during the school year. The differences in levels of program participation are to some extent structural, as discussed briefly below. Participation in the combined summer programs (SFSP and NSLP summer school and SSO) has rarely exceeded 10-15 percent of the average participation in the free and reduced-price NSLP (USDA, 2012c). In 2011, while about 21.1 million children nationwide received free or reduced-price meals through the NSLP daily, only about 3.3 million

²⁰ Although SFSP sponsors primarily serve elementary school age children (58 percent of all participants), they also serve preschoolers (17 percent) and middle school/junior high school age or high school age children (25 percent; Mathematica Policy Research [MPR], 2003). For the SFSP, children are defined as 1) persons 18 years of age and younger and 2) persons 18 years of age and older who are mentally or physically handicapped and who also participate in a public or nonprofit private school program established for the mentally or physically handicapped.

children²¹ received meals through the combined summer programs daily (nearly 16 percent of NSLP children; USDA, 2012c; USDA, 2012d; USDA, 2012e).²²

While the number of children eligible for free or reduced-price school meals has increased over the past 10 years, the number of children participating in the SFSP has remained within the range of 1.9 million (in 2005) to 2.31 million (in 2011; USDA, 2012a; see Figure II.1). Similarly, the number of children participating in the SFSP and NSLP summer option combined has ranged from 2.2 million (in 1989) to 3.6 million (in 2003; see Figure II.1).



Source: NDB.

Note: NSLP figures represent free and reduced-price meals (not full price).


Data reflect July participation in the SFSP and 9-month participation averages (excluding the summer months) for free and reduced-price NSLP lunches.

SFSP + NSLP summer data includes SFSP in addition to other USDA summer nutrition programs.

In the past 10 years, the ratio of combined summer program participation to free and reduced-price NSLP participation has decreased from 21 percent in 2000 to 15 percent in 2010, rising slightly to nearly 16 percent in 2011, as depicted in Figure II.2.

²¹ The NSLP ADA figures used to calculate this number include children served in U.S. territories and on military bases.

²² ADA for SFSP is calculated in July, the peak month of attendance.



Source: NDB.

Note: FY 2011 data are preliminary. NSLP figures represent free and reduced-price meals only (not full price).

Data reflect July participation in the SFSP and 9-month participation averages (excluding the summer months) for free and reduced-price NSLP lunches.

Among the combined summer programs, participation in the SFSP is lower than free and reduced-price NSLP participation for a number of reasons. SFSP sites are located primarily in low-income neighborhoods (due to a requirement that 50 percent of children in the area be eligible for free or reduced-price school meals for open sites), whereas the NSLP is available everywhere. In addition, attendance at SFSP sites is voluntary, whereas attendance at school, where children can benefit from the NSLP, is mandatory. Additional barriers that may explain why SFSP attendance is so much lower than school-year-based programs include lack of transportation, lack of publicity about the program, limited hours of operation that do not coincide with parent work schedules, children’s dislike of the food, insufficient enrichment activities, and parents’ concerns about neighborhood safety (Mathematica Policy Research [MPR], 2003). Other factors such as weather, availability of program activities, and length of operation also influence the number of children served (MPR, 2003).

Participation in the SFSP accounts for a very small percentage of school-year NSLP participation across the Nation. The participation rate (number of children participating in SFSP in 2011 per 100 children participating in NSLP during the 2010-2011 school year) ranged from 2.1 in Hawaii to 23.1 in New York (note that these participation rates include SFSP participation in the numerator only, and exclude participation in other summer programs; Food Research and

Action Center [FRAC], 2012).²³ According to FRAC, participation in SFSP and the other summer nutrition programs combined (SFSP and summer NSLP) still only accounts for a small percentage of school-year NSLP participation,²⁴ ranging from a low of 3.7 percent in Oklahoma to a high of 31.2 percent in New Mexico (based on data from July 2011 and the 2010-2011 school year; FRAC, 2012).

B. OVERVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION

FNS oversees the administration of the SFSP at the Federal level by setting regulations, providing funds to States²⁵ to operate the program, overseeing implementation, providing training and technical assistance, and collecting and analyzing administrative data. FNS provides funding to States on a per-meal basis to cover two types of costs: 1) operational costs, including those for the purchase, preparation, and delivery of meals, and program and staff time for food service supervision; and 2) administrative costs, including those for program management, office expenses, administrative salaries, insurance, and some financial management costs. Reimbursement rates vary by type of site, with higher rates paid for meals served at rural sites and self-preparation sites. SFSP reimbursements are based on the number of reimbursable meals served multiplied by the combined operating and administrative rate for that meal. The maximum reimbursement rates per meal for summer 2011 are shown in Table II.1 (USDA, 2012b).

Table II.1
2011 Reimbursement Rates

Meal	Reimbursed Amount
Self-Preparation - Rural Sites	
Breakfast	\$1.880
Lunch/Supper	\$3.2925
Snacks	\$0.7750
Other Types of Sites (Vended - Urban)	
Breakfast	\$1.8450
Lunch/Supper	\$3.2375
Snacks	\$0.7575

Note: Payment rates are higher in Alaska and Hawaii to reflect the higher cost of providing meals in those States.

²³ The District of Columbia had a higher SFSP participation rate in 2011, at 68.6 percent; however, the District was excluded from this analysis because it contains only a single urban area and is qualitatively different from the States.

²⁴ NSLP participation is calculated as the ratio of children participating in the SFSP and free and reduced-price NSLP meals in the summer over the number of children participating in the free and reduced-price NSLP meals during the school year. See Chapter I, pages 12-13 for a discussion of how this participation rate is calculated.

²⁵ The SFSP operates in all 50 States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia (all of which are referred to as "States" in this text).

1. State Implementation

In most States, the State education agency that administers the school meal programs administers the SFSP.²⁶ These agencies recruit new sponsors, process sponsors' applications, provide training and technical assistance to sponsors, monitor sponsor operations, and process sponsor claims. At the start of each year, States must submit a Program Management and Administration Plan to the appropriate FNS regional office to receive Federal funding for the SFSP.²⁷ The following are State responsibilities in administering the SFSP:

- Requesting and processing applications and making awards
- Training and monitoring sponsors and sites
- Submitting data to FNS on program operations (form FNS 418) and financial status (SF 269)
- Distributing funds to sponsors

2. Program Sponsors

Local program sponsors carry out the daily operations of the SFSP. The sponsors are extremely diverse in terms of the size of their programs and the activities they offer. Types of eligible organizations include:

- Public or private nonprofit schools, or SFAs
- Local government agencies
- Public or private nonprofit residential camps
- Public or private nonprofit universities or colleges participating in the National Youth Sports Program (NYSP)²⁸
- Private nonprofit organizations other than schools

Sponsors are responsible for applying to the program, providing meals or contracting with vendors to provide meals, and monitoring meal service. When applying, new sponsors

²⁶ In 2009, nine States administered the program via a State agency other than the education agency (through the Departments of Agriculture, Health, or Social Services). Virginia did not operate the program; rather, it was administered through the FNS regional office for that State.

²⁷ These plans must include 1) the State's administrative budget for the fiscal year; 2) the State's plan for use of program funds and funds from within the State; 3) plans for providing technical assistance and training to eligible sponsors; 4) plans for monitoring and inspecting sponsors, meal sites, and food service management companies; 5) the plan for timely and effective action against program violators; 6) the plan for ensuring the fiscal integrity of sponsors; 7) the plan for ensuring compliance with the food service management company procurement monitoring requirements; and 8) an estimate of the State's need, if any, for funds available to pay for the cost of conducting health inspections and meal quality tests.

²⁸ Federally funded sports camps for low-income children.

must 1) demonstrate that they are one of the eligible organization types listed above; 2) demonstrate financial and administrative capability (i.e., that they operate a nonprofit food service, provide a year-round public service to the area in which they will operate, agree to serve low-income children, and exercise management control over all sites); 3) describe how they will provide meals; and 4) provide a budget for administrative and operating costs (USDA, 2010). They must also provide detailed information on every site they intend to operate, including site location, estimated attendance, site supervisory needs, hours of meal service, and documentation of site eligibility. Sponsors must submit either school data or census data to the State to show eligibility. School data are usually based on the percentage of children in the school district who are certified eligible for free or reduced-price school meals (USDA, 2010).

Claims for reimbursement indicating the total number of program meals served during the claim period must be filed with the State within 60 days of the last day of the month during which the meals included in the claim were served.

3. Local Program Sites

Each sponsor operates one or more sites (the actual locations where meals are provided) where free meals are served to children. Sponsors may operate up to 200 sites with a maximum attendance of 50,000 per day. In 2003, 50 percent of sponsors operated more than one site; these multiple-site sponsors accounted for 89 percent of all meals served (MPR, 2003). Types of eligible program sites include:

- **Open Sites.** These sites operate in low-income neighborhoods where at least 50 percent of the children live in households with incomes at or below 185 percent of the Federal poverty level (making them eligible for free or reduced-price school meals). These sites are open to all children who wish to attend, and sponsors receive reimbursement for all meals served to children (regardless of their families' income level).
- **Enrolled (Closed) Sites.** These sites provide free meals to children enrolled in an activity program at the site where at least 50 percent of the enrolled children are eligible for free and reduced-price school meals. Sponsors receive reimbursement for all meals served to children who are enrolled in the activity program (regardless of the family income level).

Other types of sites include residential or day camps, those for children of migrant workers, and colleges and universities participating in the NYSP. The program can also operate in school districts with year-round school programs. These sites, which can be any of the above site types, serve children in school districts with year-round schools where the children may be on break, or "off-track," during times other than the summer months (USDA, 2010).

Most sites can be reimbursed for only two meals or snacks served per day; however, camp sites and sites that serve primarily migrant children can be reimbursed for as many as three meals or snacks per day served to eligible children. The meal most commonly served is lunch; in 2003, almost all of the sites served lunch and about half of the sites served breakfast (MPR, 2003).

C. SELECTIVE REVIEW OF PAST RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATIONS, AND EVALUATIONS

Since the SFSP began, numerous research and evaluation projects have been undertaken at the Federal level to 1) document participation trends and the factors that contribute to these trends, 2) understand the participation gap between the NSLP and the SFSP, or 3) identify program improvements that could be made. The findings from these studies have led to various demonstration initiatives by FNS to increase SFSP participation and decrease food insecurity among children during the summer months. These research and evaluation efforts are described in greater detail below.

The U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) has conducted a variety of studies to evaluate the impact of various reforms on SFSP participation. In the late 1970s and 1980s, GAO conducted a number of studies looking into growing trends of waste, fraud, and abuse in the program. One major focus of these reports was to document widespread compliance issues, as well as fraud and abuse, among private nonprofit sponsors (GAO, 1980). These reports included recommendations on ways to improve program integrity, such as eliminating private nonprofit sponsorship and withholding Federal funding from non-participating schools to encourage more school districts to participate in the SFSP (GAO, 1980). As a result, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 eliminated eligibility for private nonprofit sponsors (other than schools and residential camps) to participate in the SFSP (GAO, 1991a). Although new public sponsors entered the program after 1981, the number of sponsors participating in the SFSP and the number of children served was lower than it had been prior to the elimination of private nonprofits (GAO, 1991a). The Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 1989 included provisions allowing a limited number of these private nonprofits back into the program to provide children living in areas without a publicly operated SFSP access to meals during the summer. Two GAO studies conducted in 1991 evaluated the early effects of this change. The reports noted that even after being readmitted to the SFSP, private nonprofit sponsors continued to experience compliance problems, and participation levels of children at these sponsors' sites remained low (GAO, 1991a, 1991b). Nevertheless, restrictions on private nonprofit participation were eased throughout the 1990s.

In 1988, FNS contracted with Mathematica Policy Research (MPR) to describe the characteristics of SFSP sponsors and sites and the costs incurred by sponsors participating in the program. The study found that the percentage of NSLP free or reduced-price meal participants who also participated in the SFSP varied widely between the States. In 1988, the percentage across the entire United States was 13 percent; however, this figure ranged from roughly 1 percent or less in Vermont, Arkansas, and Wyoming to as high as 52 percent in Delaware (Ohls, 1988).

In 2003, USDA's Economic Research Service (ERS) released a report by MPR on the most comprehensive evaluation of the program since 1986, entitled "Feeding Low-Income Children When School Is Out." The study goals were to obtain detailed information on SFSP operations and administration and to learn more about the factors that contribute to the gap in participation levels between the NSLP and the SFSP. The study found that SFSP sponsors perceived the detailed program rules and the complex reimbursement procedures as burdensome,

and some believed that these rules and procedures could discourage program growth (MPR, 2003).

In 2001, FNS began experimenting with several approaches to simplifying the reimbursement process in order to reverse low participation rates. One particular program, the SFSP Simplified Summer Pilot program (also called the Lugar Pilot Project), implemented simplified accounting procedures for sponsors. This pilot program, which was authorized under the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2001, operated from 2001 to 2004. State eligibility was based on the participation rate in the two programs; only States with a participation rate less than 50 percent of the national average were eligible to apply. Thirteen States and Puerto Rico were eligible for, and participated in, the program (USDA, 2004). Implementation of the pilot consisted of two changes in program operations: 1) meals served were reimbursed at a fixed rate without regard to actual or budgeted costs, and 2) sponsors no longer needed to report administrative and operational costs to the State to receive reimbursement (USDA, 2008; USDA, 2010). The evaluation of this pilot program demonstrated that sponsor participation, meals served, and ADA increased in States participating in the pilot because of these changes. For example, the pilot States experienced a 40-percent increase in total SFSP meals served, while the States operating under traditional SFSP rules experienced a 24-percent decline (USDA, 2007; USDA, 2004).

Due to the success of the pilot, the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 expanded the program to include additional States. The expanded program became known as the Simplified Summer Food Service Program. Six additional States participated in the Simplified SFSP in 2005, and an additional 7 States were added in 2006, bringing the number of States implementing the program to 27 (USDA, 2007). Sponsor and child participation in all the Simplified SFSP States increased greatly. Because of these results, the FY 2008 Omnibus Appropriations Act made the Simplified SFSP available to all States (USDA, 2008).

A 2006 study by Felton & Harley Associates sought to determine why elementary school children in select areas who were eligible for free or reduced-price meals did not participate in the SFSP. The study found that more than half of families with SFSP eligible children surveyed were unaware of the SFSP sites in their areas. Of those who knew about the SFSP, almost half enrolled their children in another summer nutrition program. Other reasons cited for nonparticipation among families aware of the SFSP were that the child stayed somewhere else during the summer or that the child's parents or guardians wanted the child to remain at home. When asked about what program features would encourage families of non-participating eligible children to send their children to a SFSP site, one of the more frequently cited responses was that parents or guardians would be interested in programs with academic enrichment and physical activities (Felton & Harley Associates, 2006).

The next four chapters provide the findings from each of the SFSP demonstrations conducted to date. The last chapter provides a brief summary of results and conclusions.

CHAPTER III: FINDINGS FROM THE EXTENDING LENGTH OF OPERATION INCENTIVE DEMONSTRATION

Traditionally, it has been a challenge for SFSP sponsors to keep sites open throughout the entire summer due to planned summer maintenance of school kitchens and other school facilities, availability of volunteers to staff the sites, limited number of days on which activities can be offered, staffing constraints, and/or financial constraints. In a study released in 2003, MPR found that, on average, the vast majority of SFSP sites were open for less than 2 months (approximately 7 weeks) during the summer. Only 6 percent of sites were open for longer than 2½ months (10 weeks; MPR, 2003).²⁹ However, Arkansas claimed that, based on its own query of sponsors (cited in Arkansas's 2010 demonstration progress report), the vast majority (85 percent) of the SFSP sponsors in Arkansas were interested in extending the length of site operation to 40 or more days. This chapter provides information on both the activities and outcomes of the Extending Length of Operation Incentive demonstration conducted in Arkansas. Section A provides a brief description of the demonstration. Section B provides the key outcomes for the 2 years of the demonstration. Section C reviews outcomes from the Seamless Summer Option during this same time period and Section D provides a summary of conclusions. Supporting tables for this section are included in Appendix B.

A. DEMONSTRATION DESCRIPTION


The goal of the Extending Length of Operation demonstration is to determine whether an additional 50-cent reimbursement for lunch meals served at sites that remain open for 40 days or more can encourage programs to stay open longer so they can feed children in their communities for a larger portion of the summer.³⁰ In the second year of the demonstration, there was an exception made to the 40-day requirement as a result of extreme weather in late spring 2011. Due to inclement weather and flooding, some of the SFSP sites had to delay their start date for SFSP operations and were unable to operate for the full 40 days. However, these sites were still considered eligible to receive demonstration funds as long as they were open every weekday during the summer with the exception of the Fourth of July holiday. Arkansas spent a total of \$788,552 in grant funding from FNS for the 2 years of the demonstration.

Arkansas demonstrated an especially great need for this enhanced SFSP opportunity. It consistently ranks high among the States in prevalence of food insecurity (USDA, 2009). Despite the high need for nutrition assistance, Arkansas consistently ranks in the bottom half of States for participation in the summer nutrition programs (FRAC, 2012). According to FRAC, SFSP participation data ranked Arkansas 37th among the States in 2009, the year Arkansas was selected for participation in the demonstration (FRAC, 2010). Arkansas's SFSP participation ranking improved to 23rd among the States in 2011 (and to 27th when factoring in participation in

²⁹ Sponsors typically keep sites open 5 days per week.

³⁰ In Arkansas, additional funding was provided to all sponsors that operate sites for a minimum of 40 days in the summer. Not all sites under a particular sponsor must operate for 40 or more days for the sponsor to receive the incentive. However, the incentive was provided only for lunches served at only those sites that operated for 40 or more days, with the exception of the sites affected by inclement weather.

the other summer nutrition programs combined; FRAC, 2012). Figure III.1 below illustrates the difference between SFSP and NSLP average daily participation in Arkansas.³¹



Source: SFSP data provided by State, NSLP data from the NDB.

Note: NSLP figures represent free and reduced-price NSLP participation over the school year. SFSP figures reflect the SFSP only, and do not include figures from other USDA summer nutrition programs. The NSLP July ADA was 6,326 in 2007; 6,945 in 2008; 7,948 in 2009; 14,819 in 2010; and 9,298 in 2011.

Supporting data for Figure III.1 can be found in Appendix Tables B.3 and B.4.

The demonstration was implemented by Arkansas’s Department of Human Services, Division of Child Care and Early Childhood Education. Arkansas’s goal for the demonstration was to decrease the prevalence of food insecurity among children by increasing participation in the SFSP. In its application to FNS, Arkansas noted that reaching children is particularly difficult in the State’s rural Delta Region, which encompasses more than half of the State, since it is a challenge to locate sponsors and establish sites there. Thus, the State targeted its outreach and training efforts in that area to recruit new sponsors. The State agency undertook a number of outreach and promotional strategies, including the use of media, flyers, town hall meetings, and telephone calls. Arkansas also worked closely with existing sponsors that previously operated for fewer than 40 days per summer to encourage them to expand their days of operation.

In 2010, Arkansas’s Department of Workforce Services supplied additional support through TANF emergency contingency funds to SFSP sponsors to help break down barriers to participation. Funding for transportation was made available to sponsors to help bring food and/or children to meal sites. Funds were also provided to reimburse sponsors feeding adults at the SFSP, thus enabling families and communities to eat together. In addition to the \$338,943 in incentive funds spent by sponsors for the 2010 demonstration, Arkansas supplied \$1,097,545


³¹ For the SFSP, ADA is reported for July only, the month when attendance is typically highest. For the NSLP, participation data are 9-month averages; summer months (June-August) are excluded.

using TANF emergency contingency funds. By comparison, seven of the eight “similar” States did not use TANF funds to support SFSP-related activities. The eighth State, Florida, used \$46,237 in TANF funds for the transportation of children to SFSP sites in 2010. Arkansas did not use any TANF funds to support SFSP-related activities (transportation and reimbursement of adult meals) in 2011.

Overall, 200 SFSP meal sites (200 out of 421, or 47.5 percent) received SFSP incentive funds (and participated in the demonstration) in 2011: 106 of these were new sites and 94 were existing sites. Of the 94 existing demonstration sites in 2011, 85 participated in the demonstration in both 2010 and 2011. Each demonstration site received an average incentive increase of approximately \$1,802 over the summer, with the actual reimbursement amounts ranging from \$29.50 to \$7,429. Chart III.1 highlights the number of sites receiving demonstration funds in 2011.³²

³² Initially, 200 sites were approved to receive demonstration funds for operating a minimum of 40 days in the summer (as compared to 163 sites during the previous year). However, due to inclement weather and flooding, some of these sites had to delay their start date for SFSP operations (beginning of summer) and were unable to operate for the full 40 days. These sites still were considered eligible to receive demonstration funds as long as they were open every weekday during the summer with the exception of the Fourth of July holiday.

Chart III.1
Arkansas Demonstration Sites



The remainder of the chapter illustrates the results of the 2011 demonstration in Arkansas compared to data for the previous 4 years.

B. OUTCOME MEASURES


This section provides an illustration of the changes in the outcome measures in Arkansas. Section 1 illustrates the changes in Arkansas from 2007 to 2011 on key outcome measures, as compared to a group of similar States and the balance of the Nation. Section 2 illustrates these changes during the 2 years of the demonstration (from 2009 to 2011) between demonstration sites and non-demonstration sites that were operating in both years. The remaining two sections compare the number of operating days (Section 3) within the State and changes in number of sponsors and sites (Section 4).

1. Changes in Arkansas vs. Similar States and the Nation

a. Change in Total Number of SFSP Meals Served

Since all SFSP sites in Arkansas had the opportunity to receive the added 50 cents per lunch if they were open a sufficient number of service days, an assessment of statewide participation is informative for this demonstration. The total numbers of meals served in Arkansas increased in 2010 and 2011. More than 1.6 million SFSP meals were served in Arkansas in 2011, an increase of 16.4 percent (230,547 meals) over the previous year (Figure III.2).³³ Overall, 1,130,380 of these meals (69 percent) were served by the demonstration sites and 508,530 of the meals were served by non-demonstration sites in 2011.

Across the 2 years of the demonstration, SFSP meals served in Arkansas increased 63.6 percent (an increase of 637,241 meals). Most of this increase occurred during the first demonstration year. In the second demonstration year (from 2010 to 2011), the number of total meals served in Arkansas increased by 16.4 percent.




Note: The total meal counts in Figure III.2 include breakfasts, lunches, suppers, and snacks. For 2010, Arkansas supplied additional TANF funding to help sponsors provide transportation and other types of aid to SFSP sites; this may have had an impact on attendance, and, thus, number of meals served.

Supporting data for Figure III.2 can be found in Appendix Table B.2.

Using a comparison month of July, the total number of meals served in Arkansas increased by 19.3 percent between 2010 and 2011. This rate of change in Arkansas was higher than that for the remainder of the Nation and for similar States. The total number of meals

³³The total number of SFSP meals served is defined as the sum of the number of breakfasts, lunches, suppers, and snacks served for May, June, July, August, and September.

served in July in the remainder of the Nation dropped by 2.8 percent from 2010 to 2011, and similar States showed a modest increase of 2.9 percent in total meals served (Figure III.3).³⁴




Note: The balance of the Nation includes all States except Arkansas and Mississippi. Similar States are defined as all States eligible for, but not awarded, demonstration funds (Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming).

Supporting data for Figure III.3 can be found in Appendix Table B.2.

Change in Meals Served by Meal Type. Although the incentive was provided for the lunch meal, increases in meals served were seen across all meal types (Figure III.4). The number of supper meals served continued to increase more rapidly than other meal types (increasing 25.3 percent between 2010 and 2011), despite the lack of incentives for providing additional suppers. The numbers of breakfasts and lunches served also increased in the past year (by 14.0 percent and 15.0 percent, respectively).


³⁴ Data on meals served for similar States and for the balance of the Nation are only available for the month of July. For this reason, only the July changes are included in Figure III.3.



Note: The numbers of snacks served are not displayed in Figure III.4. The number of snacks served per year was 8,570 in 2007; 10,409 in 2008; 15,583 in 2009; 26,145 in 2010, and 48,984 in 2011.


Supporting data for Figure III.4 can be found in Appendix Table B.2.

The proportion of meals served during breakfast and lunch actually decreased slightly due to the increase in the number of snack and supper meals (Figure III.5). However, lunch remained the most commonly served meal (60.8 percent of all meals served), followed by breakfast (32.3 percent of all meals served).




Note: Supporting data for Figure III.5 can be found in Appendix Table B.2.

Change in Meals Served by Month. The 2011 demonstration encouraged sites to stay open for a longer period each summer by providing an incentive to those that were open 40 or more days. This resulted in an increase in the number of meals served over the entire summer. Between 2010 and 2011, continued increases in meals served were seen across the board for all summer months except for May, when no SFSP meals were served in 2011 (Figure III.6). As in previous years, in 2011 the vast majority of the meals continued to be served in June and July (87.6 percent of all meals in 2011).



Note: Supporting data for Figure III.6 can be found in Appendix Table B.2.

The percentage of total SFSP meals served in June decreased slightly, possibly due to inclement weather delaying site openings in 2011, while the percentage of meals served in July increased slightly (Figure III.7). The percentage of meals served in August remained about the same from 2010 to 2011.



Note: Supporting data for Figure III.7 can be found in Appendix Table B.2.


b. Change in Number of Children Served (Average Daily Attendance)

One expectation of this demonstration is that by increasing the length of operation, sponsors will be able to reach more children to provide subsidized nutritious meals during the summer. The estimated number of children served, or ADA, can be calculated in two ways: 1) the operating days ADA (the ADA for all of the operating days in the summer as a whole); and 2) the July ADA (the ADA for the month of July only, which is typically the month in which the largest numbers of meals are served).³⁵

Figure III.8 illustrates the average number of children receiving SFSP meals in Arkansas as calculated using the July ADA calculation method, as described in Chapter I. On an average day in July 2011, 22,291 children received meals through the SFSP, an increase of 24.5 percent since 2010 and nearly 69 percent since 2009 (Figure III.8).³⁶


³⁵ The ADA for June is very similar to that calculated for July. This report only includes the calculated ADA for July because that is the standard month used by FNS to compare ADA across States.

³⁶ Note that, as cited in Chapter I, there are two different ADA calculation methods: the operating days ADA, which is calculated using data from the meal served in the largest quantity, and the July ADA, which is calculated using lunch meals only. This makes the numerator higher for the operating days ADA. In addition, the estimated number of operating days in the denominator is calculated differently. In the July ADA calculation, the estimated number of operating days is either 21 or 22, based on the number of non-holiday weekdays in the month in a given year. For the operating days ADA calculation, operating days are calculated based on days of operation from each site, and are therefore not constant across sites. This difference in deriving operating days, coupled with the fact that lunch may not be the meal served in the largest quantity and July may not be the month in which the largest number of meals are served (thus possibly increasing the size of the numerator), contributes to the differences seen between the operating days measure and the July measure.



Note: Supporting data for Figure III.8 can be found in Appendix Table B.3.


In comparison with the 24.5percent increase in July ADA for Arkansas in 2011, similar States experienced a modest increase of 5.0 percent in July ADA from 2010 to 2011, while the rest of the Nation experienced an increase of only 1.8 percent (Figure III.9).



Note: The balance of the Nation includes all States except Arkansas and Mississippi. Similar States are defined as all States eligible for, but not awarded, demonstration funds (Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming).

Supporting data for Figure III.9 can be found in Appendix Table B.3.

Using the operating days ADA calculation method, on an average day in summer 2011, 30,869 children received meals through the SFSP, an increase of about 17 percent over 2010 and 73 percent over 2009 (Figure III.10).




Note: Supporting data for Figure III.10 can be found in Appendix Table B.3.

c. Change in Participation Rate

A main goal of the SFSP demonstrations was to increase the relative coverage of USDA’s child nutrition programs throughout the summer by increasing participation in the SFSP. Coverage can be measured by the number of low-income children receiving SFSP and NSLP ADA in July as a proportion of school-year ADA.³⁷

Figure III.11 illustrates the relative coverage of children receiving meals in Arkansas in July from 2007 through 2011 (through both the SFSP and NSLP-summer combined) as compared to both free and reduced-price NSLP participation in March and during the previous school year. Approximately 11.9 percent of the number of low-income children who received lunch *in March* of the 2010-2011 school year received meals in summer 2011—an increase of almost 2 percentage points (17.8 percent) from the previous year (when 10.1 percent were served; see Figure III.12). When looking at the number of children receiving July 2011 SFSP or NSLP meals relative to the average monthly number of low-income children who received free or reduced-price lunch *across the entire 2010-2011 school year*, the percentage is 12.0 percent, an increase of 16.5 percent over 2010. Note: The number of children served by the free and reduced-price NSLP in the 2010-2011 school year increased over the previous year, from 246,393 to 251,200.

³⁷ The NSLP ADA can be computed using either 1) the month of March (the month closest to summer that most children are still in school, and the month historically used by FNS for calculating the participation rate) or 2) an average of the 9-month school year (see Chapter I, pages 12 and 13 for more detail).




Note: The percentages are calculated by dividing the ADA in the SFSP and NSLP in July by the ADA into the NSLP in March or the School Year.

Supporting data for Figure III.11 can be found in Appendix Table B.4.

Both measures illustrate similar increases in the SFSP and NSLP (summer) participation rate in 2011 as compared to the previous year (17.8 percent using March as a denominator versus 16.5 percent using the school year as the denominator; see Figures III.12 and III.13 below). It must be noted that the magnitude of the increase was less than it was from 2009 to 2010 when the demonstration was in its first year, and TANF funding of more than \$1 million was provided to increase SFSP services.


FIGURE III.12
ARKANSAS: PERCENT CHANGE IN SFSP AND NSLP-SUMMER PARTICIPATION RATE COMPARED TO PREVIOUS YEAR: JULY OVER MARCH, 2008 - 2011



Note: The balance of the Nation includes all States except Arkansas and Mississippi. Similar States are defined as all States eligible for, but not awarded, demonstration funds (Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming).

Supporting data for Figure III.12 can be found in Appendix Table B.4.

FIGURE III.13
ARKANSAS: PERCENT CHANGE IN SFSP AND NSLP-SUMMER PARTICIPATION RATE COMPARED TO PREVIOUS YEAR: JULY OVER SCHOOL YEAR, 2008 - 2011



Note: The balance of the Nation includes all States except Arkansas and Mississippi. Similar States are defined as all States eligible for, but not awarded, demonstration funds (Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming).

Supporting data for Figure III.13 can be found in Appendix Table B.4.

2. Changes in Demonstration Sites vs. Non-Demonstration Sites: 2009 to 2011

In this section, we assess the 2-year impact of the demonstration on the distributions of meals served and ADA. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on the mean change from 2009 to 2011 between demonstration sites and non-demonstration sites.³⁸ The test was designed to determine whether the presence of the demonstration influenced the outcome being measured: total meals served, ADA, or operating days.³⁹ *Note: These tests compared only those sites open in BOTH 2009 and 2011; therefore, new sites for 2011 were excluded, as there was no basis on which to assess change.*

a. Change in Total Number of SFSP Meals Served

As shown in Table III.1, among the 139 existing sites that were open in both 2009 and 2011, there were some changes in the distribution of the number of sites by the total number of SFSP meals served, or meal-size categories. Among non-demonstration sites, there was a decline in the two largest meal-size categories coupled with an increase in the number of sites serving between 1,250 and 2,500 meals. Among demonstration sites, the largest increase was seen in the number of sites that served more than 5,400 meals. The median number of meals served at non-demonstration sites, already far lower than at demonstration sites, remained nearly unchanged from 2009 (2,056 meals) to 2011 (2,061 meals), while increasing by 16.5 percent at demonstration sites, from 4,169 to 4,855. An overall ANOVA test indicated that there was a significant relationship between the number of meals served and participation in the demonstration ($p = 0.02$), with demonstration sites serving more meals.

Table III.1
Total Meals Served: Arkansas Demonstration vs. Non-Demonstration Sites

Total SFSP Meals Served (ranges)	Existing Non-Demonstration Sites (open 2009 and 2011)		Existing Demonstration Sites (open 2009 and 2011)		All Existing Sites (open 2009 and 2011)		Change in # of Existing Sites 2009-2011	New Sites in 2011	Total 2011 Sites
	2009	2011	2009	2011	2009	2011			
< 1,250	22	19	12	4	34	23	-11	89	112
1,250 – 2,500	12	20	17	19	29	39	+10	50	89
2,501 – 5,400	20	18	20	18	40	36	-4	84	120
≥ 5,401	5	2	31	39	36	41	+5	59	100
TOTAL	59	59	80	80	139	139	0	282	421
Median Meals	2,056	2,061	4,169	4,855	2,759	3,076	+317	2,581	2,819

F-value = 5.26; p = 0.0234

³⁸ ANOVA was selected to account for the rankings intrinsic in the outcome measures. For example, among the four categories into which the outcomes were divided, the outcome measure increased in each category: less than 15 days, 15-21 days, 22-39 days, and greater than or equal to 40 days. Similar relationships existed for ADA and total meals served. While Chi Square is often used in categorical comparison, the ordinal rankings make an ANOVA test more appropriate in this context.

³⁹ The dependent variable was either 1) difference in total meals served; or 2) difference in ADA; or 3) difference in operating days. The independent variable was participating versus non-participating sites.

b. Change in July Average Daily Attendance

Table III.2 depicts the change in ADA for the 75 existing demonstration sites operating in July of 2009 and 2011.⁴⁰ The number of demonstration sites serving between 61 and 120 low-income children increased from 18 in 2009 to 25 in 2011; however, slightly fewer demonstration sites served more than 120 children in 2011 as compared to 2009 (20 versus 24 sites, respectively). In contrast, few non-demonstration sites served more than 60 children in either year. The median ADA among non-demonstration sites increased from 22.0 per day in 2009 to 25.4 per day in 2011, and the already higher ADA in demonstration sites increased from 63.3 in 2009 to 72.3 in 2011—an ADA increase of approximately 15 percent at both types of sites. The overall ANOVA test did not show a significant relationship between the July ADA and participation in the demonstration ($p = 0.82$).

Table III.2
July Average Daily Attendance: Arkansas Demonstration vs. Non-Demonstration Sites

July SFSP ADA (ranges)	Existing Non-Demonstration Sites (open in July in both 2009 and 2011)		Existing Demonstration Sites (open in July in both 2009 and 2011)		All Existing Sites (open in July in both 2009 and 2011)		Change in # of Existing Sites 2009-2011
	2009	2011	2009	2011	2009	2011	
< 28	17	16	15	11	32	27	-5
28 – 60	11	13	18	19	29	32	+3
61 – 120	3	2	18	25	21	27	+6
≥ 121	0	0	24	20	24	20	-4
TOTAL*	31	31	75	75	106	106	0
Median ADA	22.0	25.4	63.3	72.3	47.3	52.1	4.8

* Includes only sites open both years that served lunches in July.

F-Value = 0.05; $p = 0.8234$

c. Change in Operating Days

Table III.3 shows the changes in days open among the 139 existing sites (operating in both 2009 and 2011). These 139 existing sites included 59 non-demonstration sites and 80 demonstration sites. The number of demonstration sites operating 40 or more days in the summer grew from 54 in 2009 to 79 in 2011, a 46-percent increase. For non-demonstration sites, there was a 33-percent increase in the number of those operating at least 40 days, from 12 sites to 16.⁴¹ For demonstration sites, median days open decreased slightly from 44 days in 2009 to 43 days in 2011; this is probably due to the handful of demonstration sites that received demonstration funds despite not being able to operate for at least 40 days due to weather-related emergencies during the year. For non-demonstration sites, median days open decreased from 29 days to 23 days between 2009 and 2011. The relationship between increased days of operation and participation in the demonstration was statistically significant ($p < 0.0001$). This indicates

⁴⁰ Since fewer sites in Arkansas are open in July than are open across the entire summer, the number of sites included in this table is lower than in Table III.1 above for total summer meals.

⁴¹ Although these three sites operated for more than 40 days in the summer, they did not serve lunches and thus cannot be included in the demonstration.

that the alternative criteria for days open imposed on demonstration sites in 2011 was successful in keeping demonstration sites open longer.

Table III.3
Days Open: Arkansas Demonstration vs. Non-Demonstration Sites


Days Open (ranges)	Existing Non-Demonstration Sites (open 2009 and 2011)		Existing Demonstration Sites (open 2009 and 2011)		All Existing Sites (open 2009 and 2011)		Change in # of Existing Sites 2009-2011	New Sites in 2011	Total 2011 Sites
	2009	2011	2009	2011	2009	2011			
Open < 15 Days	11	3	4	0	15	16	+1	49	65
Open 15-21 Days	10	14	2	0	12	12	0	42	54
Open 22-29 Days	13	14	3	0	16	14	-2	25	39
Open 30-39 Days	13	12	17	1	30	15	-15	40	55
Open ≥ 40 Days	12	16	54	79	66	82	+12	126	208
TOTAL	59	59	80	80	139	139			
Median Days Open	29	23	44	43	39	40	+1	36.5	39.0

F-Value = 149.66; p < 0.0001

3. Change in Days of Operation


All sites were required to operate a minimum of 40 weekdays in the summer to receive demonstration funds in 2010 or the maximum number of days possible if the site delayed opening due to weather in 2011. The median number of days open increased from 28 days in 2010 to 39 days in 2011.

Figure III.14 shows the percentage of all SFSP sites open for 40 or more days. Overall, the number of SFSP meal sites that were open for 40 or more days increased by 9.4 percentage points between 2009 and 2011, from 94 (out of 235) to 208 (out of 421). In both 2010 and 2011, 49 percent of all SFSP meal sites in Arkansas were open a minimum of 40 days, nearly 10 percent more than in 2009 (40 percent). In addition, of the 226 new SFSP meal sites in 2011, about 47 percent were open for 40 or more days.



Note: Supporting data for Figure III.14 can be found in Appendix Table B.1.

Figure III.15 illustrates the changes in operating days for *existing* demonstration and non-demonstration sites, respectively. Nearly 43 percent of existing demonstration sites increased their operating days from the previous year, as compared to just under a quarter (24.8 percent) of non-demonstration sites. In addition, a lower percentage of existing demonstration sites decreased operating days than did existing non-demonstration sites (37.2 percent versus 60.4 percent, respectively). Differences in operating days may have been affected by weather-related issues.



4. Change in Number of Sponsors and Food Service Sites

The number of SFSP sponsors throughout the State decreased by 51.3 percent (from 306 to 149 sponsors) from 2010 to 2011, although the latter still represented a more than 35 percent increase over 2009.⁴² The number of summer meal sites, however, increased by 20.6 percent, from 349 in 2010 to 421 in 2011 (Table III.4). New sites comprised more than half (53.7 percent) of all sites in 2011, up from 43.2 percent in 2010.

Looking at the changes in number of sponsors and sites over 2 years, from 2009 to 2011, the number of sponsors increased by 35.5 percent and the number of sites increased by 79.1 percent.

Table III.4
Arkansas: Number of Sponsors and Sites by Year

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007-2008 % change	2008-2009 % change	2009-2010 % change	2010-2011 % change	2-year % change (2009-2011)
Sponsors	91	95	110	306	149	4.4%	15.8%	178.2%	-51.3%	35.5%
Sites	n/a	162	235	349	421	n/a	45.1%	48.5%	20.6%	79.1%

Note: Information on the number of sites was not available for 2007.

C. SEAMLESS SUMMER MEASURES

Table III.5 shows changes in the operation of the SSO in Arkansas from 2008 through 2011. The purpose of this analysis is to determine whether there is evidence that sponsors shifted their operations from the SSO to the SFSP because of the demonstration incentives offered for a longer operational period. All of the SSO sponsors and sites, by definition, are school districts.

Overall, the number of SSO sponsors and sites increased the first year of the demonstration (2010) but decreased in terms of the total number of meals served (by 9.1 percent). In 2011, the second year of the demonstration, there was a loss of four sponsors, each operating one site, which slightly decreased the total meals served (by 2.2 percent). This small decrease (of more than 8,000 meals) does not offset the overall increase in total SFSP meals served from 2010 to 2011 year in Arkansas (230,547 meals; see Figure III.2).

⁴² Arkansas was not able to provide the number of sponsors that participated in the Enhanced SFSP in summer 2010 that also operated sites through the SSO in summer 2009.

Table III.5
Seamless Summer

	2008	2009	2010	2011
# of Sponsors	39	44	53	49
# of Sites	93	99	119	115
Total Meals Served	--	412,213	374,749	366,375

Note: Arkansas did not provide number of operating days, so ADA could not be calculated.

D. CONCLUSIONS FOR ARKANSAS

The purpose of the Extending Length of Operation demonstration was to determine whether providing sponsors with financial incentives to extend the period of SFSP operation can improve access to meals for low-income children. The demonstration was implemented in Arkansas, a State with a high rate of child food insecurity and traditionally low participation in SFSP.

The Arkansas demonstration clearly was associated with some large gains in SFSP service levels across the 2 demonstration years.

Within-State Results

The study team examined the changes within sites that existed in the year prior to the demonstration (called existing sites). The median number of meals served at these non-demonstration sites remained nearly unchanged from 2009 (2,056 meals) to 2011 (2,061 meals), while increasing by 16.5 percent at demonstration sites, from 4,169 to 4,855. Demonstration sites operating 40 or more days increased by 46.3 percent (from 54 to 79) between 2009 and 2011. This increase was greater than the increase among the non-demonstration sites (33.3 percent, from 12 in 2009 to 16 in 2011) during the same period. For demonstration sites, median days open decreased slightly from 44 days to 43 days, which is probably due to the handful of demonstration sites that received demonstration funds despite not being able to operate for at least 40 days due to weather-related emergencies during the year. For non-demonstration sites, median days open decreased from 29 days to 23 days between 2009 and 2011.

The relationship between participation in the demonstration and increased days of operation was statistically significant ($p < 0.0001$), as was the relationship with the number of meals served ($p < 0.0234$). The relationship between days open and demonstration status was expected; nevertheless, it is notable that the alternative criteria for days open imposed on demonstration sites in 2011 remained successful in keeping demonstration sites open longer and, thus, serving more meals. However, we were not able to detect a significant relationship between ADA and demonstration status ($p < 0.823$).

Statewide Results

Across the 2 years of the demonstration, the number of SFSP sites increased by 79 percent, from 235 in 2009 to 421 in 2011. SFSP meals served increased 63.6 percent (an increase of 637,241 meals). In comparison, the total number of meals served in the remainder of

the Nation dropped during this period (by 0.3 percent from 2009 to 2010 and by 2.8 percent from 2010 to 2011), while similar States showed a modest increase in total meals served (4.9 percent from 2009 to 2010 and 2.9 percent from 2010 to 2011).

On an average summer day in 2011, 30,869 children in Arkansas received meals through the SFSP, an increase of 73 percent over the 2 years of the demonstration (Appendix Table B.3). This increase held true in July, which saw an increase of nearly 69 percent since 2009. The SFSP participation rate (based on March 2010 NSLP enrollment), increased by 43.4 percent over the 2 years of the demonstration (and 10.7 percent over the previous year). In contrast, similar States showed decreased participation rates of 0.1 percent in 2011 over 2010 using the July over March benchmark.

In both 2010 and 2011, nearly half (49 percent) of all SFSP meal sites in Arkansas were open for more than 40 days, a higher percentage than prior to the demonstration (40 percent). Meals served in the month of August increased, possibly due to the extended length of site operations. Although the incentive was provided for the lunch meal, increases in meals served were seen across all meal types.

Summary Conclusion

The results from the first year of the demonstration (2010) suggest that SFSP and TANF funds combined resulted in large gains in SFSP service levels. Note that an unknown portion of the increase in the first year of the demonstration is likely attributable to the \$1,097,545 in TANF emergency contingency funds that were used in 2010 to help transport children to SFSP sites and to feed adults at the sites so families could eat together.

However, the continuation of SFSP meal increases into the second year (2011) when TANF incentives were not available suggests that funding incentives for lunch meals (an additional \$0.50 per lunch when SFSP meals were offered for the entire summer operating period) can help sustain a previous increase and contribute towards a significant additional increase in total SFSP meals served.

CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS FROM THE ACTIVITY INCENTIVE DEMONSTRATION

Activities and special events may help draw children to meal sites and keep site participation high. According to a study released in 2003 by MPR, nearly all sites in the Nation offer some form of activities, including educational activities, supervised unstructured play, organized games or sports, and arts and crafts; additionally, nearly two-thirds of sites offered field trips (MPR, 2003). Offering more of these activities along with a wider variety of activity types may motivate parents to provide transportation to the sites, addressing another participation barrier. This chapter provides information on both the activities and outcomes of the Activity Incentive demonstration conducted in Mississippi. Section A provides a brief description of the demonstration. Section B provides the key outcomes for the 2 years of the demonstration. Section C provides a summary of conclusions. Supporting tables for this section are included in Appendix C.


A. DEMONSTRATION DESCRIPTION

The goal of this demonstration is to determine whether grants for sponsors to offer new enrichment or recreational activities designed to draw children to their meal sites could increase SFSP participation. Only activities provided for the purpose of attracting children to those sites were funded. Some examples of eligible activities included sports; arts and crafts; mentoring; tutoring; games; lessons; life skills classes; community gardening; music; and nutrition, educational, and physical activities. Sponsors were expected to provide activities for children at these sites on most, if not all, days of operation.

Mississippi demonstrated an especially great need for additional incentives to increase SFSP participation. Mississippi consistently ranks higher than average among the States in prevalence of food insecurity (USDA, 2009).

Despite the high need for nutrition assistance, there is a vast disparity between the number of children in Mississippi who participate in the NSLP during the school year as compared to the number who participate in the SFSP. According to FRAC, SFSP participation data ranked Mississippi 47th among the States in July 2009, the year Mississippi was selected to apply for participation in the demonstration (FRAC, 2010). Mississippi's rank for SFSP participation compared to NSLP participation increased to 43th among all the States in 2011 (and to 49th when factoring participation in the other summer nutrition programs combined; FRAC, 2011). Figure IV.1 below illustrates the difference between average daily participation for the NSLP and the SFSP in Mississippi, indicating that SFSP participation is consistently much lower than NSLP participation.⁴³

⁴³ For the SFSP, ADA is reported for July only, the peak month of national program activity. For the NSLP, participation data are 9-month averages; summer months (June-August) are excluded.



Source: SFSP data provided by State, NSLP data from the NDB.

Note: NSLP figures represent free and reduced-price NSLP participation over the school year (9-month average). SFSP figures reflect the SFSP only, and do not include figures from other USDA summer nutrition programs. The NSLP-Summer July ADA for the years shown in Figure IV.1 was 1,505 in 2007; 1,609 in 2008; 1,685 in 2009; 765 in 2010; and 2,146 in 2011.

Supporting data for Figure IV.1 can be found in Appendix Tables C.3 and C.4.

The demonstration was implemented by Mississippi’s Department of Education, Office of Healthy Schools’ Office of Child Nutrition. In addition to FNS’s overall goal of testing whether new activities would improve SFSP participation, Mississippi included an additional objective for the demonstration: to *curb obesity*, citing their high rate of childhood obesity. The demonstration allowed the State to provide nutritious meals to more children who otherwise would be at risk for food insecurity during the summer months, as well as to provide opportunities for greater engagement in physical and other activities during the summer.

Mississippi solicited applications and provided mini-grant awards to incentivize SFSP sponsors proposing to provide activities with the purpose of 1) drawing children to sites where meals are provided, and 2) teaching and establishing patterns for children on the importance of physical exercise and proper nutrition. The State anticipated being able to award at least 96 sites mini-grants of up to \$5,000 each year. Mississippi spent a total of \$214,132 from FNS for the 2 years of the demonstration, about one-quarter of the amount initially awarded for the demonstration.

Mississippi conducted outreach and training to sponsors throughout the State to encourage them to apply for the mini-grants. For example, the State contacted all SFAs administering the NSLP to make them aware of the demonstration and obtain estimates of activity costs. The State gave only allowed sponsors to apply that operated the SFSP for a minimum of 30 days each summer to encourage longer periods of operation. In their applications, sponsors were asked to outline proposed new activities and submit a budget for


these activities, including how the activities would promote sound health and nutrition, reduce obesity, or promote physical activity. For each site, each sponsor was asked to describe how its activities would increase participation, how the sponsor would publicize the activities within the community, and how it would provide an estimate of the number of new children that may be drawn to the site by these activities. Sponsors were expected to provide activities for children at these sites on most, if not all, days of operation.

During the first year of the demonstration, Mississippi listed several implementation challenges, including the need for a longer-than-expected timeframe for advertising; giving sponsors time to submit applications; convening a panel; scoring the applications; and making the awards. Although sponsors were given verbal approval by phone, several sponsors were reluctant to begin the activities until the contracts were signed. Thus, nearly half of the Mississippi sites that were awarded funds were unable to implement the new activities in 2010. This issue was resolved by the second year of the demonstration. In 2011, all but one of the sites that received an award spent the funds.

Chart IV.1 highlights the number of sites receiving demonstration funds in 2011. There were 486 meal sites in Mississippi in 2011. A total of 41 sites were awarded between \$2,996 and \$5,000 in demonstration funds: 22 of these were new sites and 19 were existing sites. In 2011, 40 of the 41 sites spent at least some of the demonstration funds they were awarded, up from only 22 of the 40 sites in 2010. (The site not spending any demonstration funds was not considered a demonstration site in this report.) The 40 sites spent an average of \$4,785 (in the range of \$377 to \$5,000) over the summer to implement their activities.

It is important to note that most of the demonstration sites in 2010 did not continue to participate in the demonstration the following year. Only 10 of the 40 demonstration sites that participated in 2011 also participated in 2010; thus, 30 of the sites operating in 2011 (75.0 percent) were new demonstration sites. While the reason for this dropout among demonstration sites is not known, this prevented us from being able to assess changes in existing sites across the entire 2 years.

Chart IV.1
Mississippi Demonstration Sites



Note: Of the 41 sites that applied and were selected for participation in the demonstration, 40 spent demonstration funds and 1 did not.

This remainder of this chapter contains results of the 2011 demonstration compared to data for the previous 4 years.

B. OUTCOME MEASURES


This section provides an illustration of the changes in the outcome measures in Mississippi. Section 1 illustrates the changes in Mississippi from 2007 to 2011 on key outcome measures as compared to a group of similar States and the balance of the Nation. Section 2 illustrates these changes during the 2 years of the demonstration (from 2009 to 2011) between demonstration sites and non-demonstration sites that were operating in both years. The

remaining two sections compare changes in number of sponsors and sites (Section 3) and the types of activities (Section 4) within the State.

1. Changes in Mississippi vs. Similar States and the Nation

a. Change in Total Number of SFSP Meals Served

More than 1.88 million SFSP meals were served in Mississippi in 2011, an increase of 16.2 percent (262,297 meals) over the previous year (Figure IV.2). Overall, 203,354 of these meals were served by the demonstration sites and 1,682,860 were served by non-demonstration sites in 2011.




Note: The total meal counts in Figure IV.2 include breakfasts, lunches, suppers, and snacks.

Supporting data for Figure IV.2 can be found in Appendix Table C.2.

Across the 2 years of the demonstration, total meals served increased by 21.6 percent (from 2009 to 2011). Most of this increase was between 2010 and 2011 (16.2 percent), as compared to 4.7 percent between 2009 and 2010.

The percent change in meals served from July 2010 to July 2011 was an increase of 19.6 percent. In comparison, the number of meals served in the remainder of the Nation dropped by 2.8 percent from 2010 to 2011 and similar States showed a modest increase of 2.9 percent over the same period (Figure IV.3).⁴⁴

⁴⁴ Data on meals served for similar States and for the balance of the Nation are only available for the month of July. For this reason, only the July changes are included in Figure IV.3.




Note: The balance of the Nation includes all States except Arkansas and Mississippi. Similar States are defined as all States eligible for, but not awarded, demonstration funds (Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming).

Supporting data for Figure IV.3 can be found in Appendix Table C. 2.

Change in Meals Served by Meal Type. The 2011 demonstration encouraged sponsors to increase the activities provided at the site so that more children would participate and receive meals. Both the number of breakfasts and lunches served increased during the demonstration (Figure IV.4). The number of breakfasts served increased by 33 percent from 2010 to 2011 and by 56.6 percent from 2009 to 2011. Lunch remained the most commonly served meal (65.0 percent of all meals served) followed by breakfast (31.8 percent of all meals served). Lunches served increased by 9.8 percent from 2010 to 2011 and by 12.3 percent across the 2 years of the study.


The number of breakfasts served continued an upward trend in 2011, increasing 17.8 percent from 2009 to 2010 and 33 percent from 2010 to 2011. The number of lunches served increased at the highest rate between 2010 and 2011 relative to any 2 consecutive years included in the study, at a rate of 9.8 percent (compared to 2.3 percent between 2009 and 2010). The largest percent increase of meals served was seen in the number of suppers served, which increased by 239.5 percent between 2010 and 2011 (following 2 consecutive years of decline). Despite this large increase, suppers still accounted for a small fraction of the number of breakfasts and lunches served.



Note: The numbers of snacks served are not displayed in Figure IV.4. The number of snacks served per year was 65,058 in 2007; 50,955 in 2008; 65,814 in 2009; 49,694 in 2010; and 37,193 in 2011.


Supporting data for Figure IV.4 can be found in Appendix Table C.2.

Lunch continued to represent the greatest proportion of meals served (Figure IV.5), although the percentage of total meals served comprised of lunches has shown a slow, steady decrease across all years between 2007 and 2011 (from 72.1 percent in 2007 to 65.0 percent in 2011). This decrease is due to a steady increase in the proportion of total meals served comprised of breakfasts, which has increased from 22.8 percent in 2007 to 31.8 percent in 2011. From 2010 to 2011, the percentage of total meals served comprised of lunches decreased from 68.8 percent to 65.0 percent, while the percentage of total meals comprised of breakfasts increased from 27.7 percent in 2010 to 31.8 percent in 2011.



Supporting data for Figure IV.5 can be found in Appendix Table C.2.


Change in Meals Served by Month. In Mississippi, the SFSP summer meal sites traditionally serve meals between May and August, with almost all (99.3 percent) of the meals served in June and July. In 2011, there was an increase in the total number of meals served for all summer months (Figure IV.6). The percentage increases in meals served in June and July were 13.7 percent and 19.6 percent over 2010 levels.



Note: Month of May not illustrated since the number of meals served in May consisted of less than 0.5 percent of all meals served.

Supporting data for Figure IV.6 can be found in Appendix Table C.2.

The results also showed that, when looking at the total number of SFSP meals served by month, June always accounted for the largest proportion of meals served, although its share of meals declined over the past 2 years. Between 2007 and 2010, close to three-quarters of the meals served during the summer months were served in June, and this percentage fell slightly to just under 70 percent in 2011. Approximately 30 percent of the meals served over the course of the summer were served in July in 2010 and 2011, compared to approximately one-quarter of the meals served during the summer in the previous years (Figure IV.7).



Note: Month of May not illustrated since the number of meals served in May consisted of less than 0.5 percent of all meals served.


Supporting data for Figure IV.7 can be found in Appendix Table C.2.

b. Change in Number of Children Served (Average Daily Attendance)

One expectation of this demonstration is that by increasing activities, sponsors will be able to reach more low-income children to provide nutritious meals during the summer. The estimated number of children served, or ADA, can be calculated using two methods: 1) the operating days ADA (the ADA for all of the operating days in the summer as a whole); and 2) the July ADA (the ADA for the month of July only, which is typically the month in which the largest numbers of meals are served). However, the July ADA measure is problematic for Mississippi, which historically serves more than twice as many meals in June than in July (69.9 percent or more of all SFSP meals were served in June every year since 2007). To get a more accurate estimate of the number of children served in Mississippi, this study also calculated the ADA for the month of June. Calculation of the June ADA uses the same methodology as the July method, except that it uses the total meals served in June and the number of SFSP operating days in June.⁴⁵


⁴⁵The June ADA measure is only calculated for Mississippi.

Figure IV.8 below illustrates the average number of children receiving SFSP meals in Mississippi as calculated in June and July. On an average day in July, 17,691 children received meals through the SFSP, an increase of 18.7 percent over 2010. On an average day in June, 39,226 children received meals through the SFSP, an increase of 7.5 percent over 2010.



Note: Supporting data for Figure IV.8 can be found in Appendix Table C.3.


The increase of 18.7 percent in July represents a sizeable gain compared to the 5-percent rise in the average number of children served in July in similar States between 2010 and 2011. The balance of the Nation exhibited a 1.8-percent increase in July during this same period (Figure IV.9).



Note: The balance of the Nation includes all States except Arkansas and Mississippi. Similar States are defined as all States eligible for, but not awarded, demonstration funds (Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming).

Supporting data for Figure IV.9 can be found in Appendix Table C.3.

Using the operating days ADA calculation method, in 2011, 47,374 low-income children in Mississippi were receiving meals on an average summer day through the SFSP, an increase of 14.8 percent over 2010 (Figure IV.10).




Note: Supporting data for Figure IV.10 can be found in Appendix Table C.3.

c. Change in Participation Rate

A main goal of the SFSP demonstrations was to increase the relative coverage of USDA’s food programs throughout the summer by increasing participation in the SFSP. Coverage can be measured by the SFSP and NSLP summer ADA in July as a proportion of school year ADA.⁴⁶

Figure IV.11 illustrates the relative coverage of children receiving meals in Mississippi in July from 2007 through 2011, as compared to both free and reduced-price NSLP participation in March and during the previous school year. Approximately 6.2 percent of the number of low-income children who received lunch *in March* of the 2010-2011 school year received meals in the summer—a 26.5 percent increase from the previous year (which was 4.9 percent; see Figure IV.11). When looking at the average monthly number of low-income children who received lunch *across the entire 2010-2011 school year*, the percentage is 6.3 percent, an increase of 26.0 percent over the previous school year (5.0 percent). *Note: The number of children served by the NSLP in the 2010-2011 school year increased by 0.9 percent from the previous year.*




Note: The percentages are calculated by dividing the ADA in the SFSP and NSLP in July by the ADA in the NSLP in March or the School Year. These figures differ from those in Figure I.1 due to differences in the calculation method.

Supporting data for Figure IV.11 can be found in Appendix Table C.4.


Both measures of participation rate show an increase over the previous year, and the percent change is only slightly higher using the March participation figure in the denominator (26.5 percent) than when using the school year as a denominator (26.0 percent; Figures IV.12 and IV.13).

⁴⁶The NSLP ADA can be computed using either 1) the month of March (the month closest to summer that most children are still in school, and the month historically used by FNS for calculating the participation rate) or 2) an average of the 9-month school year (see Chapter I, page 12 and 13 for more detail).



Note: The balance of the Nation includes all States except Arkansas and Mississippi. Similar States are defined as all States eligible for, but not awarded, demonstration funds (Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming).

Supporting data for Figure IV.12 can be found in Appendix Table C.4.



Note: The balance of the Nation includes all States except Arkansas and Mississippi. Similar States are defined as all States eligible for, but not awarded, demonstration funds (Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming).

Supporting data for Figure IV.13 can be found in Appendix Table C.4.

2. Changes in Demonstration Sites vs. Non-Demonstration Sites: 2010 to 2011

In this section, we assess the impact of the demonstrations on the distributions of meals served and ADA from 2010 to 2011.⁴⁷ Due to the small cell sizes, testing the significance of the difference between demonstration and non-demonstration sites was not possible using ANOVA. Instead, a bivariate logit model on demonstration status, with a dummy variable to indicate increase in the outcome measure (total meals served or ADA), was conducted.⁴⁸ The model was designed to determine whether the presence of the demonstration influences the outcome being measured. *Note: These tests compared only those sites open in BOTH 2010 and 2011; therefore, new sites for 2011 were excluded, as there was no basis on which to assess change.*

a. Change in Total Number of SFSP Meals Served

Table IV.1 shows the distribution of meals served for the 257 existing sites that were operating in both 2010 and 2011. The median number of meals served increased for demonstration sites between 2010 and 2011, from 3,488 to 4,167 (an increase of 19.5 percent). The median number of meals served among non-demonstration sites stayed about the same between 2010 and 2011 (there was a decrease of 28 meals). The relationship between site participation in the demonstration and an increase from 2010 to 2011 in the number of meals served at that site is statistically significant ($p = 0.0378$).

Table IV.1
Total Meals Served: Mississippi Demonstration vs. Non-Demonstration Sites

Total SFSP Meals Served (ranges)	Existing Non-Demonstration Sites (open 2010 and 2011)		Existing Demonstration Sites (open 2010 and 2011)		All Existing Sites (open 2010 and 2011)		Change in # of Existing Sites 2010-2011	New Sites in 2011	Total 2011 Sites
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011			
< 1,250	33	38	2	1	35	39	+4	81	120
1,250 – 2,500	44	42	3	0	47	42	-5	60	102
2,501 – 5,400	79	79	8	13	87	92	+5	52	144
≥ 5,401	82	79	6	5	88	84	-4	36	120
TOTAL	238	238	19	19	257	257	0	229	486
Median Meals	3,797	3,769	3,488	4,167	3,789	3,780	-89	1,839	2,809

$\beta = 1.0607$; $p = 0.0378$

⁴⁷ Unlike in Arkansas, the demonstration sites in Mississippi that were awarded grant funds changed from 2010 to 2011. As such, the 2-year change (2009 to 2011) could not be assessed since only 10 sites that received a grant in 2011 existed in 2009.

⁴⁸ The dependent variable was either 1) difference in meals served based on changes in each of the categories of total meals served (presented in Table IV.1) or 2) difference in ADA (based on the categories presented in Table IV.2). If the difference in these categories between 2011 and 2010 was positive, then the site received a value of “1” for that dependent measure; if the difference in these categories between 2011 and 2010 was negative or zero (no difference), then the site received a value of “0.” The independent variable was participating versus non-participating sites.

b. Change in July and June Average Daily Attendance

Table IV.2 shows the changes in the distribution of ADA for the 131 existing sites that were open in July in both 2010 and 2011 and the 244 existing sites that were open in June in both years. The median July ADA remained about the same between 2010 and 2011 for existing demonstration sites; however, the median June ADA decreased by 17.2 percent. In contrast, for non-demonstration sites, the median July ADA increased, while the median June ADA remained about the same. The bivariate logit analysis indicated that there was no significant relationship between participation in the demonstration and either the July ADA ($p = 0.086$) or the June ADA ($p = 0.297$).

Table IV.2
July and June Average Daily Attendance:
Mississippi Demonstration vs. Non-Demonstration Sites

SFSP ADA (ranges)	Existing Non-Demonstration Sites (open 2010 and 2011)		Existing Demonstration Sites (open 2010 and 2011)		All Existing Sites (open 2010 and 2011)		Change in # of Existing Sites 2010-2011
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	
JULY SFSP ADA							
< 28	52	30	3	4	32	30	-2
28 – 60	43	45	6	7	42	47	+5
61 – 120	32	34	5	4	31	33	+2
≥ 121	27	20	2	4	26	21	-5
TOTAL	154	129	16	19	131	131	0
Median ADA	41.0	51.0	54.0	53.0	46.0	52.0	+6
JUNE SFSP ADA*							
< 28	29	23	4	1	32	24	-8
28 – 60	55	53	5	8	60	60	0
61 – 120	55	63	3	5	57	68	+9
≥ 121	90	87	6	5	95	92	-3
TOTAL	229	226	18	19	244	244	0
Median ADA	94.0	95.5	78.5	65.0	95.0	95.5	+1.5

* The June ADA was calculated for Mississippi since June is traditionally the month in which the most SFSP meals are served. Calculating the June ADA uses the same methodology as the July method except it uses the total meals served in June and the number of SFSP operating days in June.

Note: The difference in the number of total existing demonstration sites for 2010 and 2011 in either ADA measure is because of sites that operated in both years but did not operate in the same month in both years.

July ADA: $\beta = 0.086$; $p = 0.086$

June ADA: $\beta = 0.503$; $p = 0.297$

3. Change in Number of Sponsors and Food Service Sites

The number of SFSP sponsors throughout the State increased by 1.6 percent between 2010 and 2011 (from 123 in 2010 to 125 in 2011), compared to a 5.1 percent increase between 2009 and 2010. The number of SFSP meal sites increased by nearly 34 percent between 2010 and 2011 (Table IV.3), with a net increase of 123 sites.


Table IV.3
Mississippi: Number of Sponsors and Sites by Year

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007-2008 % change	2008-2009 % change	2009-2010 % change	2010-2011 % change
Sponsors	107	103	117	123	125	-3.7%	13.6%	5.1%	1.6%
Sites	321	301	330	363	486	-6.2%	9.6%	10.0%	33.9%

4. Change in Activities

Forty out of the 41 sites that were approved to participate in the demonstration in Mississippi actually spent the grant funds they were awarded, up from just 22 in 2010. These 40 sites all implemented multiple types of activities (either new or additional) using these funds. The most commonly implemented activity type among demonstration sites was recreational activities, including sports and games; more than 97 percent of the demonstration sites that spent grant funds offered one or more of these activities (Figure IV.14). More than 65 percent of these sites implemented arts activities (which included arts and crafts, music, and dance), and nearly 40 percent of the sites offered academic or tutoring activities. *Note: These categories are not mutually exclusive.*⁴⁹ Thus, nearly all demonstration sites offered recreational activities and more than two-thirds of demonstration sites (65 percent) offered arts-related activities. This prevalence of activities suggests that demonstration funding made it possible for these sites to offer a wide range of activities. *Note: Baseline data on activities offered prior to implementation of the demonstration are not available since Mississippi did not collect any data on the activities offered by SFSP sites prior to the demonstration.*

⁴⁹ Of the 446 non-demonstration sites, 253 (or 56.7 percent) offered at least one activity; 193 did not offer activities. The lack of comprehensive information on non-demonstration sites offering some activities, as opposed to none, prevents direct comparison of demonstration sites offering activities to non-demonstration sites offering activities.



Note: These categories are not mutually exclusive, as most of the sites offer more than one type of activity, thus percentages do not sum to 100 percent. "Other" includes both activities that did not fit into the other four categories as well as generic descriptions for activities such as "summer camp" and "indoor activities."

Supporting data for Figure IV.14 can be found in Appendix Table C.1. These tabulations are based on the 40 of the 41 sites that spent the demonstration funds

C. CONCLUSIONS FOR MISSISSIPPI

The purpose of the Activity Incentive demonstrations was to determine whether providing sponsors with additional funding to create new or additional activities at their sites could increase SFSP participation. The demonstration was implemented in Mississippi, a State with a high rate of child food insecurity and traditionally low participation in SFSP.

A total of 81 sites were awarded grant funds over the 2-year grant period (40 in 2010 and 41 in 2011), but only a total of 52 actually spent funding (22 in 2010 and 40 in 2011, with 10 spending funds in both). However, since only 10 of the demonstration sites in Mississippi actually participated in the demonstration in both years, it is not possible to draw any conclusions about changing patterns in activities offered and whether they, or some other factor, contributed to the increases in participation from 2010 to 2011. As such, this prevented the study team from being able to assess changes in these sites across the entire 2 years. Instead, this report updates the previous report's numbers with results from 2010 to 2011.

Within-State Results

The study team also examined the changes within sites that existed in the year prior to the demonstration (called existing sites). The median number of meals served increased for demonstration sites between 2010 and 2011, from 3,488 to 4,167 (an increase of 19.5 percent).

The median number of meals served among non-demonstration sites stayed about the same between 2010 and 2011. The relationship between participation in the demonstration and the number of meals served was statistically significant ($p = 0.0378$). However, the bivariate logit analysis indicated that there was no significant relationship between participation in the demonstration and either the July ADA ($p = 0.086$) or the June ADA ($p = 0.297$).

Sites that were awarded grants offered a large number of activities in 2011.⁵⁰ Most prevalent were recreational activities (97.5 percent), followed by the arts (65.0 percent), and educational/tutoring activities (40.0 percent).

Statewide Results

With only 8.2 percent of sites (40 sites out of 486) participating in the demonstration, it is unknown how much of the statewide increases are attributable to the demonstration. Statewide, meals served increased by 16.2 percent between 2010 and 2011, as compared to 4.7 percent between 2009 and 2010. In comparison, the number of meals served in the remainder of the Nation dropped by 2.8 percent from 2010 to 2011, and similar States showed a modest increase of 2.9 percent over the same period. In 2011, 47,374 low-income children in Mississippi were receiving meals on an average summer day through the SFSP, an increase of 14.8 percent over 2010.

Participation in SFSP increased from 4.9 percent in 2010 to 6.2 percent in 2011, when using March NSLP lunch data as the base; this was an increase of 26.5 percent compared to a decrease of 0.1 percent in similar States.

Summary Conclusion

The Mississippi demonstration shows some promise, but implementation and operating challenges suggest caution in interpreting the results. A majority of the sites that participated in the first year of the demonstration did not participate in the second year (only 10 sites participated both years), limiting the ability to conduct an analysis over the full 2 years of the demonstration. In the last year of the demonstration, meals served at demonstration sites open in 2010 and 2011 increased significantly compared to those at non-demonstration sites. However, there was no difference in ADA between demonstration sites and non-demonstration sites, thus suggesting that sites served more meals to about the same number of children. Data comparing demonstration and non-demonstration sites did suggest that more activities were offered, but the absence of baseline data on activities prior to the implementation of the demonstration limits the usefulness of this information.

⁵⁰ Comparable data for non-demonstration sites and baseline data for demonstration sites are not available.

CHAPTER V: FINDINGS FROM THE 2011 MEAL DELIVERY DEMONSTRATION

In many rural areas, there are few or no SFSP sites, and those that do operate are often too difficult for children to access due to either distance or lack of transportation options during the summer months. The goal of this demonstration was to develop effective and creative ways to deliver meals to these rural children. Acceptable methods included home delivery and delivery to a central site accessible by multiple children. The emphasis, however, was on “non-congregate” meal service: meals not intended to be consumed in one place by multiple children at a particular time.

This chapter provides information on both the activities and outcomes of the 2011 Meal Delivery demonstration conducted in three States; the results presented represent the findings from the first year of a 2-year demonstration. Section A provides an overview of the demonstration across the three States. Section B provides results for Delaware. Sections C and D provide results for Massachusetts and New York, respectively. Supporting tables for this section are included in Appendix D.

The SFSP Meal Delivery demonstration delivered SFSP meals to eligible children in rural areas for at-home consumption, rather than providing meals for consumption in a congregate location.

A. DEMONSTRATION DESCRIPTION

The demonstration was implemented in three States: Delaware, Massachusetts, and New York. In 2011, the demonstration was implemented through four sponsors that delivered meals at 19 locations (Table V.1). Although not a requirement, all demonstration sponsors had operated as SFSP sponsors for one or more previous summers.

Table V.1
Meal Delivery Demonstration Sponsors

State	Sponsor	# of Delivery Locations
Delaware	Food Bank of Delaware	5
Massachusetts	YMCA of Cape Cod	3
New York	Catholic Charities Food Bank of the Southern Tier North Rose-Wolcott Central School District	11


Note: The number of locations may have varied weekly depending on the availability of volunteered space.

Each of the States worked with the sponsors selected by FNS to identify ways to conduct outreach to parents in the targeted rural areas to recruit children for participation. The sponsors were responsible for identifying and recruiting children, identifying dropoff sites and routes, and collecting all program and participant data. The sponsors employed two delivery options: door-to-door meal delivery and a distribution center model (in which delivery is to a central or conveniently located dropoff point). In total, the three States spent \$246,210 for the demonstration: Delaware spent \$107,535, Massachusetts spent \$75,534, and New York spent \$63,141.

B. DELAWARE IMPLEMENTATION AND RESULTS

This section depicts the findings of the 2011 demonstration in Delaware with selected comparisons to data for the past 3 years. Although there was just one participating demonstration sponsor, in a State the size of Delaware, meal deliveries can have a measurable impact on total SFSP meals. Section 1 provides an overview of the implementation of the demonstration in Delaware. Section 2 presents results in SFSP meals served (including meals delivered), ADA, and participation rate. Section 3 compares results from sites located nearby the delivery locations to assess any changes in SFSP outcomes.

Delaware noted in its application that increases in the State's unemployment rate and poverty rate due to the economic downturn have resulted in decreased food security for low-income children.⁵¹ In its application, Delaware cited that nearly half of the students in the State are eligible for free or reduced-price school breakfasts and lunches; in addition, the State reported having a high child-poverty rate (14.6 percent) and high childhood-obesity rate (39.7 percent). Figure V.1 shows the SFSP July ADA compared to NSLP school year ADA for Delaware.



Source: SFSP data from the Delaware State Database, NSLP data from the NDB.

Note: NSLP figures represent free and reduced-price NSLP participation over the school year. SFSP figures reflect the SFSP only, and do not include figures from other USDA summer nutrition programs. The NSLP July ADA for the years shown in Figure V.1 was 1,306 in 2008; 1,401 in 2009; 1,296 in 2010; and 2,034 in 2011.

Supporting data for Figure V.1 can be found in Appendix Tables D.2 and D.3.

⁵¹ According to FRAC, Delaware ranks in the top five States (second among all the States and the District of Columbia) for the highest NSLP-to-SFSP participation rates, with almost one-fourth of all children in the 2009-2010 school-year NSLP also participating in the summer 2010 SFSP (23.7 percent; FRAC, 2011). This participation rate is slightly higher (26.4 percent) for children who participate in the NSLP during the school year and who also participate in the SFSP, NSLP, and SSO combined during the summer (FRAC, 2011).

1. Delaware Implementation

FNS awarded Delaware a total of \$364,216 for the demonstration (\$182,108 for each year). Delaware spent \$107,535 of the grant funds in 2011 (leftover grant funding from 2011 will carry over to 2012). The demonstration was administered by the Delaware Department of Education, and was implemented through one sponsor, the Food Bank of Delaware. The department assumed full responsibility for all oversight and coordination of the demonstration.

Food Bank of Delaware. The Food Bank of Delaware implemented the demonstration by delivering meals to five low-income apartment and housing complexes that served as meal-distribution locations in rural parts of all three of the State's counties (New Castle, Kent, and Sussex). Each location served multiple children who picked up their meals at that central point, an approach the sponsor found to be more cost effective than door-to-door meal delivery. The program delivered two meals per day every weekday for 10 weeks during the summer.

The Food Bank of Delaware has been an SFSP sponsor for many years, implementing the program at nearly 50 sites throughout the State. Many of these sites consist of low-income housing and apartment complexes that house many of the students that qualify for free and reduced-price meals. However, some of these sites had faced significant challenges in remaining operational. For example, the sites had to rely on volunteers to operate and oversee the congregate meal sites, and it was difficult to ensure consistent and adequate staffing during the fixed meal times.⁵² The requirement for fixed meal-distribution times was a barrier to participation, as children were often not available to attend meals at the same designated time every day. As a result, many of the complexes were unable to continue to operate as SFSP sites, making it difficult for resident and neighborhood children to access meals during the summer. By allowing children to pick up the meals at central delivery locations, the demonstration provided an opportunity for meals to be provided without the same requirements that had previously been barriers to operation and participation.


In order to encourage participation, the Food Bank of Delaware developed and sent a letter to each of the rural school districts to inform the schools about the demonstration. After identifying eligible children, the sponsor then reached out to parents, obtained parental consent, and enrolled children.

2. Change in Total Number of SFSP Meals Served

The total number of SFSP meals served (including both congregate and delivered meals) in Delaware declined sharply in 2011 after showing increases for the preceding years (Figure V.2). Meals served increased by 23.6 percent from 2008 to 2009 and by 12.6 percent between 2009 and 2010 before declining by 15.7 percent between 2010 and 2011. The 2011 decline brought down the number of meals served to 5 percent less than the number served in 2009.⁵³

⁵² Often these volunteers were on staff at the housing complex and thus had other obligations during SFSP meal hours.


⁵³ Total meals served include breakfasts, lunches, snacks, suppers, and, for the demonstration site, home delivery meals. Multiple meals delivered (to either homes or pickup sites) at the same time are counted separately.



Note: The total meal counts in Figure V.2 include both congregate and delivered breakfasts, lunches, suppers, and snacks.

Supporting data for Figure V.2 can be found in Appendix Table D.1.

Figure V.3 depicts the number of meals delivered by month. For the summer of 2011, 32,418 out of the total of 791,873 meals were delivered as part of the demonstration, an average of about 3,200 meals per week for 10 weeks. This represents 4.1 percent of the total meals served for summer 2011. Without these delivered meals, the decrease in meals served between 2010 and 2011 would have been even greater. Slightly more than half (52.9 percent) were delivered in July compared to less than half (45.8 percent) in August. Only 1.3 percent of Delaware summer meals were delivered in June.



Note: The delivered meal counts in Figure V.3 include breakfasts and lunches. No other meal types were included in the deliveries.

Supporting data for Figure V.3 can be found in Appendix Table D.1.

3. Changes in Comparison Sites: 2010 to 2011

A discussion of the methodology for selecting the six comparison sites is provided in Appendix H. These comparison sites showed substantial year-to-year fluctuation in operating days ADA. ADA increased 40 percent at one site from 2010 to 2011, rose between 9 and 16 percent at three sites, and fell between 17 and 28 percent at two sites (see Table V.2.). In addition, even across each of the six comparison sites, there were great fluctuations across years with no discernible pattern in these variations. Distance from the comparison sites to the nearest meal delivery site also varied, with four of the comparison sites within 3 miles of the nearest delivery site, one site within 5 miles, and one site within 15 miles. As a result, it is difficult to draw conclusions about the impact of the SFSP demonstrations on comparison sites in Delaware. Still, there is no evidence of any consistent impact of the meal deliveries on comparison site ADA, even when distance is considered. Thus, it appears that the deliveries are reaching new children.

Table V.2
Percent Change in Average Daily Attendance for Existing Comparison Sites:
Meal Delivery Demonstration (Delaware)


	Distance From Nearest Meal Delivery Site (miles)	Existing Comparison Sites						
		Operating Days ADA				Percent Change		
		2008	2009	2010	2011	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
Claymont B&G Club	2.0	37.3	40.9	38.5	53.9	9.7%	-5.9%	40.0%
Greater Newark B&G Club	1.1	96.0	98.7	144.9	104.6	2.8%	46.8%	-27.8%
Laurel B&G Club	0.9	45.2	71.6	51.4	59.6	58.4%	-28.2%	16.0%
Smith Elementary	4.7	127.0	68.5	182.5	198.5	-46.1%	166.4%	8.8%
Smyrna Clayton B&G Club	14.6	75.9	57.3	58.5	65.0	-24.5%	2.1%	11.1%
Wagstaff Daycare	2.7	38.3	22.5	25.7	21.3	-41.3%	14.2%	-17.1%
Total ADA – Comparison Sites		419.7	359.5	501.5	502.9	-14.3%	39.5%	0.3%

C. MASSACHUSETTS IMPLEMENTATION AND RESULTS

This section describes the findings of the 2011 Meal Delivery demonstration in Massachusetts with selected comparisons to data for the past 3 years. With only one demonstration sponsor, any immediate impact is likely to be difficult to discern in statewide figures. Section 1 provides an overview of the implementation of the demonstration in Massachusetts. Section 2 presents results in SFSP meals served (including meals delivered), ADA, and participation rate. Section 3 compares results from sites located nearby the delivery locations to assess any changes in SFSP outcomes.

Several rural areas in Massachusetts tend to experience higher levels of poverty and food insecurity than the State as a whole.⁵⁴ The demonstration was implemented in Barnstable County, a rural county on Cape Cod with a limited number of existing SFSP sites and a low SFSP participation rate despite a large number of eligible children. According to Massachusetts' application, while the statewide SFSP participation rate was 18.5 percent in July 2009, the participation rate for Barnstable County was only 3.8 percent. The State attributed this difference in participation rate to the challenges associated with providing SFSP meals in rural areas. Figure V.4 compares the ADA statewide for the SFSP in July against that of NSLP for the school year.

⁵⁴ According to FRAC, Massachusetts also ranks in the top 10 States (seventh among all the States and the District of Columbia) for the highest NSLP-to-SFSP participation rates: 17.1 percent of children in the 2009-2010 school-year NSLP also participated in the summer 2010 SFSP (FRAC, 2011). The rate is slightly higher (19.6 percent) for the number of children who participated in NSLP during the school year and who also participated in the SFSP, NSLP, and SSO combined during the summer (FRAC, 2011).



Source: SFSP data from the Massachusetts State Database, NSLP data from the NDB.

Note: NSLP figures represent free and reduced-price NSLP participation over the school year. SFSP figures reflect the SFSP only, and do not include figures from other USDA summer nutrition programs. The NSLP July ADA for the years shown in Figure V.4 was 6,478 in 2008; 4,912 in 2009; 6,365 in 2010; and 6,632 in 2011.

Supporting data for Figure V.4 can be found in Appendix Tables D.2 and D.3.

1. Massachusetts Implementation


FNS awarded Massachusetts a total of \$272,950 for the demonstration (\$114,365 for 2011 and \$158,585 for 2012). Massachusetts spent \$75,534 of the grant funds in 2011 (leftover grant funding from 2011 will carry over to 2012). The demonstration was administered by the State’s Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and was implemented through one sponsor, the Cape Cod YMCA. The department assumed all responsibility for the demonstration, and worked with the Cape Cod YMCA to coordinate data collection and make sure the program was operating in a manner consistent with the project goals and objectives.

In previous years, SFSP sites in rural Cape Cod areas have been unable to serve more than one meal per weekday due to barriers such as high operating costs, long travel distances for children, and low population density yielding low participation. Under the demonstration, however, children enrolled in the demonstration were provided with two meals (breakfast and lunch) for all 7 days of the week for the entire summer.

Cape Cod YMCA. The Cape Cod YMCA delivered meals three days a week (Monday, Wednesday, and Friday) to three central housing locations—two of which offered door-to-door meal delivery and one that served as a pickup, or distribution, point. Each meal delivery trip provided meals for the next 2 days (or 3 days in the case of Friday deliveries). Deliveries were made by YMCA staff, and the sponsor coordinated with local police departments to ensure the safety of the delivery staff.

2. Change in Total Number of SFSP Meals Served

The total number of SFSP meals served (including both congregate and delivered meals) in Massachusetts increased slightly in 2011, continuing an increase since 2008 (Figure V.5). The total number of meals served increased by 3.3 percent from 2008 to 2009, by 2.1 percent from 2009 to 2010, and by 1.9 percent from 2010 to 2011. The change from 2010 to 2011 was an increase of 46,201 meals.⁵⁵




Note: The total meal counts in Figure V.5 include breakfasts, lunches, suppers, and snacks.

Supporting data for Figure V.5 can be found in Appendix Table D.1.

For the summer of 2011, 16,402 out of 2,511,194 meals served in Massachusetts were delivered as part of the demonstration. This represents less than 1 percent of the total meals for summer 2011, but accounts for a sizeable amount (35.5 percent) of the increase in meals served between 2010 and 2011. Figure V.6 depicts the number of meals delivered by month. In the peak month of July, 7,428 meals were delivered, dropping to 6,250 in August. The number of June meals delivered was lower at 2,724, reflecting a school calendar that extends well into the month.

⁵⁵Total meals served include breakfasts, lunches, snacks, suppers, and, for the demonstration site, home delivery meals. Multiple meals delivered (to either homes or pickup sites) at the same time were counted separately.



Note: The delivered meal counts in Figure V.6 include breakfasts and lunches. No other meal types were included in the deliveries.

Supporting data for Figure V.6 can be found in Appendix Table D.1.

3. Changes in Comparison Sites: 2010 to 2011

We examined the change in operating days ADA at one relatively nearby comparison site, but at a distance of 11 miles from the delivery location, it is likely too far away to be considered a feasible site for attendance by demonstration participants. Thus, it appears that the meal deliveries are reaching children not already served by SFSP. Operating days ADA at this comparison site increased by 6 percent from 2010 to 2011, in keeping with statewide changes (Table V.3). Appendix H illustrates details on comparison group selection and methodology.

**Table V.3
Percent Change in Average Daily Attendance for Existing Comparison Sites:
Meal Delivery Demonstration (Massachusetts)**


	Distance From Nearest Meal Delivery Site (miles)	Existing Comparison Sites						
		Operating Days ADA				Percent Change		
		2008	2009	2010	2011	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
Camp Mitton	11.2	65.5	68.2	63.7	67.5	4.1%	-6.6%	6.0%

D. NEW YORK IMPLEMENTATION AND RESULTS

This section describes the findings of the 2011 demonstration in New York with selected comparisons to data for the past 3 years. With only two demonstration sponsors that served almost 13,000 meals, it is difficult to detect any statewide impact of the demonstration given the more than 16 million SFSP meals served across the State. Section 1 provides an overview of the

implementation of the demonstration in New York. Section 2 presents results in SFSP meals served (including meals delivered), ADA, and participation rate. Section 3 compares results from sites nearby the delivery sites to assess any changes in SFSP outcomes.

New York cited in its application the need for assistance in several rural areas in upstate New York that experience much higher levels of poverty and food insecurity compared to other areas in the State.⁵⁶ Figure V.7 compares the ADA statewide for the SFSP in July against that of NSLP for the school year.



Source: SFSP data from the New York State Database, NSLP data from the NDB.

Note: NSLP figures represent free and reduced-price NSLP participation over the school year. SFSP figures reflect the SFSP only, and do not include figures from other USDA summer nutrition programs. The NSLP July ADA for the years shown in Figure V.7 was 55,791 in 2008; 57,990 in 2009; 59,625 in 2010; and 60,688 in 2011.

Supporting data for Figure V.7 can be found in Appendix Tables D.2 and D.3.

1. New York Implementation

FNS awarded New York a total of \$201,357 for the demonstration (\$85,584 for 2011 and \$115,773 for 2012). New York spent \$63,141 of the grant funds in 2011 (leftover grant funding from 2011 will carry over to 2012). The demonstration was administered by the New York State Education Department (NYSED) and implemented through two sponsors in rural areas in upstate New York. The NYSED assumed responsibility for overseeing the demonstration.

Altogether, the 2 demonstration sponsors delivered meals in 11 locations. Each of the two sponsors is described below.

⁵⁶ According to FRAC, New York's SFSP participation rate is one of the highest nationwide at 23.2 percent (FRAC, 2011), reflecting a program that is the largest in the country, although fourth in school-age population.


Catholic Charities Food Bank of the Southern Tier. The Catholic Charities Food Bank of the Southern Tier (the Food Bank) worked with the three rural school districts to identify eligible children and well-situated delivery locations in two counties, Schuyler and Steuben, where NSLP-eligible children previously did not have access to SFSP sites. In its application, the Food Bank detailed the high percentages of children who qualify for NSLP meals (which range from 43 percent to 54 percent by district) and the high levels of economic instability of households in the districts. This sponsor delivered meals via six drop-off locations where children were able to pick up meals 4 days a week (each distribution included breakfast and lunch). To ensure control of the distribution, the Food Bank maintained a confidential list of NSLP-eligible children who were qualified to pick up meals.

North Rose-Wolcott Central School District. The second sponsor, North Rose-Wolcott Central School District, is located in Wayne County. Historically, while 56 percent of children in the county qualify for free and reduced-price meals, only 25 percent of these children have participated in the SFSP. The sponsor used school district vans to deliver food to five distribution locations around the county. These locations consisted of various places in the community—such as churches, community centers, fire departments, and libraries—where families could pick up meals for their children 4 days a week (Monday through Thursday, each delivery consisting of breakfast and lunch). The sponsor sent letters directly to the families of children who were eligible for free and reduced-price meals to notify them of the program and recruit the children for participation. The sponsor provided participating children with an eligibility card that families presented to receive meals.

2. Change in Total Number of SFSP Meals Served

The total number of SFSP meals served (including both congregate and delivered meals) in New York has declined slightly each year for the previous 3 years (Figure V.8). Meals served decreased by 1.1 percent from 2008 to 2009, by 1.7 percent from 2009 to 2010, and by 1.4 percent from 2010 to 2011. A total of 239,477 fewer meals were served in 2011 compared to 2010.⁵⁷


⁵⁷Total meals served include breakfasts, lunches, snacks, suppers, and, for the demonstration site, home delivery meals. Multiple meals delivered (to either homes or pickup sites) at the same time are counted separately.



Note: The total meal counts in Figure V.8 include congregate and delivered breakfasts, lunches, suppers, and snacks.

Supporting data for Figure V.8 can be found in Appendix Table D.1.

During the full summer of 2011, 12,734 meals were delivered. This represents less than 1/10 of 1 percent of the total meals served for summer 2011. Figure V.9 shows the number of meals delivered by month. Similar numbers of meals were delivered during the months of July and August: 5,764 in July and 6,118 in August. Only 852 meals were delivered in June, consistent with the fact that schools remain in session through most of that month.



Note: The delivered meal counts in Figure V.9 include breakfasts and lunches. No other meal types were included in the deliveries.

Supporting data for Figure V.9 can be found in Appendix Table D.1.

3. Changes in Comparison Sites: 2010 to 2011

The demonstration took place in two separate rural areas. For one of these sponsors, Catholic Charities of the Southern Tier, we examined changes at four comparison sites, each moderately distant from the delivery area (10 to 18 miles) and unlikely to be a reasonable alternative for children in delivery areas to participate on site. Each of these had varying changes in operating days ADA from 2010 to 2011, ranging from a decrease of 12.1 percent to an increase of 124.1 percent; for each, there were substantial fluctuations in operating days ADA in the previous years (Table V.4). It seems likely that none of these changes in ADA were related to the demonstration. Appendix H illustrates details on comparison group selection and methodology.

For the other sponsor, North Rose-Wolcott, we examined two non-demonstration sites located a relatively short distance from the sponsor, but both are probably too far from the delivery area (18 and 31 miles) to be feasible for onsite attendance for demonstration participants. These two sites had operating days ADA declines of 17.6 percent and 6.3 percent from 2010 to 2011, most likely due to factors unrelated to the demonstration. The first of these experienced an even larger decline the year before the demonstration (between 2009 and 2010). The other showed an increase of 8 percent in operating days ADA from 2009 to 2010. Thus, in each of two separate rural areas it appears that the meal deliveries are reaching children not already served by SFSP.

Table V.4
Percent Change in Average Daily Attendance for Existing Comparison Sites:
Meal Delivery Demonstration (New York)

	Distance From Nearest Meal Delivery Site (miles)	Existing Comparison Sites						
		Operating Days ADA				Percent Change		
		2008	2009	2010	2011	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
Catholic Charities Food Bank of the Southern Tier								
Coopers Education Center	9.7	44.3	45.1	44.7	44.5	1.8%	-0.9%	-0.4%
Corning Area Youth Center	12.3	19.1	20.8	17.7	20.7	8.9%	-14.9%	16.9%
Diven School	17.6	98.1	63.0	16.2	36.3	-35.8%	-74.3%	124.1%
Dundee Area Youth Center	13.4	56.1	62.3	47.8	42.0	11.1%	-23.3%	-12.1%
Total ADA – Comparison Sites		217.6	191.2	126.4	143.5	-12.1%	-33.9%	13.5%
North Rose-Wolcott Central School District								
Michael A. Maroun Elementary School	30.9	195.4	202.2	149.3	123.0	3.5%	-26.2%	-17.6%
Camp Hollis	18.4	49.2	50.3	54.3	50.9	2.2%	8.0%	-6.3%
Total ADA – Comparison Sites		244.6	252.5	203.6	173.9	3.3%	-19.4%	-14.6%

E. CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of the Meal Delivery demonstrations was to expand the reach of SFSP in rural areas where programs did not operate or where congregate sites were difficult for children to access. The three States in which the demonstrations were implemented are all in the Northeast. In their applications, each of the States, though more urban than most, cited difficulties in reaching children in rural areas.

Only four sponsors, two in New York and one each in Delaware and Massachusetts, implemented the demonstrations.

Comparison Site Results

A snapshot of sites nearby the demonstration sites was examined to determine if there was any change in attendance at neighboring sites as a result of the home deliveries. There did not seem to be any discernible effects of the demonstrations on SFSP participation at the comparison sites across the three States.

In Delaware, two of the six comparison sites did show decreases in operating days ADA (down 17 percent and 28 percent). The remaining four, however, showed a range of increases, from 8.8 to 40 percent. There was no apparent relationship between distance of the comparison sites to the delivery area and change in ADA.

In Massachusetts, the comparison site showed annual changes that were consistent with statewide changes, thus indicating that the demonstration did not affect the SFSP operations.

Operating days ADA at this site, which was too far from the delivery area to provide an alternative attendance location, increased by 6 percent from 2010 to 2011.

In New York, we analyzed six comparison sites. Four of these sites experienced declines in operating days ADA of 0.4, 6.3, 12.1, and 17.6 percent between 2010 and 2011. The remainder of these experienced increases of 124.1 percent and 16.9 percent from 2010 to 2011. None of the sites was close enough to provide a reasonable alternative for onsite attendance, so changes in ADA at these locations appear unrelated to the demonstration.

Summary Conclusion

In each State, thousands of meals were delivered to children who were not likely to have been able to receive the benefits of summer meals because existing SFSP sites were moderately distant and transportation to them was a barrier for families. The demonstrations were localized, operating in a small number of areas in each State, and were not expected to have statewide effects. There was no evidence that participation (as measured by ADA) at comparison sites, which provided a snapshot of traditional SFSP sites nearby the demonstration sites, was affected by meal deliveries in the demonstration sites.

Across the three States, 61,554 meals were delivered to locations at or near the homes of children who would probably not have otherwise been served by SFSP.

CHAPTER VI: FINDINGS FROM THE 2011 FOOD BACKPACK DEMONSTRATION

Since many SFSP sites are not able to serve daily meals, the goal of this demonstration was to provide backpacks containing food already packaged or divided into meals (e.g., food that can be easily prepared as meals) for children to consume at home. Approved sponsors were required to provide congregate meals at SFSP sites during the majority of the week and provide the backpacks for meals on non-operating days (predominantly weekends). The backpacks were used to supplement meal service during the times that SFSP sites were not open for normal operation.

This chapter provides information on both the activities and outcomes of the 2011 Food Backpack demonstration conducted in three States. Section A provides an overview of the demonstration across the three States. Section B provides results for Arizona. Sections C and D provide results for Kansas and Ohio, respectively. Supporting tables for this section are included in Appendix E.

The Food Backpack demonstration delivered backpacks containing SFSP meals for consumption on days during which the meal sites were not open.

A. DEMONSTRATION DESCRIPTION

The demonstration was implemented in three States: Arizona, Kansas, and Ohio. In 2011, the demonstration was implemented by 16 sponsors at 82 sites: 3 sponsors in Arizona, 7 sponsors in Kansas, and 6 sponsors in Ohio (Table VI.1). Only existing sponsors were able to apply for this demonstration.

**Table VI.1
Food Backpack Demonstration Sponsors**

State	Sponsor	# of Sites
Arizona	Chandler Unified School District Litchfield Elementary School District Mesa Public Schools	18
Kansas	Arkansas City Public School District Central Unified School District (Burden) Gardner Edgerton School District Lawrence Public Schools Topeka Public Schools United Methodist Church (at Wilson Elementary) East Central Kansas Cooperative in Education	14
Ohio	Andrew's House Ashtabula County Children Services Community Action Organization of Scioto County Hamilton Living Water Ministry Hocking Athens Perry Community Action Agency Whole Again International	50

Each of the States worked with the selected sponsors to identify ways to conduct outreach to parents in the targeted areas to recruit children for participation. The sponsors were responsible for identifying and recruiting children, distributing backpacks, and collecting all program and participant data. In total, the three States spent \$352,393 for the demonstration: Arizona spent \$134,398, Kansas spent \$80,191, and Ohio spent \$137,804.


B. ARIZONA IMPLEMENTATION AND RESULTS

This section illustrates the findings of the 2011 demonstration in Arizona compared to data for the past 3 years. Section 1 provides an overview of the implementation of the demonstration in Arizona. Section 2 presents changes in SFSP meals served (including meals delivered), ADA, and participation rate. With only 18 sites participating in the demonstration, any immediate impact is likely to be obscured in statewide figures. As such, Section 3 compares results from demonstration sites to a group of similar sites.

According to FRAC, Arizona had one of the lowest participation rates of children in the NSLP also participating in the SFSP in the Nation, at just 4.3 percent in 2011, ranking the State 47th (FRAC, 2012).^{58,59} This participation rate increases to 11.0 percent when children who participate in FNS summer food programs are included (FRAC, 2012). Figure VI.1 depicts the difference in SFSP versus NSLP ADA from 2008 through 2011.

⁵⁸ One factor contributing to the number of SFSP meals served is the school calendar. Most of the school districts in Arizona operate a full 10-month calendar, from early August through late May, with weeklong breaks between each quarter plus holidays. Thus, the SFSP operates almost exclusively in June and July.

⁵⁹ Arizona's SFSP participation rate only increases to 11 percent when children who participate in all three FNS summer feeding programs (the SFSP, NSLP, and SSO) are also included (FRAC, 2012).



Source: SFSP data from the Arizona State Database, NSLP data from the NDB.

Note: NSLP figures represent free and reduced-price NSLP participation over the school year. SFSP figures reflect the SFSP only, and do not include figures from other USDA summer nutrition programs. The NSLP July ADA for the years shown in Figure VI.1 was 34,621 in 2008; 28,419 in 2009; 39,875 in 2010; and 30,073 in 2011.

Supporting data for Figure VI.1 can be found in Appendix Tables E.4 and E.5.

1. Arizona Implementation

FNS awarded Arizona a total of \$328,232 for the demonstration (\$164,116 for each of 2011 and 2012). Arizona spent \$134,398 of the grant funding in 2011 (leftover grant funding from 2011 will carry over to 2012). The demonstration was administered by the Arizona Department of Education – Health and Nutrition Services Unit, which conducted all oversight, data collection, training and technical assistance to sponsors. In 2009, the department conducted an analysis of why SFSP program participation was so low in the State, and hired a market research consultant to try to understand and address some of the obstacles to SFSP participation. The department viewed the SFSP demonstrations as one way to address some of the barriers to SFSP participation in Arizona.

Three sponsors were selected by FNS to implement the demonstration. Each sponsor chose to implement the demonstration at sites that serve a large percentage of children who are eligible to receive free or reduced-price school meals. Altogether, the sponsors operated a total of 18 congregate meal sites (9 of which were operated by one sponsor). All sites used the backpacks to deliver breakfasts and lunches for both days of the weekend. A brief description of each sponsor is provided below followed by a comparison table (Table VI.2).

Chandler Unified School District (CUSD). This sponsor operated the demonstration at seven congregate meal sites during 2011 that serve a population in which an average of 77 percent of children receive NSLP meals. The sites served two congregate meals per day from Monday through Friday. On Fridays, the sites provided participating children with separate

backpacks containing 2 days' worth of breakfasts and 2 days' worth of lunches to ensure food for both weekend days. CUSD planned to provide backpack meals to at least 1,000 children per week throughout the 7 weeks of program operation.

Litchfield Elementary School District (LESD). This sponsor operated the demonstration at nine SFSP congregate meal sites with the highest percentages of children eligible for free or reduced-price meals. One of the sites provided participating children with separate backpacks containing 2 days' worth of breakfasts and 2 days' worth of lunches on Fridays to ensure food for both weekend days. The other two sites provided backpacks on Saturdays for one day's worth of meals (2 meals). LESD planned to provide backpack meals to 500 children per week for the full 8 weeks of program operation. Program staff at the demonstration sites monitored the distribution of the backpacks to ensure that only qualified children receive the meals, and also checked the empty backpacks brought back on Mondays.

Mesa Public Schools (MPS). This sponsor selected two SFSP congregate meal sites to operate the demonstration. At school sites, plastic bags containing take-home meals were provided to children attending the site on the last operating day of the week (Thursdays). Three breakfasts and three lunches were provided in two bags. The sponsor planned to provide meals to between 200 and 300 children per week over the 9-week operating period.


Table V1.2 illustrates a summary of each of the sponsors.

**Table VI.2
Arizona Demonstration Sponsors**

Sponsor Name	Demonstration Description	# of Demonstration Sites	# of Weeks in Demonstration Period	Expected # Children Served per Week
Chandler Unified School District	Backpacks contained 2 days' worth of both breakfasts and lunches to take home on Fridays.	7 sites	7 weeks	At least 1,000 children
Litchfield Elementary School District	Backpacks contained 1 or 2 days' worth of both breakfasts and lunches to take home on Fridays or Saturdays, depending on the site.	9 sites	8 weeks	500 children
Mesa Public Schools	For school sites, 3 breakfasts and 3 lunches were provided in each take-home bag on Thursday For community sites, 2 breakfasts and 2 lunches were provided in each take-home bag on Friday.	2 sites	9 weeks	Between 200 and 300 children

2. Change in Total Number of SFSP Meals Served

The total number of SFSP meals served (including both congregate and backpack meals) in Arizona increased from 1.6 million in 2010 to nearly 2.1 million in 2011 (Figure VI.2). However, there was also a substantial increase in meals served from 2009 to 2010, which was prior to the implementation of the demonstration. Meals served increased 29.5 percent from 2010 to 2011 and by 25.8 percent from 2009 to 2010. In 2011, 472,793 more meals were served than in 2010.⁶⁰




Note: The total meal counts in Figure VI.2 include congregate and backpack breakfasts, lunches, suppers, and snacks.

Supporting data for Figure VI.2 can be found in Appendix Table E.3.

During the summer of 2011, 79,795 meals were provided in take-home backpacks and bags. This represents 3.8 percent of meals for summer 2011 and accounts for 16.9 percent of the increase in meals between 2010 and 2011. Figure VI.3 depicts the number of meals provided in backpacks by month. In the peak month of June, nearly 47,000 meals were provided in backpacks, dropping to slightly less than 33,000 in July. No meals were provided in August and only a trivial number in May; this reflects the 2-month summer calendar typical in Arizona.

⁶⁰Total meals served include breakfasts, lunches, snacks, suppers, and, for the demonstration site, backpack meals. If multiple meals were included in the same backpack, each one was counted separately.



Note: The total meal counts in Figure VI.3 include breakfasts and lunches.

Supporting data for Figure VI.3 can be found in Appendix Table E.3.

3. Changes in Demonstration Sites vs. Comparison Sites: 2010 to 2011

The relatively small scale of the demonstrations makes it difficult to identify their impact on outcomes at the State level. In this section, we compare the existing demonstration sites to a special group of comparison sites that are similar to the demonstration sites. In Arizona, the comparison sites were all non-demonstration sites in the same county as the demonstration sites (Maricopa County).⁶¹

For meals served and July ADA, the demonstration sites showed remarkably higher increases from 2010 to 2011 than did comparison sites (Figure VI.4 and Table VI.3). For example, total meals served increased 79.7 percent from 2010 to 2011 at demonstration sites versus only 1.8 percent at comparison sites. July ADA increased 147.9 at demonstration sites compared to just 8.9 percent at comparison sites. Appendix H illustrates details on comparison group selection and methodology.

⁶¹ With more than 700,000 students in 58 school districts, Maricopa County enrolls 63 percent of all students in Arizona (<http://www.maricopa.gov/Schools/about.aspx>).




Table VI.3
Backpack Demonstration Sites vs. Comparison Sites in Arizona

	Existing Demonstration Sites* (open 2010 and 2011)			Existing Comparison Sites* (open 2010 and 2011)			New Sites in 2011	Total 2011 Sites
	2010	2011	% Change 2010- 2011	2010	2011	% Change 2010- 2011	2011	2011
Total Meals**	77,659	139,565	79.7%	950,579	968,152	1.8%	488,658	2,076,375
Median Meals per Site	2,780	9,361	236.7%	2,755	2,950	7.1%	2,814	2,501
July ADA*	816	2,023	147.9%	8,479	9,234	8.9%	5,109	20,190


* Sites open in both 2010 and 2011.

**Includes congregate and backpacks meals.

C. KANSAS IMPLEMENTATION AND RESULTS

This section illustrates the findings of the 2011 demonstration in Kansas compared to data for the past 3 years. Section 1 provides an overview of the implementation of the demonstration in Kansas. Section 2 presents changes in SFSP meals served (including meals delivered), ADA, and participation rate. With only 14 sites participating in the demonstration, any immediate impact on statewide figures is not likely to be discernible. As such, Section 3 compares results from demonstration sites to a group of similar sites.

According to FRAC, Kansas ranks the seventh lowest (45th) in the Nation for its participation rate of children who participate in the NSLP and also participate in SFSP, at just 5.9 percent (FRAC, 2012). This participation rate only increases to 6.5 percent when children who participate in all FNS summer food programs (SSO and NSLP summer school) are included, ranking Kansas 50th (FRAC, 2012). Figure VI.5 depicts the difference between the SFSP and the NSLP based on ADA from 2008 through 2011.



Source: SFSP data from the Kansas State Database, NSLP data from the NDB.

Note: NSLP figures represent free and reduced-price NSLP participation over the school year. SFSP figures reflect the SFSP only, and do not include figures from other USDA summer nutrition programs. The NSLP July ADA for the years shown in Figure VI.5 was 1,831 in 2008; 1,525 in 2009; 1,994 in 2010; and 1,073 in 2011.

Supporting data for Figure VI.5 can be found in Appendix Tables E.4 and E.5.

1. Kansas Implementation

FNS awarded Kansas a total of \$246,172 for the demonstration (\$123,086 for each of 2011 and 2012). Kansas spent \$80,191 of the funds in 2011 (leftover grant funding from 2011 will carry over to 2012). The demonstration was administered by the Kansas State Department of Education, which conducted all oversight, data collection, training, and technical assistance to sponsors and sites. During the last several years, the State has been trying to address its high food-insecurity rates during the summer months. Through different initiatives, the State has seen a 59-percent increase in SFSP participation since 2004. Kansas’s application for the demonstration viewed it as a way to continue momentum in this area.

To deliver the backpacks, the State built on the existing infrastructure for a similar initiative it operates in certain school districts during the school year, called the “backsnacks” program. Through this program, children are provided food to take home on the weekends; usually, these packages are organized through local and regional food banks. Since many of the sponsors operated the school-year “backsnacks” program, the infrastructure, knowledge, and facilities for the SFSP demonstration were already partially in place to extend the program into the summer.

Seven sponsors were approved by FNS to participate in the demonstration. These sponsors include a mix of urban and rural locations, large and small organizations, and schools and private nonprofit entities. Each sponsor chose to implement the backpack demonstration in

sites with the largest percentage of NSLP-eligible children. Together, these sponsors implemented the demonstration at 14 sites in 2011. Most sites distributed backpacks with meals containing lunch only for the weekends; only one site distributed backpacks that contained both breakfast and lunch. A brief description of each sponsor is provided below, followed by a comparison table (Table VI.3).

Arkansas City Public School District. This sponsor operated the demonstration at one site that provided lunches to children Monday through Thursday during the summer months. For the demonstration, the site provided children with a backpack containing 3 days' worth of lunches for the 3-day weekend (Friday through Sunday). The sponsor operated for 6 weeks during the summer, and aimed to provide backpacks to between 100 and 150 elementary school children per week in 2011 (and increase to 150-200 for 2012).⁶²

Central Unified School District (Burden). This sponsor operated the demonstration at four sites that served four poor rural towns in which an average of 90 percent of the children receive free or reduced-price meals during the school year. The sites served lunches Monday through Thursday for 9 weeks during the summer. For the demonstration, the sites provided drawstring bags containing lunches for the 3-day weekend to participating children on Thursdays. The sponsor aimed to provide backpacks to about 75 children per week during the summer in 2011 (and 94 children per week in 2012).

Gardner Edgerton School District. This sponsor served breakfast and lunch at one site for 8 weeks during the summer. The sponsor served meals Monday through Friday, and children participating in the demonstration received a backpack each Friday containing two lunches. The sponsor aimed to provide backpacks to 150 children per week in 2011 (and 188 children per week in 2012), including 50 children who receive "backsnacks" during the school year.

Lawrence Public Schools. This sponsor operated the demonstration at five existing SFSP sites. Bags of take-home meals were provided during the lunch service on Fridays for 11 weeks during the summer, with each bag containing two lunch meals, one for each weekend day. The sponsor planned to provide bags to 550 children per week during the summer of 2011 (increasing to 688 per week in 2012).

Topeka Public Schools. This sponsor operated the demonstration at one site at which free and reduced-price school meal eligibility was more than 96 percent. This site has a history of high SFSP participation (including many walk-ins) in previous summers and high participation in the school-year "backsnacks" program. The site distributed backpacks that contained both breakfasts and lunches for each weekend day for a total of 7 weeks during the summer. The sponsor aimed to distribute backpacks to 100 children per week in 2011 (and 125 per week in 2012).

The United Methodist Church (at Wilson Elementary). This sponsor operated the demonstration at one site that served SFSP lunches for 11 weeks during the summer. On Thursdays, the site provided bags with lunches for the 3 weekend days (Friday-Sunday) to each

⁶² The sponsor targeted children who received the "backsnacks" for participation in the demonstration.

participating child. The sponsor estimated that it would provide backpacks to 45 children per week in 2011 (and 56 per week in 2012).

East Central Kansas Cooperative in Education. This sponsor operated the demonstration at one site. Bags of take-home meals were provided during lunch service on Thursdays for 9 weeks during the summer, with each bag containing two lunch meals for the weekend days. The sponsor planned to provide bags to 75 children per week at the site during the summer of 2011 (and 94 children per week for 2012).


Table VI.4 provides a description of each sponsor.

**Table VI.4
Kansas Demonstration Sponsors**

Sponsor Name	Demonstration Description	# of Demonstration Sites	# of Weeks in Demonstration Period	Expected # Children Served per Week
Arkansas City Public School District	Backpack contained 3 days' worth of lunches for the weekend (provided on Thursdays).	1 site	6 weeks	100-150 children in 2011, and 150-200 in 2012
Central Unified School District (Burden)	Bags contained 3 days' worth of lunches for the weekend (provided on Thursdays).	4 sites	9 weeks	75 children in 2011, and 94 in 2012
Gardner Edgerton School District	Backpack or bag contained 2 lunches (provided on Fridays).	1 site	8 weeks	150 children in 2011, and 188 in 2012
Lawrence Public Schools	Backpack or bag contained 2 lunches (provided on Fridays).	5 sites	11 weeks	550 children in 2011, and 688 in 2012
Topeka Public Schools	Backpack or bag contained 2 breakfasts and lunches (provided on Fridays).	1 site	7 weeks	100 children in 2011, and 125 in 2012
United Methodist Church (at Wilson Elementary)	Bags contained 3 days' worth of lunches (provided on Thursdays).	1 site	11 weeks	45 children in 2011, and 56 in 2012
East Central Kansas Cooperative in Education	Backpack or bag contained 2 lunches (provided on Thursdays).	1 site	9 weeks	75 children in 2011, and 94 children in 2012

2. Change in Total Number of SFSP Meals Served

The total meals served (including both congregate and backpack meals) in all of Kansas increased by 18.9 percent (136,893 meals) in the year of the demonstration, from 724,209 in 2010 to 861,102 in 2011 (Figure VI.6). Meals served increased by 29.4 percent between 2008 and 2009 (from more than 592,500 to about 767,000), and then declined by 5.6 percent between 2009 and 2010 (down to about 724,000).⁶³




Note: The total meal counts in Figure VI.6 include congregate and backpack breakfasts, lunches, suppers, and snacks.

Supporting data for Figure VI.6 can be found in Appendix Table E.3.

Kansas distributed 24,290 backpack meals, 2.8 percent of the total meals provided statewide in 2011. These meals account for 17.7 percent of the increase in meals from 2010 to 2011. Figure VI.7 illustrates the number of backpack meals provided by month. Slightly fewer than half (12,036, or 49.6 percent) of the backpack meals were provided in July, with somewhat fewer (11,214, or 46.2 percent) provided in June, and only a small fraction (1,040, or 4.3 percent) provided in August.

⁶³Total meals served include breakfasts, lunches, snacks, suppers, and, for the demonstration site, backpack meals. If multiple meals were included in the same backpack, each one was counted separately.



Note: The total meal counts in Figure VI.7 include breakfast and lunches.

Supporting data for Figure VI.7 can be found in Appendix Table E.3.

3. Changes in Demonstration Sites vs. Comparison Sites: 2010 to 2011

Appendix H illustrates details on comparison group selection and methodology. Since the demonstrations were relatively small, discerning their effect at the State level is difficult. To address this, we compared the existing demonstration sites to a special group of comparison sites that are similar to the demonstration sites. In Kansas, the comparison sites were non-demonstration sites in communities in three counties that were most similar to the demonstration sites on five factors: population density, per capita income, unemployment rate, percent below poverty, and the proportion that are eligible for free and reduced-price meals.

For meals served and July ADA, the Kansas demonstration sites showed remarkably greater increases from 2010 to 2011 than did comparison sites (Figure VI.8 and Table VI.5). For example, total meals served increased 62.8 percent from 2010 to 2011 at demonstration sites compared to a decline of 7.5 percent at comparison sites. July ADA increased 67.7 percent at demonstration sites compared to a decrease of 3 percent at comparison sites.




Table VI.5
Backpack Demonstration Sites vs. Comparison Sites in Kansas

	Existing Demonstration Sites* (open 2010 and 2011)			Existing Comparison Sites* (open 2010 and 2011)			New Sites in 2011	Total 2011 Sites
	2010	2011	% Change 2010- 2011	2010	2011	% Change 2010- 2011	2011	2011
Total Meals**	45,136	73,479	62.8%	72,182	66,775	-7.5%	197,059	861,102
Median Meals per Site	2,901	5,196	79.1%	2,353	2,372	0.8%	2,384	2,312
July ADA*	757	1,269	67.7%	634	615	-3.0%	2,521	11,053


* Sites open in both 2010 and 2011.

**Includes congregate and backpack meals.

D. OHIO IMPLEMENTATION AND RESULTS

This section illustrates the findings of the 2011 demonstration in Ohio compared to data for the past 3 years. Section 1 provides an overview of the implementation of the demonstration in Ohio. Section 2 presents changes in SFSP meals served (including meals delivered), ADA, and participation rate. While 50 sites participated in the demonstration—more than in any of the other backpack demonstration States—any impact on statewide figures is unlikely in view of the more than 3.7 million SFSP meals served in Ohio. As such, Section 3 compares results from demonstration sites to a group of similar sites.

According to FRAC, only 9.7 percent of children who participate in the NSLP during the school year also participate in the SFSP, ranking Ohio 29th among the States in terms of SFSP participation (FRAC, 2012). This participation rate only increases to 10.6 percent when children who participate in all FNS summer food programs are included (FRAC, 2012). Figure VI.9 illustrates the difference between SFSP and NSLP based on ADA from 2008 through 2011.



Source: SFSP data from the Ohio State Database, NSLP data from the NDB.

Note: NSLP figures represent free and reduced-price NSLP participation over the school year. SFSP figures reflect the SFSP only, and do not include figures from other USDA summer nutrition programs. The NSLP July ADA for the years shown in Figure VI.9 was 11,229 in 2008; 12,784 in 2009; 13,105 in 2010; and 13,503 in 2011.

Supporting data for Figure VI.9 can be found in Appendix Tables E.4 and E.5.

1. Ohio Implementation

FNS awarded Ohio a total of \$329,724 for the demonstration (\$162,314 for 2011 and \$167,410 for 2012). Ohio spent \$137,804 of the grant funds in 2011 (leftover grant funding from 2011 will carry over to 2012). The demonstration was administered by the Ohio Department of Education, which conducted all program oversight, data collection, training, technical assistance and financial reporting.

Six sponsors were selected by FNS to participate in the Food Backpack demonstration. A brief description of each sponsor is provided below, followed by a comparison table (Table VI.6).

Andrew's House, Inc. This sponsor operated one site at an elementary school in an area in which nearly half of all children qualify for free or reduced-price meals. During the recent economic downturn, the area has seen increased unemployment and increasing food insecurity among resident families. The sponsor served meals Monday through Friday for 10 weeks during the summer. Children participating in the demonstration received backpacks on Fridays that contained lunches for the following 2 weekend days. The sponsor aimed to provide backpacks to 60 children per week during each summer.

Ashtabula County Children Services. This sponsor operated six sites in subsidized housing projects and community centers in an area of the State with higher-than-average unemployment rates. The sites served breakfast and lunch Monday through Friday for 9 weeks during the summer months. Sites participating in the demonstration provided backpacks containing both breakfasts and lunches for the upcoming weekend to participating children on Fridays. The sponsor sought to provide backpacks to about 425 children per week during the summer.

Community Action Organization of Scioto County. This sponsor operated 23 sites through its Workforce Connections program, providing meals to young people for 9 weeks during the summer. Most of the sites provided lunches Monday through Friday, and most backpacks containing lunches for the weekend days were provided to participating children on Fridays. Three of the sites provided the backpacks on Thursdays, each containing lunches for the next 3 days. The sponsor proposed to provide backpack meals to 600 children per week across all sites in both 2011 and 2012.

Hamilton Living Water Ministry. This sponsor operated one site in a very poor area in which 90 percent of children receive free or reduced-price meals. The sponsor provided lunches Monday through Friday for 8 weeks during the summer. Since attendance was historically lower on Fridays compared to other weekdays, the sponsor provided participating children with backpacks on Thursdays containing lunches and snacks for the 3-day weekend. The sponsor aimed to provide backpacks to 125-150 children per week in 2011 (and 175-200 per week in 2012).

Hocking Athens Perry Community Action Agency. This sponsor already had experience implementing an independently funded backpack program in two school districts

prior to the demonstration. The sponsor proposed to provide backpacks to 700 children per week in 16 SFSP sites in 2011. Backpacks containing lunches for weekend days were distributed for 10 weeks during the summer.

Whole Again International. This sponsor operated the demonstration at three SFSP sites that serve low-income populations. One site served homeless children, one operated at a government housing facility, and the third served a low-income immigrant community. On Fridays, the sites provided children who attended SFSP meals at least 3 days each week with backpacks containing breakfasts and lunches for the weekend days. The sponsor aimed to provide backpacks to 300 children for 10 weeks during the summer.

Table VI.6 illustrates a summary of each of the sponsors.


**Table VI.6
Ohio Demonstration Sponsors**

Sponsor Name	Demonstration Description	# of Demonstration Sites	# of Weeks in Demonstration Period	Expected # Children Served per Week
Andrew's House, Inc.	Backpack or bag contained 2 lunches (provided on Fridays).	1 site	10 weeks	60 children
Ashtabula County Children Services	Backpack or bag contained 2 breakfasts and lunches (provided on Fridays).	6 sites	9 weeks	425 children
Community Action Organization of Scioto County	Backpack or bag containing 2 lunches (provided on Fridays) at 20 sites and 3 lunches (provided on Thursdays) at 3 sites.	23 sites	9 weeks	600 children
Hamilton Living Water Ministry	Backpack or bag contained 3 lunches and snacks (provided on Thursdays).	1 site	8 weeks	125-150 children in 2011, and 175-200 in 2012
Hocking Athens Perry Community Action Agency	Backpack or bag contained 2 lunches (provided on varying days across sites).	16 sites	10 weeks	700 additional children for a total of 1,400
Whole Again International	Backpack contained 2 breakfasts and lunches (provided on Fridays).	3 sites	10 weeks	300 children

2. Change in Total Number of SFSP Meals Served

The total meals served (including both congregate and backpack meals) in Ohio decreased by 7.0 percent (280,114 meals) in the year of the demonstration, from about 4.0 million in 2010 to 3.7 million (Figure VI.10). Prior to that, meals served increased by 9.6

percent between 2008 and 2009 (from nearly 3.3 million to 3.6 million), and 11.7 percent from 2009 to 2010 (up to 4.0 million).⁶⁴




Note: The total meal counts in Figure VI.10 include congregate and backpack breakfasts, lunches, suppers, and snacks.

Supporting data for Figure VI.10 can be found in Appendix Table E.3.

Ohio distributed 58,702 meals in backpacks, 1.6 percent of the total meals provided statewide in 2011. Figure VI.11 illustrates the number of backpack meals provided by month. More than half of the meals (30,720, or 52.3 percent) were provided in July, with smaller numbers provided in June (17,498, or 29.8 percent) and August (10,484, or 17.9 percent).

⁶⁴ Total meals served include breakfasts, lunches, snacks, suppers, and, for the demonstration site, backpack meals. If multiple meals were included in the same backpack, each one was counted separately.



Note: The total meal counts in Figure VI.11 include breakfasts and lunches.

Supporting data for Figure VI.11 can be found in Appendix Table E.3.

3. Changes in Demonstration Sites vs. Comparison Sites: 2010 to 2011

Since the demonstrations were relatively small, discerning their effect at the State level is difficult. To address this, we compared the demonstration sites to a specified group of comparison sites that are similar to the demonstration sites. In Ohio, the comparison sites (in either the same counties or similar counties) were non-demonstration sites in communities in eight counties that were most similar to the demonstration sites on five factors: population density, per capital income, unemployment rate, percent below poverty, and the proportion that are eligible for free and reduced-price meals. Appendix H illustrates details on comparison group selection and methodology.

For both meals served and July ADA, the existing demonstration sites in Ohio showed remarkably greater increases from 2010 to 2011 than did comparison sites in the State (Figure VI.12 and Table VI.7). For example, total meals served increased 35.8 percent between 2010 and 2011 at demonstration sites compared to a decline of 12.3 percent at comparison sites. July ADA increased 33.5 percent among demonstration sites compared to a decrease of 9.3 percent at comparison sites.




Table VI.7
Backpack Demonstration Sites vs. Comparison Sites in Ohio

	Existing Demonstration Sites* (open 2010 and 2011)			Existing Comparison Sites* (open 2010 and 2011)			New Sites in 2011	Total 2011 Sites
	2010	2011	% Change 2010- 2011	2010	2011	% Change 2010- 2011	2011	2011
Total Meals**	78,777	107,017	35.8%	375,247	329,223	-12.3%	1,091,285	3,742,743
Median Meals per Site	1,580	2,628	66.3%	1,800	1,562	-13.2%	1,287	1,451
July ADA*	1,279	1,707	33.5%	4,493	4,077	-9.3%	14,867	53,432

* Sites open in both 2010 and 2011.

**Includes congregate and backpack meals.

E. SEAMLESS SUMMER MEASURES

The SSO enables SFAs to offer meals (usually at schools) during the summer and over longer schools breaks in areas where at least 50 percent of the students are approved for free or reduced-price school meals. The program reimburses meals at NSLP/SBP rates, which are lower than SFSP reimbursement rates. One possible concern about the backpack demonstrations was that school districts that provide summer meals at schools through the SSO might shift from the SSO to the SFSP demonstrations if they perceived them to be more beneficial or vice versa. This would have resulted in skewed increases or decreases to SFSP meal counts independent of the demonstration project effects. Thus, we reviewed this data to determine if there was evidence that the increases or decreases in State outcomes were due to the SSO (Table VI.8).

In Arizona, the results were mixed. The number of SSO sponsors increased between 2010 and 2011 while the number of SSO sites decreased. Similarly, total meals served increased

by 2.9 percent between 2010 and 2011 while the SSO operating days ADA decreased by 5.5 percent. Still, more SSO meals were served and the operating days ADA in 2011 was higher than in 2008. On balance, there is no evidence of a shift from the SSO to the SFSP in Arizona.

In Kansas, the SSO has been declining the past 4 years, from two sponsors operating four sites in 2008 to one sponsor operating one site in 2009 and none in 2010 (prior to the SFSP demonstrations). Since there were no SSO sponsors in 2010, there is no evidence of any shift from SSO to SFSP in 2011.

In Ohio, the number of SSO sponsors and sites declined by seven and three respectively between 2010 and 2011 (after a sizeable increase between 2009 and 2010). SSO meals and ADA declined by 9.9 percent from 2010 to 2011 and 18.3 percent respectively from 2010 to 2011. It is possible that these sponsors shifted their operations to the SFSP; however, it did not offset the overall decline in meals served in the State (280,114 meals). Additionally, it is not known whether any of these changes were in or near demonstration districts.

Table VI.8
Seamless Summer: Backpack Demonstration States (Statewide)

Seamless Summer Sites												
	Arizona				Kansas				Ohio			
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2008	2009	2010	2011	2008	2009	2010	2011
# of Sponsors	84	83	71	79	2	1	--	--	19	17	60	53
# of Sites	394	390	383	361	4	1	--	--	58	55	113	110
Total Meals Served	1,533,513	1,710,721	1,603,865	1,650,669	18,450	1,708	--	--	83,461	82,060	221,338	199,494
Operating Days ADA	41,438	49,929	47,226	44,647	599.4	80.6	--	--	3,761	3,025	6,410	5,237

F. CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of the demonstration was to provide food for consumption over the weekend, when SFSP sites do not operate, and to boost attendance at SFSP sites when they are open, with meal backpacks as an encouragement to attend. The three States in which the demonstrations were implemented included Arizona, Kansas, and Ohio. Each of the States cited difficulties in reaching children through the SFSP during the summer months. In 2011, the demonstration was implemented by 16 sponsors and 82 sites: 3 sponsors in Arizona, 7 sponsors in Kansas, and 6 sponsors on Ohio.

Comparison Site Results

In each of these States, we compared key outcomes (e.g., percent change in meals served and ADA) in the demonstration sites to the same outcomes in the specially identified comparison sites as well as to all other non-demonstration sites. These comparison sites were either in the same county, if possible—as was the case in Arizona—or in other counties within the State that were most similar on each of five measures associated with food security—as was the case in

Kansas and Ohio. The results suggest that the demonstrations, accompanied by promotional efforts to inform families about them, were highly successful in attracting new students to SFSP.

In each State, there were substantial changes in the percentage of meals served and ADA at the demonstration sites compared with much smaller changes, if any, at both the comparison sites and non-demonstration sites not part of the comparison group. For example, the July ADA increases at the demonstration sites were 147.9 percent in Arizona, 67.7 percent in Kansas, and 33.5 percent in Ohio, versus an increase of 8.9 percent and declines of 2.9 percent and 9.3 percent in the comparison sites respectively by State. Similarly, in Arizona, meals served increased 80 percent at demonstration sites versus 2 percent at comparison sites. In Kansas, demonstration site meals were up 63 percent versus an 8-percent decrease at the comparison sites, while Ohio saw a 36-percent increase in meals at demonstration sites versus a 12-percent decrease in meals at comparison sites. These results suggest that the demonstration sites attracted additional children to the SFSP program in part because they could take home meals for the weekend/days when SFSP sites were not open. This is strong initial evidence of the promise of backpack meals to increase participation in SFSP.

Summary Conclusion

In each State, children attending SFSP sites brought home thousands of meals through backpacks/bags for consumption at home over the weekend. While the demonstrations were localized, operated in a limited number of areas in each State, and were not expected to have statewide effects, they potentially did have a substantial impact on participating SFSP sites. Participating SFSP sites experienced large increases in total meals served and ADA from 2010 (before the demonstration) to 2011. In comparison, total meals and ADA showed little change or decreases at the comparison sites. Again, results should be interpreted with caution, as other potential confounding factors could not be controlled for.

CHAPTER VII: CROSS-PROJECT SUMMARY AND OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

In this second year of the eSFSP demonstrations, a total of eight States planned and successfully implemented four demonstrations. Two demonstrations began in 2010 and ran for two summers, the full term of the demonstrations. Another two demonstrations began in 2011 and were implemented for 1 year. The results for these latter demonstrations are preliminary, as each demonstration will also run for a second year in 2012.

While each demonstration project showed promise, it is important to note that there are many extraneous factors that could influence the estimates shown in this report. It is difficult to disaggregate the effects of the demonstrations from confounding factors that may have impacted demand for the SFSP such as State outreach efforts, local economic factors, and other issues. The results of this demonstration for the year 2012 need to be carefully viewed in that context. Nonetheless, the changes observed are consistent with a generally positive impact of the demonstrations on measures of SFSP service levels. Below is a brief description of the demonstration outcomes.

Extending Length of Operation. The evaluation after the first year provided promising evidence of the ability of the demonstration to attract more children to SFSP sites as measured by statistically significant increases in days open, ADA, and total meals served.⁶⁵ In the second year of the demonstration, however, Arkansas experienced extensive spring flooding, which delayed the opening of numerous SFSP sites until the waters receded and cleanup was completed. Thus, for many sites, 40 days of operation in the summer was not possible. Rather than discontinue the demonstration, Arkansas worked with FNS to arrive at a solution in which sponsors were eligible for the incentive funding if their sites remained open for every possible weekday during the normal summer period except for holidays. Nevertheless, the 2-year review of results at demonstration sites was nearly as promising, showing significant increases in days open and total meals served in demonstration sites compared to non-demonstration sites in Arkansas.

Activity Incentive. The first year of the demonstration received a late start in 2010 due to delayed funding of the meal sites, preventing them from purchasing materials for new activities and implementing the demonstration that year. As a result, there was no detectable significant relationship between meals served/ADA and participation in the demonstration. During the demonstration's second year, however, the positive relationship between participation in the demonstration and the number of meals served was statistically significant, although the relationship between participation and ADA was not when compared to non-demonstration sites.

Meal Delivery. A total of 61,554 meals were delivered in 2011 by four sponsors implementing the demonstrations in rural communities. Tests of a hypothesis that there would be no change in participation at comparison sites (based on a snapshot of sites nearby the demonstration sites) showed no consistent evidence that the deliveries were affecting

⁶⁵ What can be concluded from this 2010 effort is that, when SFSP and TANF funds are provided simultaneously, this combination can result in large gains in SFSP service levels.

participation at those sites. Thus, this seems to indicate that the meal delivery demonstrations reached children that had no or limited access to traditional SFSP sites.

Food Backpacks. A total of 162,787 meals were provided in SFSP backpacks in 2011 across the 16 sponsors that implemented the demonstration. Using non-demonstration sites in similar communities, we compared the increases in meals served and ADA from 2010 to 2011 at the demonstration sites to these similar non-demonstration sites. In each State, there were substantial increases in the meals served and ADA in the demonstration sites compared with much smaller changes, if any, in non-demonstration comparison sites. After just one summer, the food backpack demonstrations show promising evidence of success in increasing the average number of children served each day through the SFSP.

REFERENCES

- Felton & Harley Associates (2006). *Analysis of Summer Food Program and food needs of non-participating children: Final report* (Special Nutrition Program Report Series, Document No. CN-06-SFSP). Prepared by Felton & Harley Associates, Inc. and Westat under Contract No. 43-3198-3-0098. Alexandria, VA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. Retrieved from <http://www.fns.usda.gov/ora/menu/Published/CNP/FILES/SFSPFoodNeeds.pdf>.
- Food Research and Action Center. (2010). *Hunger doesn't take a vacation: Summer nutrition status report*. [Series of reports on participation in the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service summer nutrition programs.] Retrieved from <http://frac.org>.
- Food Research and Action Center. (2011). *Hunger doesn't take a vacation: Summer nutrition status report*. [Series of reports on participation in the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service summer nutrition programs.] Retrieved from <http://frac.org>.
- Food Research and Action Center. (2012). *Hunger doesn't take a vacation: Summer nutrition status report*. [Series of reports on participation in the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service summer nutrition programs.] Retrieved from <http://frac.org>.
- Mathematica Policy Research. (2003). *Feeding low-income children when school is out: The Summer Food Service Program*. Retrieved from <http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/efan03001/efan03001.pdf>.
- Nord, M. (2009). *Food insecurity in households with children: Prevalence, severity, and household characteristics* (U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, Publication No. EIB-56). Retrieved from <http://www.ers.usda.gov/Publications/EIB56/EIB56.pdf>.
- Ohls, J.C., Cavin, E., Kisker, E., Chapman, N., & Homrighausen, J. (1988). *An evaluation of the Summer Food Service Program*. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research.
- U.S. Government Accountability Office. (1980). *Efforts to control fraud, abuse, and mismanagement in domestic food assistance programs: Progress made—more needed*. Retrieved from <http://archive.gao.gov/f0202/112294.pdf>.
- U.S. Government Accountability Office. (1991a). *Readmitting private nonprofit sponsors into the Summer Food Service Program*. Retrieved from <http://archive.gao.gov/d20t9/143984.pdf>.
- U.S. Government Accountability Office. (1991b). *Information on the private sponsors in the 1990 Summer Food Service Program*. Retrieved from <http://archive.gao.gov/d19t9/144867.pdf>.

- U.S. Government Accountability Office. (1998). *Effects of reduced reimbursements on the Summer Food Service Program*. Retrieved from <http://www.gao.gov/assets/230/226577.pdf>.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. (2004). *Evaluation of the 14 State Summer Food Service Program Pilot Project*. Retrieved from <http://www.fns.usda.gov/ora/MENU/Published/CNP/cnp-archive.htm>.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. (2007). *Report to Congress: USDA's Simplified Summer Food Program 2001-2006*. Retrieved from <http://www.fns.usda.gov/ora/MENU/Published/CNP/FILES/SimplifiedSummerSummary.pdf>.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. (2008). *Nationwide expansion of Summer Food Service Program simplified cost accounting procedures*. [FNS memo.] Retrieved from http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/summer/Administration/Policy/2008-2009/SFSP_01-2008-OS.pdf.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. (2009). *Food security in the United States: Key statistics and graphics; State-level prevalence of food insecurity*. Retrieved from http://www.ers.usda.gov/Briefing/FoodSecurity/stats_graphs.htm#geographic.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. (2010). *Summer Food Service Program 2010 administrative guidance for sponsors*. Retrieved from <http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/summer/library/HandBooks/AdminGuideSponsors.pdf>.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. (2011). *Summer Food Service Program data, FY 2011*. Retrieved from http://www.fns.usda.gov/fns/key_data/july-2011.pdf.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. (2012a). *Summer Food Service Program data, 1969-2011*. Retrieved from <http://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/sfsummar.htm>.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. (2012b). *Summer Food Service Program: Frequently asked questions*. Retrieved from <http://www.summerfood.usda.gov/FAQs.htm>.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. (2012c). *Annual summary of Food and Nutrition Service Programs: National School Lunch Program data*. Retrieved from <http://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/annual.htm>.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. (2012d). *National School Lunch Program: Participation and lunches served*. Retrieved from <http://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/slsummar.htm>.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. (2012e). *Summer Food Service Program: Average daily attendance*. Retrieved from <http://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/04sffypart.htm>.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SFSP HISTORY

APPENDIX A: SFSP HISTORY

A brief history/timeline of the SFSP is shown below.

- 1965: SFSP began as a pilot program.
- 1975: SFSP authorized as a permanent program and participation (defined by average daily attendance in July) increased dramatically.
- Late 1970s: Reports of fraud and abuse (particularly among nonprofit sponsors) led to greater oversight of sponsors and restrictions on nonprofit sponsors, leading to a decline in participation (GAO, 1991a, 1991b).
- 1981: The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 prohibited private nonprofit groups (except private schools and residential camps) from serving as sponsors and set a more restrictive income threshold for site eligibility.
- Mid-to-late 1980s through 1990s: Participation increased as a result of USDA and advocates working to publicize the program. Expanding participation became a major policy goal through improving administrative procedures and reducing program operating costs.
- 1996: Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act lowered reimbursement rates and the number of reimbursable meals per day, and eliminated start-up and expansion grants to sponsors. As a result, GAO (1998) showed sponsors substituted less expensive foods, reduced staff wages and reduced the number of sites, but had little impact on number of sponsors or on number of children served.
- 1998: The Child Nutrition Reauthorization Act relaxed restrictions on nonprofit sponsors and streamlined paperwork requirements for experienced sponsors.
- 2001: The Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2001 (P.L. 106-554) authorized SFSP pilot projects to increase the number of participating children in low-participation States. It also enabled some sponsors in several States to be reimbursed at the maximum rate based on the number of meals served, without regard to actual costs and relaxed restrictions on using program funds to pay for operational expenses.
- 2004: The Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 (P.L. 108-265) reduced paperwork for sponsors and families, excluded the military privatized housing allowance as income, and removed transportation barriers in rural areas.
- 2007: The Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2008 (P.L. 110-161) expanded USDA's Simplified Summer Food Program accounting procedures to all SFSP sponsors. This allowed sponsors to be reimbursed on a per-meal basis, to all sponsors in all States nationwide.

APPENDIX B

EXTENDING LENGTH OF OPERATION INCENTIVE DEMONSTRATION DETAILED TABLES

APPENDIX B: EXTENDING LENGTH OF OPERATION INCENTIVE DEMONSTRATION DETAILED TABLES

**Table B.1
Number of SFSP Sites: Length of Operation Demonstration (Arkansas)**

	Number					Percent Change			
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
TOTAL SPONSORS	91	95	110	306	149	4.4%	15.8%	178.2%	-51.3%
TOTAL SITES									
Total Sites		162	235	349	421		45.1%	48.5%	20.6%
New			93	151	226			62.4%	49.7%
Existing			142	198	195			39.4%	-1.5%
Avg. Award per Site				\$1,941.00	\$1,801.75				-7.2%
TOTAL DAYS OPEN (all sites)									
Avg. Days Open		36.9	35.3	33.6	32.7		-4.3%	-4.8%	-2.7%
Median Days Open		24	25	28	39		2.1%	14.3%	-39.3%
TOTAL SITES BY DAYS OPEN (all sites)									
Open ≥ 40 Days		73	94	173	208		28.8%	84.0%	20.2%
Open 30-39 Days		42	67	40	55		59.5%	-40.3%	37.5%
Open 22-29 Days		20	32	48	39		60.0%	50.0%	-18.8%
Open 15-21 Days		17	13	44	54		-23.5%	238.5%	22.7%
Open < 15 Days		10	29	44	65		190.0%	51.7%	47.7%
SITES THAT:									
Increased # of Days Open			69	86	65			24.6%	-24.4%
Maintained # of Days Open			20	38	34			90.0%	-10.5%
Decreased # of Days Open			53	74	96			39.6%	29.7%
New Site Open ≥ 40 Days			28	63	107			125.0%	69.8%
New Site Open < 40 Days			65	88	119			35.4%	35.2%

Table B.1
Number of SFSP Sites: Length of Operation Demonstration (Arkansas)

	Number					Percent Change			
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
DEMONSTRATION SITES									
Total Demonstration Sites				163	200				22.7%
New				58	106				82.8%
Existing				105	94				-10.5%
SITES BY SPONSOR TYPE – DEMONSTRATION SPONSORS									
Government Sponsors				14	17				21.4%
School Sponsors				27	27				0.0%
Other				122	156				27.9%
NON-DEMONSTRATION SITES									
Total Non-Demonstration Sites				184	221				20.1%
New				93	101				11.0%
Existing				93	120				29.0%
SITES BY SPONSOR TYPE – NON-DEMONSTRATION SPONSORS									
Government Sponsors				14	5				-64.3%
School Sponsors				27	68				151.9%
Other				122	148				21.3%

Note: Arkansas did not maintain data at the site level in 2007.

Note: States were not always able to consistently report data across all years. Shaded cells reflect data that are not available for a given year.

Note: Due to weather-related emergencies in early summer 2011, some sites could not open as scheduled. The State changed the requirement to receive demonstration incentive funding from being open 40 days in the summer to being open every weekday during the summer, except for the Fourth of July holiday. We will treat such sites as open 40 days, even if the actual number of days was less than 40.

Table B.2
SFSP Meals Served by Meal Type, Month, and Sponsor Type: Arkansas, Balance of Nation, and Similar States

	ARKANSAS					BALANCE OF NATION				SIMILAR STATES*							
	Number					Percent Change				Percent Change							
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
TOTAL MEALS	957,602	895,950	1,001,669	1,408,363	1,638,910	-6.4%	11.8%	40.6%	16.4%	11.4%	3.3%	-0.3%	-2.8%	18.9%	7.2%	4.9%	2.9%
MEALS BY TYPE																	
Breakfast	355,261	325,279	314,805	465,114	530,143	-8.4%	-3.2%	47.7%	14.0%	15.8%	3.9%	1.2%	-3.7%	46.9%	10.0%	6.7%	4.6%
Lunch	578,174	551,669	644,560	866,124	995,928	-4.6%	16.8%	34.4%	15.0%	12.6%	2.8%	-1.1%	-3.0%	19.2%	7.1%	4.6%	2.0%
Snack	8,570	10,409	15,583	26,145	48,984	21.5%	49.7%	67.8%	87.4%	-0.8%	6.3%	0.9%	-1.7%	-7.2%	4.6%	2.8%	-1.0%
Supper	15,597	8,593	26,721	50,980	63,855	-44.9%	211.0%	90.8%	25.3%	-0.3%	0.9%	0.1%	2.9%	15.7%	-7.7%	13.5%	77.8%
MEALS BY MONTH																	
May	4,251	5,826	1,739	584	0	37.1%	-70.2%	-66.4%	-100.0%								
June	463,989	423,037	455,793	618,226	700,090	-8.8%	7.7%	35.6%	13.2%								
July	427,854	398,336	451,520	616,388	735,208	-6.9%	13.4%	36.5%	19.3%	11.4%	3.3%	-0.3%	-2.8%	18.9%	7.2%	4.9%	2.9%
August	61,508	68,751	92,617	173,165	203,612	11.8%	34.7%	87.0%	17.6%								

Note: Tabulations for the balance of the Nation and similar States are available for July only.

* The "Similar States" included in these calculations are Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming.

Table B.3
SFSP Average Daily Attendance by Sponsor Type: Arkansas, Balance of the Nation, and Similar States

	ARKANSAS					BALANCE OF NATION				SIMILAR STATES*							
	Number					Percent Change				Percent Change							
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011				
Operating Days ADA	15,276	14,268	17,836	26,455	30,869	-6.6%	25.0%	48.3%	16.7%								
July ADA	12,198	11,222	13,226	17,899	22,291	-8.0%	17.9%	35.3%	24.5%	7.4%	2.9%	3.8%	1.8%	13.8%	7.1%	9.6%	5.0%

Note: Tabulations for the balance of the Nation and similar States are available for July only.

* The "Similar States" included in these calculations are Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming.

Table B.4
Participation Rate: Arkansas, Balance of the Nation, and Similar States

	ARKANSAS					BALANCE OF NATION				SIMILAR STATES*							
	Number					Percent Change				Percent Change							
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
July/March Participation Rate	8.0%	7.5%	8.3%	10.1%	11.9%	-6.3%	10.7%	21.7%	17.8%	-1.8%	-7.5%	-4.7%	-4.3%	0.0%	-4.8%	2.3%	-0.1%
July/School Year Participation Rate	8.1%	7.5%	8.1%	10.3%	12.0%	-7.4%	8.0%	27.2%	16.5%	-2.4%	-10.8%	1.1%	-6.0%	-6.7%	-3.5%	3.8%	-4.0%
March NSLP F/RP ADA	226,842	228,595	240,420	250,968	253,375	0.8%	5.2%	4.4%	1.0%								
School Year NSLP F/RP ADA	224,884	230,300	237,900	246,393	251,200	2.4%	3.3%	3.6%	2.0%								

Note: The July/March Participation Rate and the July/School Year Participation Rate represent two methods of calculating summer lunches served as a percentage of school year lunches served. The July/March Participation Rate is calculated by dividing the July ADA [(SFSP lunches for July + NSLP lunches for July)/number of operating days in July] by the NSLP (free and reduced price) ADA for March. The July/School Year Participation Rate is calculated by dividing the July ADA [(SFSP lunches for July + NSLP lunches for July)/number of operating days in July] by the NSLP (free and reduced price) ADA for the whole school year.

* The "Similar States" included in these calculations are Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming.

**Percent change figures may not be computed directly due to rounding.

APPENDIX C

ACTIVITY INCENTIVE DEMONSTRATION DETAILED TABLES

APPENDIX C: ACTIVITY INCENTIVE DEMONSTRATION DETAILED TABLES

**Table C.1
Number of SFSP Sites: Activity Incentive Demonstration (Mississippi)**

	Number of SFSP Sites: Activity Incentive Demonstration (Mississippi)								
	Number					Percent Change			
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
TOTAL SPONSORS	107	103	117	123	125	-3.7%	13.6%	5.1%	1.6%
TOTAL SITES									
Total Sites	321	301	330	363	486	-6.2%	9.6%	10.0%	33.9%
New		55	99	118	229		80.0%	19.2%	94.1%
Existing		246	231	245	257		-6.1%	6.1%	4.9%
Avg. Award per Site				\$3,673.60	\$4,784.86				30.2%
TOTAL DAYS OPEN									
Avg. Days Open	25.3	25.7	27.0	27.7	25.9	1.6%	5.1%	2.6%	-6.5%
Median Days Open	23	24	24.5	28	27.0	4.3%	2.1%	14.3%	-3.6%
Avg. Increase in Days Open		5.8	5.3	6.1	6.5		-8.6%	15.1%	6.6%
Median Increase in Days Open		3	3	5	3		0.0%	66.7%	-40.0%
DEMONSTRATION SITES									
Total Sites Demonstration				39	41				5.1%
New				20	22				10.0%
Existing				19	19				0.0%
DEMONSTRATION SITE ACTIVITIES (FUNDED BY FNS)									
Total Activities				69	93				34.8%
Education/Tutoring/Enrichment				17	16				-5.9%
Recreation/Sports/Games				20	39				95.0%
Arts				17	26				52.9%
Other				15	12				-20.0%

Table C.1
Number of SFSP Sites: Activity Incentive Demonstration (Mississippi)

	Number					Percent Change			
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
NON-DEMONSTRATION SITES									
Total Non-Demonstration Sites				324	445				37.3%
New				98	209				113.3%
Existing				226	238				5.3%
NON-DEMONSTRATION SITE ACTIVITIES									
Total Activities				215	365				69.8%
Education/Tutoring/Enrichment				74	118				59.5%
Recreation/Sports/Games				54	121				124.1%
Arts				38	39				2.6%
Other				45	87				93.3%

Note: Mississippi did not maintain data at the site level in 2007.

Note: States were not always able to consistently report data across all years. Shaded cells reflect data that are not available for a given year.

Note: In 2010, while 39 sites were awarded grant funding (as shown in the table), only 22 spent grant funding (and offered activities using grant money).

Table C.2
SFSP Meals Served by Meal Type and Month: Mississippi, Balance of Nation, and Similar States

	MISSISSIPPI					BALANCE OF NATION				SIMILAR STATES*							
	Number					Percent Change				Percent Change							
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
TOTAL MEALS	1,492,995	1,467,313	1,551,714	1,623,917	1,886,214	-1.7%	5.8%	4.7%	16.2%	11.4%	3.3%	-0.3%	-2.8%	18.9%	7.2%	4.9%	2.9%
MEALS BY TYPE																	
Breakfast	340,867	362,899	382,454	450,424	598,906	6.5%	5.4%	17.8%	33.0%	15.8%	3.9%	1.2%	-3.7%	46.9%	10.0%	6.7%	4.6%
Lunch	1,076,130	1,039,474	1,091,143	1,116,556	1,225,524	-3.4%	5.0%	2.3%	9.8%	12.6%	2.8%	-1.1%	-3.0%	19.2%	7.1%	4.6%	2.0%
Snack	65,058	50,955	65,814	49,694	37,193	-21.7%	29.2%	-24.5%	-25.2%	-0.8%	6.3%	0.9%	-1.7%	-7.2%	4.6%	2.8%	-1.0%
Supper	10,940	13,985	12,303	7,243	24,591	27.8%	-12.0%	-41.1%	239.5%	-0.3%	0.9%	0.1%	2.9%	15.7%	-7.7%	13.5%	77.8%
MEALS BY MONTH																	
May	7,383	4,179	1,007	0	2,897	-43.4%	-75.9%	-100.0%	100.0%								
June	1,134,092	1,123,353	1,150,711	1,157,408	1,316,256	-0.9%	2.4%	0.6%	13.7%								
July	350,371	338,924	398,673	465,093	556,244	-3.3%	17.6%	16.7%	19.6%	11.4%	3.3%	-0.3%	-2.8%	18.9%	7.2%	4.9%	2.9%
August	1,149	857	1,323	1,416	10,817	-25.4%	54.4%	7.0%	663.9%								

Note: Tabulations for the balance of the Nation and similar States are available for July only.

* The "Similar States" included in these calculations are Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming.

Table C.3
SFSP Average Daily Attendance: Mississippi, Balance of the Nation, and Similar States

	MISSISSIPPI					BALANCE OF NATION				SIMILAR STATES*							
	Number					Percent Change				Percent Change							
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011				
Operating Days ADA	41,052	40,098	40,200	41,283	47,374	-2.3%	0.3%	2.7%	14.8%								
July ADA	12,339	10,789	12,553	14,902	17,691	-12.6%	16.3%	18.7%	18.7%	7.4%	2.9%	3.8%	1.8%	13.8%	7.1%	9.6%	5.0%
June ADA **	38,652	38,057	36,983	36,486	39,226	-1.5%	-2.8%	-1.3%	7.5%								

Note: Mississippi's SFSP attendance is at its peak in June; thus, June ADA is shown as well as July ADA. Tabulations for the balance of the Nation and similar States are available for July only.

* The "Similar States" included in these calculations are Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming.

** The June ADA was calculated for Mississippi since June is traditionally the month in which the most SFSP meals are served. Calculating the June ADA uses the same methodology as the July method except it uses the total meals served in June and the number of SFSP operating days in June.

Table C.4
Participation Rate: Mississippi, Balance of the Nation, and Similar States

	MISSISSIPPI					BALANCE OF NATION				SIMILAR STATES*							
	Number					Percent Change				Percent Change							
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
July/March Participation Rate	4.7%	4.2%	4.7%	4.9%	6.2%	-10.6%	11.9%	4.3%	26.5%	-1.8%	-7.5%	-4.7%	-4.3%	0.0%	-4.8%	2.3%	-0.1%
July/School Year Participation Rate	4.6%	4.2%	4.7%	5.0%	6.3%	-8.7%	11.9%	6.4%	26.0%	-2.4%	-10.8%	1.1%	-6.0%	-6.7%	-3.5%	3.8%	-4.0%
March NSLP F/RP ADA	302,799	302,234	311,247	321,521	321,154	0.0%	3.0%	3.3%	0.0%								
School Year NSLP F/RP ADA	309,827	301,709	307,579	315,383	318,318	-2.6%	1.9%	2.5%	.9%								

Note: The July/March Participation Rate and the July/School Year Participation Rate represent two methods of calculating summer lunches served as a percentage of school year lunches served. The July/March Participation Rate is calculated by dividing the July ADA [(SFSP lunches for July + NSLP lunches for July)/number of operating days in July] by the NSLP (free and reduced price) ADA for March. The July/School Year Participation Rate is calculated by dividing the July ADA [(SFSP lunches for July + NSLP lunches for July)/number of operating days in July] by the NSLP (free and reduced price) ADA for the whole school year.

* The "Similar States" included in these calculations are Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming.

**Percent change figures may not be computed directly due to rounding.

APPENDIX D

MEAL DELIVERY DEMONSTRATION DETAILED TABLES

APPENDIX D: MEAL DELIVERY DEMONSTRATION DETAILED TABLES

Table D.1
SFSP Meals Served by Meal Type, Month, and Sponsor Type: Meal Delivery Demonstration States
(Delaware, Massachusetts, and New York)

	DELAWARE							MASSACHUSETTS							NEW YORK						
	Number				Percent Change			Number				Percent Change			Number				Percent Change		
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2008	2009	2010	2011	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2008	2009	2010	2011	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
TOTAL MEALS (CONGREGATE AND DELIVERED)	674,685	833,833	938,801	791,873	23.6	12.6	-15.7	2,335,624	2,413,123	2,464,993	2,511,194	3.3	2.1	1.9	17,333,163	17,150,100	16,855,375	16,615,898	-1.1	-1.7	-1.4
TOTAL MEALS (CONGREGATE AND DELIVERED) BY MEAL TYPE																					
Breakfast	229,675	265,253	292,112	243,132	15.5	10.1	-16.8	676,210	689,456	702,635	742,712	2.0	1.9	5.7	5,589,585	5,625,609	5,539,549	5,439,183	0.6	-1.5	-1.8
Lunch	322,540	411,568	453,728	400,789	27.6	10.2	-11.7	1,380,620	1,416,957	1,460,206	1,483,829	2.6	3.1	1.6	9,349,164	9,182,342	9,020,272	8,973,960	-1.8	-1.8	-0.5
Snack	96,535	110,079	132,178	120,516	14.0	20.1	-8.8	193,456	227,995	233,237	229,674	17.9	2.3	-1.5	476,661	399,413	380,789	438,259	-16.2	-4.7	15.1
Supper	25,935	46,933	60,783	27,436	81.0	29.5	-54.9	85,338	78,715	68,915	54,979	-7.8	-12.4	-20.2	1,917,753	1,942,736	1,914,765	1,764,496	1.3	-1.4	-7.8
TOTAL MEALS (CONGREGATE AND DELIVERED) BY MONTH																					
May	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4,876	--	--	--	-100
June	188,021	221,155	233,214	171,824	17.6	5.5	-26.3	120,396	79,421	115,479	99,926	-34.0	45.4	-13.5	308,097	464,396	805,279	212,976	50.7	73.4	-73.6
July	358,943	437,981	450,541	394,366	22.0	2.9	-12.5	1,518,412	1,593,396	1,533,548	1,515,176	4.9	-3.8	-1.2	10,587,296	10,438,791	9,882,267	9,425,704	-1.4	-5.3	-4.6
August	127,721	174,697	255,046	225,683	36.8	46.0	-11.5	696,816	740,306	815,966	896,092	6.2	10.2	9.8	6,423,467	6,235,388	6,153,649	6,832,168	-2.9	-1.3	11.0
September	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	14,303	11,525	9,304	145,050	-19.4	-19.3	1459
DELIVERED MEALS																					
TOTAL DELIVERED MEALS				32,418							16,402							12,734			
DELIVERED MEALS BY MEAL TYPE																					
Breakfasts				16,209							8,201							6,367			
Lunches				16,209							8,201							6,367			
DELIVERED MEALS BY MONTH																					
May				--							--							--			
June				416							2,724							852			
July				17,164							7,428							5,764			
August				14,838							6,250							6,118			
September				--							--							--			

Table D.2
SFSP Average Daily Attendance: Meal Delivery Demonstration States
(Delaware, Massachusetts, and New York)

	DELAWARE							MASSACHUSETTS							NEW YORK						
	Number				Percent Change			Number				Percent Change			Number				Percent Change		
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2008	2009	2010	2011	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2008	2009	2010	2011	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
Operating Days ADA	1,263	1,368	4,271	1,209	8.3%	212.2%	-71.7%	46,797	49,844	48,274	50,954	6.5%	-3.1%	5.6%	43,160	43,390	42,084	40,992	0.5%	-3.0%	-2.6%
July ADA	7,675	9,804	10,280	9,646	27.7%	4.9%	-6.2%	40,918	42,488	43,009	44,836	3.8%	1.2%	4.2%	264,945	260,094	255,564	258,181	-1.8%	-1.7%	1.0%

Note: ADA based on all meals (congregate plus delivered) in 2011.

Table D.3
Participation Rate: Meal Delivery Demonstration States
(Delaware, Massachusetts, and New York)

	DELAWARE							MASSACHUSETTS							NEW YORK						
	Number				Percent Change			Number				Percent Change			Number				Percent Change		
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2008	2009	2010	2011	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2008	2009	2010	2011	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
July/March Participation Rate	20.6%	23.4%	21.7%	20.6%	13.6%	-7.3%	-5.1%	18.7%	18.0%	17.6%	18.1%	-3.7%	-2.2%	2.8%	27.8%	27.2%	26.0%	25.9%	-2.2%	-4.4%	-0.4%
July/School Year Participation Rate	20.9%	22.1%	22.2%	21.1%	5.7%	0.5%	-5.0%	19.1%	16.8%	18.0%	18.4%	-12.0%	7.1%	2.2%	28.2%	25.0%	26.3%	26.3%	-11.3%	5.2%	0.0%
March NSLP F/RP ADA	44,536	48,272	53,717	56,645	8.4%	11.3%	5.5%	253,106	267,159	283,184	287,296	5.6%	6.0%	1.5%	1,159,087	1,164,624	1,204,131	1,236,757	0.5%	3.4%	2.7%
School Year NSLP F/RP price ADA	44,013	47,646	52,516	55,534	8.3%	10.2%	5.7%	249,036	259,147	275,911	282,495	4.1%	6.5%	2.4%	1,144,225	1,148,836	1,189,678	1,213,911	0.4%	3.6%	2.0%

Note: The July/March Participation Rate and the July/School Year Participation Rate represent two methods of calculating summer lunches served as a percentage of school year lunches served. The July/March Participation Rate is calculated by dividing the July ADA [(SFSP lunches for July + NSLP lunches for July)/number of operating days in July] by the NSLP (free and reduced price) ADA for March. The July/School Year Participation Rate is calculated by dividing the July ADA [(SFSP lunches for July + NSLP lunches for July)/number of operating days in July] by the NSLP (free and reduced price) ADA for the whole school year.

APPENDIX E

FOOD BACKPACK DEMONSTRATION DETAILED TABLES

APPENDIX E: FOOD BACKPACK DEMONSTRATION DETAILED TABLES

**Table E.1
Number of Demonstration SFSP Sites: Food Backpack Demonstration States
(Arizona, Kansas, and Ohio)**

	ARIZONA	KANSAS	OHIO
	Number for 2011	Number for 2011	Number for 2011
TOTAL DEMONSTRATION SPONSORS			
Total Sponsors	3	7	6
DEMONSTRATION SITES			
Total Sites	18	14	50
Total Backpacks Distributed	17,439	9,459	16,570
Total Unique Children Given Backpacks	2,556	1,211	2,920
Avg. Number Meals per Backpack Provided per Single Meal Type*	2.0	2.0	2.0

Note: Unique children given backpacks was estimated by adding up the highest ADA for the summer for each site.

** This measure assumes backpacks only contain either breakfast or lunch, but not both.*

Table E.2
2011 SFSP Demonstration Sponsors: Food Backpack Demonstration States
(Arizona, Kansas, and Ohio)

Sponsor Name	Number of Sites	Total Number of Backpacks	Total Number of Unique Children Given Backpacks	Avg. Number of Meals per Backpack
ARIZONA				
Chandler Unified School District	7	8,957	1,283	2
Litchfield Elementary School District	9	6,343	975	1.8
Mesa Public Schools	2	2,139	298	3
KANSAS				
Arkansas City Public School District	1	563	144	2
Central Unified School District (Burden)	4	587	96	2
Gardner Edgerton School District	1	1,050	150	2
Lawrence Public Schools	5	5,150	560	2
Topeka Public Schools	1	522	111	4
United Methodist Church (at Wilson Elementary)	1	506	66	2
East Central Kansas Cooperative in Education	1	577	84	2
OHIO				
Andrew's House	1	545	59	2
Ashtabula County Children Services	6	1,933	296	2
Community Action Organization of Scioto County	23	4,106	768	2
Hamilton Living Water Ministry	1	862	122	3
Hocking Athens Perry Community Action Agency	16	7,053	1,435	2
Whole Again International	3	2,071	240	2

Note: Unique children given backpacks was estimated by adding up the highest ADA for the summer for each site.

Table E.3
SFSP Meals Served by Meal Type, Month, and Sponsor Type: Food Backpack Demonstration States
(Arizona, Kansas, and Ohio)

	ARIZONA							KANSAS						OHIO							
	Number				Percent Change			Number				Percent Change		Number				Percent Change			
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2008	2009	2010	2011	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2008	2009	2010	2011	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
TOTAL MEALS (CONGREGATE AND BACKPACK)	1,135,755	1,274,884	1,603,582	2,076,375	12.2%	25.8%	29.5%	592,530	766,969	724,209	861,102	29.4%	-5.6%	18.9%	3,286,678	3,601,201	4,022,857	3,742,743	9.6%	11.7%	-7.0%
TOTAL MEALS (CONGREGATE AND BACKPACK) BY TYPE																					
Breakfast	365,629	404,422	496,757	626,935	10.6%	22.8%	26.2%	219,711	205,929	186,393	216,506	-6.3%	-9.5%	16.2%	699,667	751,599	996,466	922,414	7.4%	32.6%	-7.9%
Lunch	681,031	726,115	910,399	1,240,398	6.6%	25.4%	36.2%	532,625	521,987	500,629	605,260	-2.0%	-4.1%	20.9%	2,197,909	2,406,130	2,548,146	2,401,829	9.5%	5.9%	-5.7%
Snack	46,699	83,753	113,888	90,478	79.3%	36.0%	-20.6%	31,516	29,807	29,013	30,668	-5.4%	-2.7%	5.7%	261,337	306,924	331,635	292,317	17.4%	8.1%	-11.9%
Supper	42,396	60,594	82,538	118,564	42.9%	36.2%	43.6%	6,678	9,246	8,174	8,668	38.5%	-11.6%	6.0%	127,765	136,548	146,610	126,183	6.9%	7.4%	-13.9%
TOTAL MEALS (CONGREGATE AND BACKPACK) BY MONTH																					
May	34,311	12,298	22,784	7,195	-64.2%	85.3%	-68.4%	2,893	4,198	2,247	4,132	45.1%	-46.5%	83.9%	845	--	--	214	n/a	n/a	n/a
June	820,842	876,892	1,020,946	1,340,497	6.8%	16.4%	31.3%	507,064	483,767	465,722	539,332	-4.6%	-3.7%	15.8%	1,098,900	1,232,926	1,371,499	1,397,033	12.2%	11.2%	1.9%
July	253,919	351,081	526,160	680,247	38.3%	49.9%	29.3%	277,436	273,120	245,643	306,528	-1.6%	-10.1%	24.8%	1,634,271	1,810,844	1,957,766	1,653,729	10.8%	8.1%	-15.5%
August	26,683	34,613	33,692	48,436	29.7%	-2.7%	43.8%	3,137	5,884	10,597	11,110	87.6%	80.1%	4.8%	552,664	557,431	693,592	691,767	0.9%	24.4%	-0.3%
BACKPACK MEALS																					
TOTAL BACKPACK MEALS				79,795							24,290							58,702			
BACKPACK MEALS BY TYPE																					
Breakfasts				25,905							5,461										22,114
Lunches				53,890							18,829										34,002
BACKPACK MEALS BY MONTH																					
May				288							--										--
June				46,789							11,214										17,498
July				32,718							12,036										30,720
August				--							1,040										10,484

Note: In Ohio, a few sites also provided snacks in the backpacks. The number of snacks provided is not shown in the table.

Table E.4
SFSP Average Daily Attendance: Food Backpack Demonstration States
(Arizona, Kansas, and Ohio)

	ARIZONA							KANSAS						OHIO							
	Number				Percent Change			Number				Percent Change		Number				Percent Change			
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2008	2009	2010	2011	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2008	2009	2010	2011	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
Operating Days ADA	26,856	28,699	33,860	47,011	6.9%	18.0%	38.8%	18,259	17,395	16,982	21,038	-4.7%	-2.4%	23.9%	68,757	77,124	79,336	75,292	12.2%	2.9%	-5.1%
July ADA	6,955	8,712	13,917	20,190	25.3%	59.7%	45.1%	8,533	8,650	8,415	11,053	1.4%	-2.7%	31.3%	50,154	56,548	59,108	53,432	12.7%	4.5%	-9.6%

Note: ADA based on all meals (congregate plus delivered) in 2011.

Table E.5
Participation Rate: Food Backpack Demonstration States
(Arizona, Kansas, and Ohio)

	ARIZONA							KANSAS						OHIO							
	Number				Percent Change			Number				Percent Change		Number				Percent Change			
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2008	2009	2010	2011	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2008	2009	2010	2011	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
July/March Participation Rate	6.4%	5.7%	6.8%	7.8%	-10.9%	19.3%	14.7%	6.2%	5.9%	5.3%	6.4%	-4.8%	-10.2%	20.8%	10.8%	11.3%	10.8%	9.8%	4.6%	-4.4%	-9.3%
July/School Year Participation Rate	6.4%	5.7%	6.9%	7.9%	-10.9%	21.1%	14.5%	6.3%	5.9%	5.3%	6.4%	-6.3%	-10.2%	20.8%	10.8%	11.2%	11.1%	9.9%	3.7%	-0.9%	-10.8%
March NSLP F/RP ADA	428,372	462,271	495,435	489,558	7.9%	7.2%	-1.2%	166,922	175,731	191,641	196,274	5.3%	9.1%	2.4%	576,425	619,975	671,295	681,002	7.6%	8.3%	1.4%
School Year NSLP F/RP price ADA	427,654	454,237	485,780	485,138	6.2%	6.9%	-0.1%	166,121	176,197	189,756	196,429	6.1%	7.7%	3.5%	574,376	614,662	655,299	671,767	7.0%	6.6%	2.5%

Note: The July/March Participation Rate and the July/School Year Participation Rate represent two methods of calculating summer lunches served as a percentage of school year lunches served. The July/March Participation Rate is calculated by dividing the July ADA [(SFSP lunches for July + NSLP lunches for July)/number of operating days in July] by the NSLP (free and reduced price) ADA for March. The July/School Year Participation Rate is calculated by dividing the July ADA [(SFSP lunches for July + NSLP lunches for July)/number of operating days in July] by the NSLP (free and reduced price) ADA for the whole school year.

APPENDIX F

EXAMPLE CALCULATION OF AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE

APPENDIX F: EXAMPLE CALCULATION OF AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE

Below, we provide an example of the methodology used by FNS for calculating the average daily attendance (ADA) as shown in Chapter I, Section B of this report. Average daily attendance is estimated using meals served to approximate the average daily number of children receiving SFSP meals at eligible SFSP program sites. The data for this calculation are obtained directly from State administrative data.

There are two ways that FNS has presented ADA; these measures are not directly comparable due to the different methods of calculation. Each of these measures is described below.

Operating Days (site-level) ADA. This method yields the average number of children receiving SFSP meals per day across all of the operating days in the entire summer. The measure is calculated at the site level and summed across all sites in the State. For each SFSP site, this “summer” ADA is computed by dividing the number of “first” meals served⁶⁶ for the largest sitting—breakfast, lunch, or supper⁶⁷—by the total number of operating days over the summer. This figure is rounded to the nearest integer value and the ADA is summed across all SFSP sites in the State.

July (State-level) ADA. This method yields the number of children receiving SFSP meals on an average day in July. The ADA can vary greatly by month by State, so all States are often compared using 1) lunch data from the month of July (the summer month during which States typically serve the most SFSP meals) and 2) an estimated number of operating days, equal to the number of non-holiday weekdays in July. For the State, the total number of SFSP “first” lunches served in July (across all sites) is divided by a standard number of operating days in July across the Nation (e.g., the total number of non-holiday weekdays in July).⁶⁸ *Note: Very few sites actually operate for the entire number of working days in July. As such, although this estimate allows comparisons across States, it also makes the estimate of the July ADA less reliable as a State-specific measure.*

An example of both methods of calculation is illustrated below for one hypothetical in Table F.1 below.

⁶⁶ SFSP participants can have second and third servings, but only the number of first servings is included in calculating the ADA. SFSP reimburses for a limited number of second meals.

⁶⁷ For example, if there were 2,000 1st meals for lunch and 1,000 1st meals for breakfast, then the largest sitting would be lunch.

⁶⁸ For example, this assumes that all participants are served for 21 weekdays in July 2011 (not counting the Fourth of July holiday).

Table F.1
Example Data from Site XYZ Upward Bound

Site Name	June Meals				July Meals			
	# of Days Open	# of Breakfast Meals	# of Lunches	# of Suppers	# of Days Open	# of Breakfast Meals	# of Lunches	# of Suppers
XYZ Upward Bound	27	897	870	895	17	627	589	585

Operating Days Measure:

At this site, the largest meal served over the 2-month period was breakfast—where 1,520 meals were served—as compared to lunch, where 1,459 meals were served, and supper where 1,480 meals were served. As such, this measure uses the meals served at breakfast to calculate ADA. The measure is calculated as:

$$\text{Estimated ADA (based on operating days)} = \frac{897+627}{27+17} = 35 \text{ children}$$

July Measure:

This measure uses lunches served in July to approximate the ADA. During this year, FNS estimated the number of operating days in July equal to 21. Thus, at this site, the measure is calculated as:

$$\text{Estimated July ADA} = \frac{589}{21} = 28 \text{ children}$$

Altogether, there are different ways in which the operating days ADA (calculated across the entire summer) is different from the July ADA (calculated for lunches in July). These differences include the following:

1. Lunch may not have the highest meal count (in terms of type of meals served).
2. July may not be the month with the highest meal count.
3. The estimated number of SFSP operating days in July (typically, this is a standard number averaged across the United States) does not reflect the actuality in the State (e.g., the average of all sites’ operating days in July for a particular State).

National Databank ADA:

The SFSP ADA produced for the Food and Nutrition Service’s National Databank (NDB) is calculated by summing the total number of first meals served during a sponsor’s primary meal service (usually lunch) during July, and dividing that number by the number of operating or meal service days for July. Although FNS provides this definition as guidance, each State is responsible for the calculation and submission of its ADA and there is variation in the application of the definition. As a result of these differences, it is difficult to compare the State-reported ADA numbers in the NDB, both across States and to ADA estimates from other sources.

APPENDIX G

EXAMPLE CALCULATION OF NSLP FREE AND REDUCED-PRICE AVERAGE DAILY PARTICIPATION DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR

APPENDIX G: EXAMPLE CALCULATION OF NSLP FREE AND REDUCED-PRICE AVERAGE DAILY PARTICIPATION DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR

Below, we provide an example of the methodology used by FNS for calculating the denominator of the participation ratio shown in Chapter I, Section B of this report (i.e., the average daily number of children receiving NSLP free and reduced-price meals during the school year). The data for this calculation is obtained from monthly data reported to FNS by States on OMB Form 0584-002, entitled “Report of School Operations.” This form contains data including the total number of NSLP lunches served (broken down by paid, reduced price, and free) along with the average daily number of lunches served.⁶⁹ However, the data do not contain the NSLP average daily number of *free and reduced-price* lunches served. As such, FNS calculates this information for each month and averages it over the entire school year.⁷⁰ The method for calculating this information is illustrated below.

First, the number of operating days each month is estimated. Since the number of operating days varies across schools and SFAs within a State, FNS does not require the States to compile and submit this information on OMB Form 0584-002. Instead, FNS calculates the number of operating days for each month using the average daily number of NSLP lunches served given to FNS by the States (Column C, Table G.1). For each State, the number of operating days in a school year (across all schools) is calculated separately for each of the 9 school-year months. The formula is based on total NSLP lunches served, including free, reduced price, and paid, as:

Operating days (month A)

$$= \frac{\text{Total number of NSLP lunches served (month A)}}{\text{Average number of NSLP lunches served per day (month A)}}$$

Second, the average daily number of NSLP free and reduced-price lunches served is calculated as:

Average number of NSLP free and reduced-price lunches served per day (month A)

$$= \frac{\text{Total number of NSLP free and reduced price lunches served (month A)}}{\text{Number of operating days (month A)}}$$

This yields an average daily lunch count for NSLP free and reduced-price meals each month (which is not available in the FNS data).

Third, a 9-month average is obtained by summing the average daily number of free and reduced-price lunches served per month (between October and May and during September of the following year) and dividing by nine. Last, this school-year average is divided by an attendance

⁶⁹ Note that the individual components of this average are not submitted on this form. States report all lunches served in the NSLP, including all lunches served in SFAs that qualify the State for additional payment.

⁷⁰ This method has long been used by FNS to calculate NSLP free and reduced-price participation from the NDB. Additionally, the method has been detailed in previous USDA Reports to Congress. For more information, please see Appendix C of the 2007 report entitled “Report to Congress: USDA’s Simplified Summer Food Program: 2001-2006” (USDA, 2007).

factor of 0.927 to adjust for attendance to achieve the average daily number of children receiving NSLP free and reduced-price meals during the school year.⁷¹

An example of this calculation is shown in Table G.1 below.

Table G.1
Example Calculation of Denominator of Participation Ratio

	<u>Column A</u>	<u>Column B</u>	<u>Column C</u>	<u>Column D</u>	<u>Column E</u>
	NSLP total lunches served	NSLP average daily number of lunches served	Estimated operating days (Column A/ Column B)	NSLP total free and reduced-price lunches served (excludes paid)	NSLP average daily number of free and reduced-price lunches served (Column D/ Column C)
October	629,075	29,232	21.5	369,476	17,169
November	530,713	29,223	18.2	313,826	17,280
December	405,227	28,608	14.2	239,382	16,900
January	535,955	28,693	18.7	316,116	16,924
February	533,401	28,696	18.6	321,181	17,279
March	485,451	28,576	17.0	290,359	17.092
April	585,810	28,917	20.3	353,035	17,427
May	555,525	27,734	20.0	335,146	16,732
September (following year)	598,904	29,082	20.6	364,191	17,685
Average Daily Participation (9-month average)					17,165
Average Daily Participation (9-month average divided by 0.927)					18,517

⁷¹ Note that the March ADA calculation also uses the 0.927 factor to adjust for attendance.

APPENDIX H

WAVE 2 DEMONSTRATIONS COMPARISON GROUP SELECTION METHODOLOGY

APPENDIX H: WAVE 2 DEMONSTRATIONS COMPARISON GROUP SELECTION METHODOLOGY

The 2010 Evaluation Report on the Extending Length of Operation demonstration in Arkansas and Activity Incentive demonstration in Mississippi used selected similar States as the comparison group. These similar States (Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming) are States that were eligible for the demonstrations due to low rates of food security and participation in Summer Food Service Programs but were not selected to participate in the Wave I SFSP enhancement demonstrations. The same similar States are again used as the comparison group in the current report for the final year of demonstrations in Arkansas and Mississippi.

The Wave 1 comparison groups (comprised of similar States) are not appropriate for the Food Backpack and Meal Delivery projects because these demonstrations were not implemented statewide but instead were operated at the localized level. This is particularly true for demonstrations in rural areas where, by definition, populations are small. It is possible that even the most successful demonstration would show no effect at the statewide level. FNS and Insight explored using comparison groups at the Core Based Statistical Area (a term that describes areas around an urban cluster, including Metropolitan Statistical Areas and Micropolitan Statistical Areas) and the county levels, but these areas present the same issue of potentially masking any effects of the demonstrations in relatively small demonstration areas.

It was decided that the appropriate level of comparison for both Wave II enhancement demonstrations would be to examine changes at the SFSP site level. The method for determination of the comparison sites differed between the two types of demonstrations, as described below.

Food Backpack. For the Food Backpack projects, the primary research question is whether providing backpacks would increase participation at the SFSP sites that implemented the demonstrations from the prior year. As a quasi-control, the evaluation would assess the change in participation and meals served in “similar” traditional SFSP sites that serve as the comparison group. This group would be comprised of either sites within the same county/counties as those in which demonstration sites were located and/or sites selected from demographically similar counties.

The decision rules for selection of Backpack demonstration comparison sites are as follows:

1. Identify demonstration sites within each of three States (Arizona, Kansas, and Ohio) that also operated in 2010.
2. To select comparison sites, identify non-demonstration sites within the same county as the demonstration site(s) that existed in both 2010 and 2011.
3. If comparison sites did not exist within all or some demonstration counties, non-demonstration sites that operated in 2010 and 2011 would be selected from demographically similar counties within the same State, starting with those that are most similar (shortest distance statistically). These counties were ranked using the Distance procedure in SAS that computes the standardized measures of statistical distance or

similarity between the observations (rows) of a data set. The dataset contained county level measures that are often cited as being associated with household food security and to each other⁷²—population density, median household income, percent below poverty, unemployment rate (from U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey and Population Estimates),⁷³ and percent who are eligible for free and reduced-price lunches (from Department of Education’s Common Core of Data).⁷⁴

4. In the case that similar counties are also demonstration counties, comparison sites will be selected from the next statistically similar county that is not a demonstration county.
5. To determine how many sites to select from these similar counties, the following criteria are applied:
 - The sites should be within defined geographic units, in this case counties.
 - Select all comparison (non-demo) sites that were open in 2010 from the next demographically similar county. Compare 2010 meal counts; if total meals served in comparison sites are comparable or more than those in total demonstration sites, stop there.
 - If 2010 meal counts for the comparison group is less than in demonstration sites, expand to select from next similar county (two counties total) until meal counts are comparable or exceed those in the demonstration site.
6. Demonstration sites and comparison sites for each State were pooled together respectively to assess of change in ADA and meals served from the previous year (2010).

**Number of Demonstration and Comparison
(Non-Demonstration) Sites in Backpack States**

States	Demonstration Sites	Comparison Sites
Arizona	18	327
Kansas	14	23
Ohio	50	368

Meal Delivery. The SFSP sites that serve as comparison groups for the meal delivery demonstrations in Delaware, Massachusetts, and New York were selected through a different procedure than was used for the Food Backpack States. Because the meals were either delivered to actual residences or dropped off and picked up at locations that were not SFSP sites, using the same criteria for selection and comparison of non-demonstration SFSP sites does not provide any meaningful comparisons.

Thus, for Meal Delivery States, FNS mapped out all of the SFSP sites in the States as well as the location of the dropoff sites and selected the SFSP sites that were nearest geographically to the demonstration area. The changes in participation (as measured by average daily attendance, or ADA) from 2010 to 2011 at these sites were examined for two purposes: 1)

⁷² Coleman-Jensen, A., Nord, M., Andrews, M., & Carlson, S. (2011). Household Food Security in the United States in 2010 (ERR-125). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Economic Research Service.

⁷³ U.S. Census Bureau. (2012, February 16). American FactFinder. Retrieved 2.25.12 from <http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>.

⁷⁴ U.S. Department of Education. (2011, April). NCES Common Core of Data Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey: School Year 2009-10. Retrieved 3.2.12 from <http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/pubschuniv.asp>.

to provide a visual example of how far these comparison sites are from these rural areas (which shows the need for the meal deliveries), and 2) to test/explore the research question that asks if participation at these nearest sites would be affected by the meal deliveries. The hypothesis is that there would be no change in ADA from 2010-2011 because the children who receive meals via the delivery demonstration live too far from these traditional SFSP sites. Decision rules for selection of Meal Delivery demonstration comparison sites are as follows:

1. Identify the “demonstration” locations within the State. These demonstration sites are not SFSP sites, but rather dropoff locations or actual residences.
2. Map out all addresses (street number, street name, ZIP Code) of demonstration and non-demonstration sites in the State.
3. Using the mapped results, select closest non-demonstration sites for each demonstration location within the State. To control for trends in ADA, the comparison site must have operated from 2008 to 2011. The number of comparison sites to select depends on mapping results. Because the locations of meal delivery dropoff sites will be in rural areas of the State, there should not be a great number of traditional SFSP sites in the same area.
4. Examine each comparison site separately in assessing change in ADA from previous years.

**Number of Demonstration and Comparison
(Non-Demonstration) Sites in Meal Delivery States**

States	Delivery/Drop-off (Demo) Areas*	Comparison Sites
Delaware	5	6
Massachusetts	3	1
New York	11	6

**Delivery locations and routes were typically clustered in certain rural areas based on the location of the sponsor; the exception is Delaware where one sponsor dropped off meals at six locations throughout the State.*



Insight Policy Research, Inc.
1901 North Moore Street
Suite 204
Arlington, VA 22209

www.insightpolicyresearch.com