



Afterschool Suppers: A Snapshot of Participation

2020 Afterschool Nutrition Report

October 2020 ■ www.FRAC.org



Afterschool Suppers: A Snapshot of Participation

October 2020

Acknowledgments

This report was prepared by Clarissa Hayes, Crystal FitzSimons, and Allyson Pérez of the Food Research & Action Center (FRAC).

FRAC gratefully acknowledges support of its work to expand and improve the Afterschool Nutrition Programs from the following:

- National Dairy Council/Dairy Management, Inc.;
- National League of Cities Institute;
- National Recreation and Park Association;
- Walmart.org; and
- YMCA of the USA.

General support of FRAC's work to expand and improve the Afterschool Nutrition Programs has been provided by the following:

- Annie E. Casey Foundation;
- Anonymous Donor;
- The From Now On Fund of the Tides Foundation;
- General Mills Foundation;

- Nourishing Neighbors, a program of the Albertsons Companies Foundation;
- The JPB Foundation; and
- Kellogg Company Fund.

About FRAC

The Food Research & Action Center (FRAC) is the leading national organization working for more effective public and private policies to eradicate domestic hunger and undernutrition. For more information about FRAC, Afterschool Nutrition Programs, or to sign up for FRAC's *Weekly News Digest*, or *Meals Matter* newsletter, visit frac.org.



Executive Summary

The Afterschool Nutrition Programs,¹ in normal times, provide funding to serve suppers and snacks to children alongside educational and enrichment programming, helping to reduce childhood hunger in low-income communities and support the establishment and sustainability of afterschool programs. While funding for afterschool suppers² has only been available nationwide for 10 years, steady progress has been made in that short time as a result of aggressive and strategic expansion efforts on the national, state, and local level. More children are being drawn into afterschool programs that keep them safe, learning, and well-nourished in the hours after the school day has ended.

This report analyzes national and state participation in the Afterschool Nutrition Programs in October 2019 when compared to participation in October 2018.

Key Findings

- Over 1.4 million children participated in the Afterschool Nutrition Programs on an average day in October 2019.
- Participation in afterschool suppers increased by more than 86,900 participants in October 2019 when compared to October 2018.
- In October 2019, just 6.6 children received an afterschool supper for every 100 low-income children who participated in the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) during the same month; more than 21 million children participated in NSLP in October 2019.

When schools and afterschool programs across the country shuttered in the spring due to the pandemic,

the Afterschool Nutrition Programs played a critical role in providing much-needed suppers and snacks as millions of students lost access to school meals. Along with the Summer Nutrition Programs — which took the place of the School Breakfast Program and NSLP — afterschool suppers and snacks ensured that children had continued access to up to three meals and a snack per day, despite schools being closed. At the end of February, the Food Research & Action Center (FRAC) weighed in with the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), and began working with Congress to ensure that key waivers necessary to support access to meals through the child nutrition programs would be issued, and FRAC led efforts to extend those waivers. Those waivers issued in March by USDA provided the flexibility that was needed for schools and out-of-school time programs (such as YMCAs, Boys & Girls Clubs, and parks and recreation centers) to provide suppers and snacks safely by allowing meals to be picked up and taken home, instead of eaten onsite alongside enrichment activities. USDA's timely leadership in issuing these waivers gave program operators the ability to adapt quickly and to pivot smoothly in order to meet the unprecedented need.

As communities continue to respond to COVID-19, one thing is increasingly clear: the school day and out-of-school time hours will look very different this school year. Across the country, schools are planning and redesigning how learning will take place, with many districts implementing a range of virtual learning, staggered schedules, and hybrid models of virtual and in-classroom instruction. As a result, the hours that children are “out of school” will increase, and afterschool programs will be more essential than ever.

¹ In this report, the Afterschool Nutrition Programs include the Child and Adult Care Food Program At-Risk Afterschool Supper and Snack Program and the National School Lunch Program Afterschool Snack Program. The term “At-Risk” is used by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and state agencies to describe the Child and Adult Care Food Program Afterschool Supper and Snack Program included in this report. The Food Research & Action Center does not normally use this term, but is using USDA's term in the description of the programs for clarity.

² Federal funding for afterschool snacks has been available since 1998.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY CONTINUED

While the reach of afterschool suppers has seen steady growth over the last decade, the fact remains that these programs were falling short of meeting the need before the pandemic and without the inherent challenges that reaching children during an ongoing public health crisis presents. As states move into phases of reopening and recovery, it is critical that the Afterschool Nutrition Programs maintain the important gains they've made to date.

To keep momentum and to lay the foundation for reaching more children with afterschool suppers and snacks during COVID-19 and beyond, USDA has issued and extended waivers that allow the Afterschool Nutrition Programs to adapt and respond to the new normal that has been created by the pandemic. To date, USDA has extended waivers through the 2020–2021 school year. These waivers allow afterschool snacks and suppers to be consumed offsite, provide flexibility around meeting the enrichment activity requirement virtually or at home, and eliminate the area eligibility requirements to allow for additional meal sites.

However, more long-term policy improvements also should be implemented so that the Afterschool Nutrition Programs are able to meet the growing need. One key proposal is to allow all sponsors the opportunity to provide meals year-round through the rules of the Summer Food Service Program, which is less administratively burdensome than the Child and Adult Care Food Program. Additionally, lowering the area eligibility threshold that sites must meet from 50 percent (which was critical for the Summer Nutrition Programs to meet the need in the spring) would help ensure that low-income children across the country are receiving the healthy afterschool nutrition they need.

Significant investments on the federal, state, and local level also are needed to create more opportunities



for enrichment programs, which provide an important foundation for afterschool meals, and will be necessary to counter the educational inequities that the pandemic is amplifying.³ Out-of-school time programming was hit hard by COVID-related closures, and it will take additional support and funding to ensure that these critical services are able to rebound. The need for additional investments is compounded by the fact that funding for afterschool programming was already failing to fill the gap before the pandemic.

While it will be some time before schools and afterschool programs return to normal operations, children can and should have access to afterschool suppers and snacks. Schools, for example, can leverage the existing flexibilities and ensure that suppers and snacks are part of the nutritional support they are providing to children learning remotely, which also allows them to draw down additional reimbursement and support overall operations. It will take continued innovation and increased investment, but USDA; state agencies; and anti-hunger, afterschool, and child advocates can work together to expand the reach of the Afterschool Nutrition Programs in the current school year and well after.

³ McKinsey & Company. (2020). *COVID-19 and student learning in the United States: The hurt could last a lifetime*. Available at: <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/public-and-social-sector/our-insights/covid-19-and-student-learning-in-the-united-states-the-hurt-could-last-a-lifetime#>. Accessed on September 23, 2020.

About This Report

This report measures the reach of the Afterschool Nutrition Programs, which include the Afterschool Supper Program and the Afterschool Snack Programs. The Afterschool Supper Program is funded through the federal Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP); the Afterschool Snack Programs are funded through both CACFP and the federal National School Lunch Program (NSLP).⁴ This report focuses on participation in October 2019, with comparisons to October 2018, nationally and in each state. Based on a variety of metrics, this report examines trends and the impacts of policies on participation in the programs.

The focus in particular is on afterschool supper participation through CACFP, using the extent of free and reduced-price school lunch participation in NSLP in October as a benchmark against which to compare afterschool supper participation. Because there is broad participation in the regular school-year lunch program by low-income students across the states, this is a useful comparison by which to measure how many students are and could be benefiting from the Afterschool Supper Program.

The Food Research & Action Center (FRAC) sets the goal of reaching 15 children with the Afterschool Supper Program for every 100 low-income children participating in school lunch, and calculates the shortfall in terms of the number of unserved children and the federal dollars lost in October 2019 in each state that is not meeting this goal. In some states, fewer schools meet the area eligibility requirement (at least 50 percent of the students in the elementary, middle, or high school

that is serving the area where the afterschool program is located must be certified to receive free or reduced-price school meals), which can impact the reach of afterschool suppers. FRAC sets a modest goal to help ensure that all states can reach it. Additional information on states' ability to reach this goal can be found in [Afterschool Suppers: A Snapshot of Participation](#) (March 2018).

In addition to afterschool supper participation, this report examines afterschool snack participation through CACFP and NSLP. It also looks at the number of sites (i.e., afterschool programs) providing suppers, snacks, or both through CACFP, and snacks through NSLP. The number of sites is an important indicator of access to afterschool nutrition for low-income children at the state level.

Finally, this report identifies and describes effective strategies for increasing the reach of the Afterschool Supper Program.



⁴ Participation in a separate provision called the CACFP Outside-School-Hours Care Option is not included in the report, due to data limitations. The U.S. Department of Agriculture collects the number of meals served by and site participation data on Child Care Centers. Those data include Outside-School-Hours Care as well as a number of other options within CACFP (mostly participation in meals in early childhood programs). This means that the number of afterschool suppers or snacks provided through Outside-School-Hours Care, or the number of sites operating that program, cannot be specified. Additional information on the methodology can be found in the Technical Notes section.

How the Afterschool Nutrition Programs Work

Two federal Afterschool Nutrition Programs — the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) and the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) — provide funding to serve suppers and snacks to children after the school day ends. The U.S. Department of Agriculture provides the funding for these programs through a state agency in each state, usually the state department of education, health, or agriculture.

The CACFP At-Risk Afterschool Supper and Snack Program reimburses public and private nonprofit schools, local government agencies, and private nonprofit organizations for providing a supper, snack, or both to children 18 years old and younger⁵ who participate in educational or enrichment programming after school, on weekends, and during school holidays throughout the school year.⁶ For-profit centers also may be able to participate if they meet additional requirements. Eligible entities can provide



suppers and snacks at one or multiple sites. For example, a school, park and recreation department, a youth service nonprofit (like a YMCA or a Boys & Girls Club), or a food bank can provide meals, snacks, or both at multiple sites throughout the community. To qualify, each site must be located in the attendance area of an elementary, middle, or high school that has at least 50 percent of its student enrollment certified to receive free or reduced-price school meals. Sites can include schools or nonprofit or government agencies where educational and enrichment activities are offered to children during the school year.

NSLP reimburses public and private nonprofit schools for providing snacks (but not suppers) to children 18 years old and younger who participate in school-sponsored educational or enrichment programming. Schools also can provide the snacks in community programs that they designate as school sponsored or school operated. The afterschool program does not need to be operated by a school or be located on school grounds in order to receive NSLP snacks. Similar to the CACFP At-Risk Afterschool Supper and Snack Program, a site is eligible to participate in NSLP — and have meals reimbursed for all children at the “free” (higher reimbursement) rate — if it is located in the attendance area of a school that has at least 50 percent of its enrollment certified to receive free or reduced-price school meals. If the site is not located in an eligible area, it still can provide snacks through NSLP, but the reimbursement rate is based on the participating children’s eligibility for free or reduced-price school meals.

⁵ Children who turn 19 during the school year are able to continue participating in the Afterschool Nutrition Programs for the remainder of the year.

⁶ Programs operating on weekends or school holidays during the school year can choose to serve breakfast or lunch instead of supper. The Child and Adult Care Food Program breakfast and lunch participation data are not included in this report.

National Findings for October 2019

Participation in afterschool suppers increased by 6.5 percent in October 2019, compared to the previous year. At the same time, afterschool snack participation decreased overall, with National School Lunch Program (NSLP) participation dropping by 5.4 percent, or 65,244 children, and Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) snack participation decreasing by 3.4 percent, or 11,684 children. The combined decrease in snack participation was likely driven by some programs taking the positive step of providing suppers instead of snacks.

- The Afterschool Supper Program served 1,434,344 children on an average weekday in October 2019, an increase of 86,914 children, from October 2018.
- Despite the growth, the Afterschool Supper Program still served only a small fraction of the low-income

students who participated in the free or reduced-price school lunch program in October 2019, reaching just one child for every 15 children who participated in school lunch.

- The Afterschool Snack Programs served just under 1.5 million children; 1,135,427 through NSLP, and 334,553 through CACFP.
- More than 48,000 afterschool programs participated in the Afterschool Nutrition Programs in October 2019, with participation slightly higher in CACFP (27,227 sites) compared to NSLP (20,864 sites).
- There was a 7.3 percent increase in CACFP afterschool sites and a 2.2 percent decrease in NSLP afterschool sites.

State Findings for October 2019

Participation in afterschool suppers varied significantly by state. Some states made great strides to expand the reach of the Afterschool Supper Program, but all states have room to grow in the 2020–2021 school year and beyond.

- In October 2019, the District of Columbia (19.3 to 100) reached the Food Research & Action Center's goal for states to serve supper to at least 15 children for every 100 who participated in the school-day free or reduced-price school lunch program. Two additional states came close to reaching that same goal: California (13.7 to 100) and Vermont (12.4 to 100).
- Ten additional states reached more children with afterschool suppers than the national average of 6.6 to 100: Missouri (9.7 to 100); Texas (9.7 to 100); Oregon (9.0 to 100); Florida (8.6 to 100); Alabama (8.5 to 100); Delaware (7.8 to 100); Nevada (7.3 to 100); Oklahoma (7.2 to 100); Maryland (7.0 to 100); and Tennessee (6.9 to 100).
- Thirty-one states served supper to fewer than one child for every 20 low-income children who participated in school lunch; five of them served

fewer than 2.0 to 100: Wyoming (1.6 to 100); Mississippi (1.3 to 100); Iowa (0.8 to 100); North Dakota (0.6 to 100); and Hawaii (0.4 to 100).

- Comparing October 2019 to October 2018, 36 states moved in the right direction and increased their participation rate in afterschool suppers; 22 of these states increased by more than 10 percent.
- Four states increased the number of children participating in supper by more than 50 percent: Wyoming (177.2 percent); Maine (89.6 percent); Missouri (65.7 percent); and Arizona (53.6 percent).
- Sixteen states saw a decrease in supper participation when comparing October 2018 to October 2019 data; two states dropped by more than 10 percent: New Jersey (-21.3 percent) and Nebraska (-12.3 percent).
- Three large states together served afterschool suppers to more than half of the 1.4 million children who participated nationwide: California (354,746 children); Texas (271,830 children); and Florida (125,741 children).

A History of the Afterschool Nutrition Programs

The Food Research & Action Center (FRAC) turns 50 this year, and throughout its history, FRAC has worked to ensure that children have access to nutritious meals and snacks after school. FRAC led the advocacy efforts to create the Afterschool Nutrition Programs and played a critical role in the implementation and expansion of the new programs. Below are major milestones in the history of the Afterschool Nutrition Programs and FRAC's role in supporting them.

1998 — FRAC worked with Congress to create the **Afterschool Snack Programs** through the National School Lunch Program and the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) to provide funding to serve snacks to children 18 years old and younger at afterschool programs through the William F. Goodling Child Nutrition Reauthorization Act of 1998 (P.L. 105-336).

2000 — FRAC worked with Congress to create the **Afterschool Supper Program** through CACFP to be available in six states (Delaware, Michigan, Missouri, New York, Oregon, and Pennsylvania) through the Agriculture Risk Protection Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-224). FRAC then worked with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, state child nutrition agencies, and anti-hunger advocates to implement the new Afterschool Supper Program in those six states.

2001 — Through the **Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act Fiscal Year 2002 (P.L. 107-76)**, Congress made Illinois the seventh state to serve afterschool supper.

2008 — Through the **2008 Consolidated Appropriations Act (P.L. 110-161)**, Congress made West Virginia the eighth state to serve afterschool supper.

2009 — **The Fiscal Year 2009 Omnibus Appropriations Act (P.L. 111-8)** added Maryland and Vermont to the supper program. That same year, the **Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act Fiscal Year 2010 (P.L. 111-80)** added Connecticut, the District of Columbia, Nevada, Washington, and Wisconsin.

2010 — FRAC led advocacy efforts to expand the Afterschool Meal Program to all states through the **Healthy Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010**. FRAC then worked with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, state child nutrition agencies, anti-hunger and youth-serving advocates, and schools on the nationwide implementation of afterschool meals.

2012 — FRAC partnered with the National League of Cities to create the **Cities Combatting Hunger (CHAMPS) initiative**, which worked with cities to feed over 152,000 children more than 12.5 million meals over the project's duration.

2015 — FRAC provided support and technical assistance to schools and sponsors as the U.S. Department of Agriculture released updates to the **CACFP meal pattern guidelines**.

2018 — FRAC released its first **Afterschool Suppers: A Snapshot of Participation report**, which analyzed participation in the Afterschool Nutrition Programs at the national and state level.

2020 — **COVID-19** has caused school closures and prompted alternative school-learning models to be implemented. Since the beginning of the pandemic, FRAC has been leading advocacy efforts to ensure that children continue to receive school and afterschool meals regardless of a school's operating status. FRAC also has been providing technical assistance to schools and community-based sponsors to support the continued provision of afterschool suppers and snacks.

Missed Opportunities

The Child and Adult Care Food Program provides federal funding to serve suppers at afterschool programs in low-income communities. When states fail to use these funds, children lose the opportunity to receive a nutritious meal, an opportunity they may not have again until school breakfast the next morning. Similarly, afterschool programs miss out on federal funding that would support their financial sustainability and help strengthen their programs.

If every state had served supper to 15 children for every 100 low-income children who participated in school lunch in October 2019, then 1,808,515 additional children would have received a nutritious meal after school, and an additional \$119.5 million in federal funding would have supported the provision of afterschool suppers in October 2019 alone.

Six states each lost out on more than \$5 million in federal reimbursements in October 2019 and failed to serve the most children: Texas (\$9.7 million; 146,459 children); New York (\$8.4 million; 127,340 children); Georgia (\$6.6 million; 100,095 children); Florida (\$6.2 million; 94,600 children); North Carolina (\$5.4 million; 81,907 children); and Pennsylvania (\$5.3 million; 80,319 children).



Child Nutrition Programs During COVID-19

Schools and other community sponsors turned to the Summer Nutrition Programs and Afterschool Nutrition Programs to provide nutritious meals when schools shuttered in response to COVID-19. To overcome some of the barriers to operating the child nutrition programs during a pandemic, the Families First Coronavirus Response Act expanded the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) waiver authority to allow it to issue nationwide waivers, as well as waivers that increase the cost of operating the child nutrition programs. With this authority, USDA implemented a number of nationwide afterschool and summer waivers that have supported access to meals as sites have had to socially distance and respond to the dramatic increase in need.⁷ Below are some of these waivers:

- **Afterschool Activity**, which allowed programs to serve suppers and snacks without providing an enrichment or educational activity;
- **Area Eligibility**, which allowed meals to be offered through the Summer and Afterschool Nutrition Programs at sites that do not meet the 50 percent area eligibility requirement;
- **Meal Times**, which allowed meals to be served outside traditional times to maximize flexibility for meal pick up;
- **Non-Congregate Feeding**, which allowed meals to be served in a non-group setting (i.e., allowing for “grab and go” and delivered meals); and
- **Parent/Guardian Meal Pick-Up**, which allowed parents/guardians to pick up meals for the child without the child being present.

⁷ As of October 8, the Afterschool Activity waiver has not been extended beyond June 30, 2020. The other waivers listed have been extended through June 30, 2021. Stay up-to-date on the [child nutrition COVID-19 waivers](#).

Increasing Participation in the Afterschool Nutrition Programs: COVID-19 and Beyond

Across the country, schools and community sponsors, which are operating the Afterschool Nutrition Programs and are providing out-of-school time programming, are serving families in unprecedented circumstances. In light of virtual school day models and reduced capacity for in-person afterschool programs, many schools and out-of-school time partners are innovating and shifting their operations in order to continue providing enrichment and nutrition, regardless of the physical setting. Lessons that have been learned since the creation of the Afterschool Nutrition Programs can help highlight opportunities to increase participation moving forward.

Policy Opportunities

Streamline the Afterschool Meal Program and Summer Food Service Program

Many community-based organizations and local government agencies operating the Afterschool Meal Program through the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) also serve summer meals to the same children through the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP). This means that sponsors must apply for and operate two distinct programs with different eligibility criteria and program requirements in order to provide meals 365 days a year. Allowing sponsors to operate one program year-round through SFSP would eliminate duplicative and burdensome paperwork while supporting sponsors' efforts to serve more children in their community and to do it better. During COVID-19, schools and sponsors were able to operate both programs simultaneously, ensuring children would receive up to three meals and a snack a day as schools remain closed. This access should be maintained during this ongoing time of unprecedented food insecurity and beyond to better meet children's nutritional needs and provide the same access during the summer as is available during the school year.

Allow School Food Authorities to Serve Suppers Through the National School Lunch Program

Schools can provide only snacks after school through the National School Lunch Program (NSLP), which requires them to operate CACFP to serve a meal instead of just a snack or to feed children on weekends and school holidays. This creates a significant and unnecessary administrative burden for schools. The Afterschool Nutrition Programs should be streamlined to allow schools to provide up to a meal and a snack during the regular school year through NSLP, as allowed through CACFP.

Lower the Area Eligibility Threshold From 50 to 40 Percent

Pre-COVID-19, most afterschool sites qualified by demonstrating that they are located in a low-income area in which at least 50 percent of the children are eligible for free or reduced-price school meals. This eligibility test keeps many communities where poverty is less concentrated, such as rural and suburban areas, from participating. During the pandemic, the U.S. Department of Agriculture took the important step to waive the area eligibility requirement, ensuring families in need would have access to afterschool meals and snacks. As the nation recovers from the pandemic, maintaining this broad access will be critical to supporting children's nutritional needs. Eliminating the eligibility threshold requirement for sites or even taking incremental steps to lower it would improve access to suppers in every state.

Funding for Afterschool Programs

In normal times, afterschool nutrition and afterschool programs are closely interconnected. Afterschool programming not only draws children into safe and engaging learning environments, it also provides an important — and required — foundation for providing federally reimbursable afterschool meals. Historically there has not been enough afterschool programming that

has been available or accessible to low-income families to participate, which results in limited opportunities to expand the Afterschool Nutrition Programs.

The need to increase public (federal, state, and local) and private funding to operate afterschool programs in low-income communities has always been an identified priority, and is one which has only been exacerbated by COVID-19. Although some afterschool programs were able to pivot in the spring to provide virtual programming or to serve children of essential workers, the reality is that the afterschool programs, especially those that serve low-income communities and communities of color, were hit hard by the pandemic, with many organizations losing critically needed funding and resources. This is a concern nationwide: a survey by the Afterschool Alliance in July 2020 found that existing afterschool programs are in jeopardy, with 84 percent reporting concerns that they will not be able to provide services in the fall.⁸ While afterschool programs have received some relief through COVID-19 recovery legislation, it hasn't been nearly enough to counter the impact of the pandemic. Moving forward, additional investments are critical to ensuring the survival of these important programs. In addition to advocating for support in future recovery funding bills, funding must also be increased.

■ **21st Century Community Learning Centers**

(21st CCLC): The federal dollars available through 21st CCLC play an important role in supporting afterschool programs, but do not come close to meeting the need. While over 21 million low-income children could be eligible to participate in 21st CCLC, there is only enough funding to reach 1.7 million children. Until 21st CCLC's funding comes closer to meeting the demand for afterschool programming, many children from low-income communities will remain unserved.

■ **State and local investments:** At the state and local level, only 17 states allocate state funds to support and expand access to afterschool programs, demonstrating an opportunity that exists to prioritize further investment in afterschool programs that serve low-income children. California is leading the way with its After School Education & Safety (ASES) Program that provides \$550 million annually to fund afterschool programs across the state. During COVID-19, many [states](#) used COVID-19 recovery and relief funding to support summer and afterschool programs. More states and localities can take similar steps to expand afterschool programming moving forward.

Conclusion

Afterschool suppers remain an exciting and underutilized opportunity to reduce childhood hunger, draw children into quality afterschool programming, and support working families. The number of afterschool suppers served increased in October 2019, maintaining the trajectory of growth seen since the program became broadly available in 2010. National participation increased by 6.5 percent — more than 86,900 children — from the previous year. This rate of increase was slower than that seen between October 2017 and October 2018 (10.4 percent). This slowing of growth, combined with the new challenges in providing afterschool suppers in the current school

year, demonstrate the urgency of redoubling efforts to expand the reach of afterschool suppers and snacks.

The Afterschool Nutrition Programs and the afterschool community (both programs and advocates) were a critical part of the response to COVID-19 in the spring, and will remain so as communities continue to recover. With food insecurity at unprecedented levels and expected to continue to rise, it will take continued leadership from the U.S. Department of Agriculture — as well as collaboration among state agencies and anti-hunger, afterschool, and child advocates — to ensure that children have access to the afterschool suppers and snacks they need to thrive.

⁸ Afterschool Alliance. (2020). *Afterschool in the Time of COVID-19*. Available at: <http://afterschoolalliance.org/documents/Afterschool-COVID-19-Wave-1-Fact-Sheet.pdf>. Accessed on September 23, 2020.

Technical Notes

The data in this report are collected from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and from a survey of state child nutrition officials conducted by the Food Research & Action Center (FRAC). This report does not include the Afterschool Nutrition Programs in Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, or Department of Defense schools. It also does not include Outside-School-Hours Care Centers (OSHCC), due to data limitations.

Overall afterschool nutrition participation is defined as the sum of average daily participation in the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) At-Risk Afterschool Supper and Snack Program plus average daily participation in the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) Afterschool Snack Program.

The data are based on meals and snacks served in October of each year. FRAC focuses on October because USDA requires states to report CACFP at-risk meal data only every October and March, and focusing on October makes it possible to include the 2019–2020 school year (based on October 2019 reporting) in this report's analysis.

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

Average daily participation in each component of afterschool nutrition — CACFP snacks, CACFP suppers, and NSLP snacks — is based on the number of snacks or suppers served in October of each year divided by each state's average number of serving days in NSLP in October of that year. Year-to-year fluctuations in the number of days of service may cause average daily participation to increase even though the number of meals or snacks served decreased, or vice versa.

USDA obtains the October numbers of sites serving snacks and suppers from the states, and reports them as the states provide them. For this report, FRAC gave states the opportunity to update the October data

on CACFP and NSLP sites, and the total numbers of CACFP suppers and snacks and NSLP snacks that FRAC obtained from USDA. The state changes are included.

Afterschool Suppers and Snacks

USDA provided FRAC with the number of CACFP suppers and snacks and NSLP snacks served in each state in October of each school year. FRAC calculated each state's average daily CACFP supper attendance by dividing the total number of suppers served in October by each state's average number of serving days in NSLP in October.

Similarly, FRAC calculated each state's average daily CACFP snack participation by dividing the total number of snacks served in October by the state's average number of NSLP serving days.

FRAC calculated each state's average daily NSLP snack attendance using the same methodology as for CACFP snack and supper attendance: by dividing the total number of NSLP snacks served in October by each state's average number of NSLP serving days.

NSLP Lunches

FRAC calculated each state's October average daily free and reduced-price school lunch participation by dividing the number of free and reduced-price lunches served in October by each state's average number of October serving days.

Note that USDA adjusts the average daily lunch participation by dividing the average daily lunch participation figures by an attendance factor (0.927) to account for children who were absent from school on a particular day. To ensure comparability between the average daily lunch participation figures and the average daily supper and snack figures for CACFP and NSLP, FRAC does not apply the attendance factor adjustment to the lunch participation estimates.

The Cost of Low Participation

For each state, FRAC calculated the average daily number of children receiving afterschool suppers in October for every 100 children receiving free or reduced-price NSLP lunches in the same month. FRAC then calculated the number of additional children who would be reached if that state achieved a 15-to-100 ratio of afterschool supper participation to free and reduced-price lunch participation. FRAC then multiplied this unserved population by the afterschool supper reimbursement rate, and multiplied this total by the national average number of NSLP serving days in October. FRAC assumed each supper is reimbursed at the standard rate for school year 2019–2020: \$3.41. Reimbursement estimates do not include the additional value of commodities, or cash-in-lieu of commodities, which also are provided by USDA for each supper served.

States' Ability to Meet FRAC's Goal

The number of low-income students who participated in school lunch provides an important baseline for the

need for afterschool meals. The CACFP Afterschool Meal Program's eligibility rules require that at least 50 percent of the students attending the local elementary, middle, or high school serving the area where the afterschool program is located are certified for free or reduced-price school meals. This requirement significantly limits the areas that are eligible to participate, resulting in low-income students in every state not having access to afterschool meals. In addition, the eligibility requirement makes it more difficult for states with lower concentrations of poverty within their schools' enrollment to provide low-income children with afterschool meals.

To ensure that all states could meet FRAC's benchmark, FRAC set a modest goal of providing afterschool meals to 15 children for every 100 receiving a free or reduced-price school lunch during the regular school year through NSLP. FRAC conducted additional analysis that confirmed the target 15-to-100 ratio is achievable by all states. For details, see FRAC's first report on afterschool nutrition programs, [Afterschool Suppers: A Snapshot of Participation](#) (March 2018).

Table 1:**Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) Suppers¹ Compared to Free and Reduced-Price National School Lunch Program (NSLP),² October 2018 and 2019, by State**

State	October 2018				October 2019				Percent Change in Supper ADP
	Supper ADP	Lunch ADP	Ratio ³	Rank	Supper ADP	Lunch ADP	Ratio ³	Rank	
Alabama	32,588	392,426	8.3	6	31,628	371,140	8.5	8	2.9%
Alaska	1,662	41,509	4.0	23	1,644	37,911	4.3	25	-1.1%
Arizona	12,734	476,765	2.7	36	19,564	468,076	4.2	26	53.6%
Arkansas	14,548	245,830	5.9	14	13,397	247,088	5.4	17	-7.9%
California	364,241	2,634,225	13.8	2	354,746	2,596,840	13.7	2	-2.6%
Colorado	5,610	224,403	2.5	39	5,840	217,445	2.7	41	4.1%
Connecticut	5,616	200,609	2.8	34	6,882	204,915	3.4	35	22.5%
Delaware	5,580	66,579	8.4	5	5,142	66,067	7.8	9	-7.9%
District of Columbia	9,756	44,000	22.2	1	9,240	47,949	19.3	1	-5.3%
Florida	119,397	1,483,435	8.0	8	125,741	1,468,942	8.6	7	5.3%
Georgia	24,764	895,963	2.8	34	32,324	882,797	3.7	31	30.5%
Hawaii	259	66,550	0.4	51	282	63,997	0.4	51	9.0%
Idaho	1,947	104,003	1.9	44	1,849	86,052	2.1	45	-5.1%
Illinois	30,687	835,264	3.7	26	30,861	698,729	4.4	24	0.6%
Indiana	10,725	449,850	2.4	41	12,177	456,004	2.7	42	13.5%
Iowa	1,102	194,196	0.6	48	1,505	200,587	0.8	49	36.6%
Kansas	5,078	191,326	2.7	36	5,375	188,820	2.8	40	5.9%
Kentucky	20,164	441,599	4.6	20	24,575	451,505	5.4	16	21.9%
Louisiana	19,427	468,387	4.1	22	18,198	469,410	3.9	28	-6.3%
Maine	1,077	59,311	1.8	45	2,041	56,225	3.6	33	89.6%
Maryland	19,503	305,681	6.4	12	21,549	306,308	7.0	12	10.5%
Massachusetts	10,012	347,082	2.9	33	13,099	353,644	3.7	30	30.8%
Michigan	19,421	601,091	3.2	30	22,473	618,570	3.6	32	15.7%
Minnesota	11,240	288,969	3.9	24	13,854	278,506	5.0	20	23.3%
Mississippi	3,942	307,848	1.3	47	3,943	301,512	1.3	48	0.0%
Missouri	21,133	363,597	5.8	15	35,015	360,932	9.7	5	65.7%
Montana ⁴	1,959	49,509	3.8	25	1,818	47,059	3.9	29	-7.2%
Nebraska	4,433	130,487	3.4	28	3,887	130,750	3.0	37	-12.3%
Nevada	14,512	186,090	7.8	9	14,439	199,125	7.3	10	-0.5%
New Hampshire	1,071	34,591	3.1	31	1,276	32,769	3.9	27	19.1%
New Jersey	24,141	451,214	5.4	17	19,004	394,383	4.8	21	-21.3%
New Mexico	6,662	177,699	3.7	26	8,150	173,667	4.7	22	22.3%
New York	93,857	1,418,932	6.6	11	87,034	1,429,163	6.1	15	-7.3%
North Carolina	16,186	695,354	2.3	43	17,552	663,058	2.6	43	8.4%
North Dakota	190	33,898	0.6	48	214	34,215	0.6	50	12.6%
Ohio	16,623	646,981	2.6	38	17,451	598,435	2.9	39	5.0%
Oklahoma	16,445	289,683	5.7	16	22,905	317,463	7.2	11	39.3%
Oregon	16,941	206,639	8.2	7	17,647	196,013	9.0	6	4.2%
Pennsylvania	23,053	706,270	3.3	29	25,111	702,866	3.6	34	8.9%
Rhode Island	2,335	51,806	4.5	21	2,765	52,923	5.2	19	18.4%
South Carolina	18,197	361,799	5.0	18	18,871	360,753	5.2	18	3.7%
South Dakota	763	49,153	1.6	46	1,021	48,464	2.1	46	33.9%
Tennessee	31,265	485,250	6.4	12	33,551	482,807	6.9	13	7.3%
Texas	231,396	2,725,245	8.5	4	271,830	2,788,591	9.7	4	17.5%
Utah	4,041	158,989	2.5	39	4,467	152,149	2.9	38	10.5%
Vermont	2,796	25,531	10.9	3	3,061	24,643	12.4	3	9.5%
Virginia	21,335	456,270	4.7	19	20,842	463,766	4.5	23	-2.3%
Washington	8,712	356,789	2.4	41	9,271	351,205	2.6	44	6.4%
West Virginia	8,936	130,802	6.8	10	9,867	153,104	6.4	14	10.4%
Wisconsin	9,233	304,598	3.0	32	8,992	298,319	3.0	36	-2.6%
Wyoming	136	24,089	0.6	48	376	23,401	1.6	47	177.2%
US	1,347,430	21,888,165	6.2		1,434,344	21,619,062	6.6		6.5%

¹ Average daily participation in CACFP supper is calculated by dividing the total number of suppers served in October of each year by each state's average number of days of service in NSLP in October.

² Average daily free and reduced-price participation in the National School Lunch Program in October is calculated by dividing the number of free and reduced-price lunches served by each state's average number of days of service in NSLP in October.

³ Ratio of supper to lunch is the average daily number of children participating in a supper program per 100 children participating in free or reduced-price school lunch.

⁴ Montana reported a revised number of CACFP suppers for October 2018.

Table 2:**Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Supper and Additional ADP and Additional Federal Reimbursement¹ if States Reached FRAC's Goal of 15 Supper Participants per 100 National School Lunch Program (NSLP) Participants**

State	Supper ADP, October 2019	Ratio of Supper ADP to NSLP ADP	Total Supper ADP if Supper to NSLP Ratio Reached 15:100	Additional Supper ADP if Supper to NSLP Ratio Reached 15:100	Additional Federal Reimbursement Dollars ¹ if Supper to NSLP Ratio Reached 15:100
Alabama	31,628	8.5	55,671	24,043	\$1,588,302
Alaska	1,644	4.3	5,687	4,043	\$267,056
Arizona	19,564	4.2	70,211	50,648	\$3,345,790
Arkansas	13,397	5.4	37,063	23,667	\$1,563,421
California	354,746	13.7	389,526	34,780	\$2,297,581
Colorado	5,840	2.7	32,617	26,777	\$1,768,897
Connecticut	6,882	3.3	30,737	23,856	\$1,575,915
Delaware	5,142	7.8	9,910	4,768	\$315,006
District of Columbia	9,240	19.3	7,192	met goal	met goal
Florida	125,741	8.6	220,341	94,600	\$6,249,330
Georgia	32,324	3.7	132,420	100,095	\$6,612,312
Hawaii	282	0.4	9,600	9,318	\$615,527
Idaho	1,849	2.1	12,908	11,059	\$730,565
Illinois	30,861	4.4	104,809	73,949	\$4,885,071
Indiana	12,177	2.7	68,401	56,224	\$3,714,161
Iowa	1,505	0.8	30,088	28,583	\$1,888,218
Kansas	5,375	2.8	28,323	22,948	\$1,515,970
Kentucky	24,575	5.4	67,726	43,151	\$2,850,564
Louisiana	18,198	3.9	70,412	52,213	\$3,449,221
Maine	2,041	3.6	8,434	6,392	\$422,278
Maryland	21,549	7.0	45,946	24,397	\$1,611,675
Massachusetts	13,099	3.7	53,047	39,948	\$2,638,982
Michigan	22,473	3.6	92,785	70,312	\$4,644,849
Minnesota	13,854	5.0	41,776	27,922	\$1,844,530
Mississippi	3,943	1.3	45,227	41,284	\$2,727,198
Missouri	35,015	9.7	54,140	19,124	\$1,263,369
Montana	1,818	3.9	7,059	5,241	\$346,246
Nebraska	3,887	3.0	19,612	15,725	\$1,038,810
Nevada	14,439	7.3	29,869	15,429	\$1,019,260
New Hampshire	1,276	3.9	4,915	3,640	\$240,438
New Jersey	19,004	4.8	59,157	40,153	\$2,652,542
New Mexico	8,150	4.7	26,050	17,900	\$1,182,453
New York	87,034	6.1	214,374	127,340	\$8,412,127
North Carolina	17,552	2.6	99,459	81,907	\$5,410,766
North Dakota	214	0.6	5,132	4,918	\$324,916
Ohio	17,451	2.9	89,765	72,314	\$4,777,094
Oklahoma	22,905	7.2	47,619	24,714	\$1,632,615
Oregon	17,647	9.0	29,402	11,755	\$776,508
Pennsylvania	25,111	3.6	105,430	80,319	\$5,305,878
Rhode Island	2,765	5.2	7,938	5,173	\$341,731
South Carolina	18,871	2.1	54,113	35,242	\$2,328,087
South Dakota	1,021	2.1	7,270	6,248	\$412,752
Tennessee	33,551	6.9	72,421	38,870	\$2,567,764
Texas	271,830	9.7	418,289	146,459	\$9,675,116
Utah	4,467	2.9	22,822	18,356	\$1,212,571
Vermont	3,061	12.4	3,696	636	\$41,987
Virginia	20,842	4.5	69,565	48,723	\$3,218,622
Washington	9,271	2.6	52,681	43,410	\$2,867,669
West Virginia	9,867	6.4	22,966	13,099	\$865,319
Wisconsin	8,992	3.0	44,748	35,756	\$2,362,066
Wyoming	376	1.6	3,510	3,134	\$207,060
US	1,434,344	6.6	3,242,859	1,808,515	\$119,470,916

¹ Additional federal reimbursement dollars are calculated assuming that the sites are reimbursed for each child at the federal reimbursement rate for free suppers (\$3.41 per supper) for the national average days of service in October.

Table 3:**Change in Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) Snacks and National School Lunch Program (NSLP) Snacks, October 2018 to 2019, by State**

State	CACFP Snacks			NSLP Snacks		
	October 2018	October 2019	Percent Change	October 2018	October 2019	Percent Change
Alabama	12,001	10,237	-14.7 %	11,987	11,464	-4.4 %
Alaska	621	638	2.7 %	1,892	1,786	-5.6 %
Arizona	4,798	5,223	8.9 %	37,954	31,343	-17.4 %
Arkansas	10,031	8,931	-11.0 %	9,079	9,422	3.8 %
California	34,134	29,531	-13.5 %	212,886	196,907	-7.5 %
Colorado	5,915	6,050	2.3 %	10,884	13,853	27.3 %
Connecticut	973	786	-19.3 %	9,311	7,635	-18.0 %
Delaware	835	2,215	165.2 %	1,045	1,330	27.3 %
District of Columbia	583	560	-4.0 %	11,645	14,253	22.4 %
Florida	21,242	16,404	-22.8 %	119,732	115,482	-3.5 %
Georgia	18,905	22,990	21.6 %	66,048	67,098	1.6 %
Hawaii	212	358	69.2 %	6,358	5,799	-8.8 %
Idaho	1,501	1,248	-16.9 %	3,731	3,099	-16.9 %
Illinois	9,032	9,169	1.5 %	20,995	19,623	-6.5 %
Indiana	5,959	6,041	1.4 %	23,952	22,808	-4.8 %
Iowa	889	1,239	39.4 %	8,042	7,817	-2.8 %
Kansas	1,606	1,811	12.7 %	9,883	9,795	-0.9 %
Kentucky	4,890	5,747	17.5 %	8,358	7,927	-5.2 %
Louisiana	1,118	1,302	16.4 %	26,732	28,377	6.2 %
Maine	1,033	797	-22.8 %	3,283	2,787	-15.1 %
Maryland	9,657	12,033	24.6 %	3,759	2,675	-28.8 %
Massachusetts	9,451	7,285	-22.9 %	23,229	19,916	-14.3 %
Michigan	8,383	8,102	-3.4 %	15,844	15,985	0.9 %
Minnesota	8,991	12,397	37.9 %	18,788	18,258	-2.8 %
Mississippi	4,626	3,439	-25.7 %	6,993	7,456	6.6 %
Missouri	6,245	7,424	18.9 %	13,900	12,546	-9.7 %
Montana	447	557	24.7 %	3,158	2,598	-17.7 %
Nebraska	930	823	-11.5 %	7,126	7,403	3.9 %
Nevada	1,733	1,837	6.0 %	2,269	2,144	-5.5 %
New Hampshire	2,264	2,351	3.9 %	2,081	2,074	-0.4 %
New Jersey	6,432	5,726	-11.0 %	37,115	29,578	-20.3 %
New Mexico	1,618	1,501	-7.2 %	16,982	17,547	3.3 %
New York	26,596	25,668	-3.5 %	160,525	145,248	-9.5 %
North Carolina	8,007	7,959	-0.6 %	24,031	24,246	0.9 %
North Dakota	290	510	75.8 %	2,744	3,478	26.7 %
Ohio	6,426	5,452	-15.1 %	16,692	15,387	-7.8 %
Oklahoma	5,776	4,497	-22.2 %	15,647	15,364	-1.8 %
Oregon	2,035	2,184	7.3 %	5,221	5,248	0.5 %
Pennsylvania	13,800	13,637	-1.2 %	13,314	13,862	4.1 %
Rhode Island	711	643	-9.6 %	3,475	2,988	-14.0 %
South Carolina	6,200	4,314	-30.4 %	32,066	31,486	-1.8 %
South Dakota	898	869	-3.3 %	1,987	1,987	0.0 %
Tennessee	19,057	17,115	-10.2 %	27,002	28,598	5.9 %
Texas	29,097	26,077	-10.4 %	93,137	85,993	-7.7 %
Utah	1,471	1,226	-16.7 %	5,372	4,624	-13.9 %
Vermont	382	308	-19.2 %	1,687	1,251	-25.8 %
Virginia	16,304	16,145	-1.0 %	9,456	6,361	-32.7 %
Washington	5,918	6,117	3.4 %	9,331	7,514	-19.5 %
West Virginia	4,346	5,285	21.6 %	7,024	8,055	14.7 %
Wisconsin	1,844	1,772	-3.9 %	15,656	15,870	1.4 %
Wyoming	20	26	27.7 %	1,263	1,080	-14.5 %
US	346,237	334,553	-3.4 %	1,200,671	1,135,427	-5.4 %

Table 4:**Percent of Overall Afterschool Average Daily Participation (ADP) Coming From Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) Snacks, CACFP Suppers, and National School Lunch Program (NSLP) Snacks, October 2019, by State**

State	Percent of Overall Afterschool ADP			Overall Afterschool ADP
	CACFP Snacks ADP	CACFP Suppers ADP	NSLP Snacks ADP	
Alabama	19.2 %	59.3 %	21.5 %	53,329
Alaska	15.7 %	40.4 %	43.9 %	4,068
Arizona	9.3 %	34.9 %	55.8 %	56,129
Arkansas	28.1 %	42.2 %	29.7 %	31,750
California	5.1 %	61.0 %	33.9 %	581,183
Colorado	23.5 %	22.7 %	53.8 %	25,743
Connecticut	5.1 %	45.0 %	49.9 %	15,302
Delaware	25.5 %	59.2 %	15.3 %	8,686
District of Columbia	2.3 %	38.4 %	59.3 %	24,052
Florida	6.4 %	48.8 %	44.8 %	257,627
Georgia	18.8 %	26.4 %	54.8 %	122,412
Hawaii	5.6 %	4.4 %	90.1 %	6,440
Idaho	20.1 %	29.8 %	50.0 %	6,196
Illinois	15.4 %	51.7 %	32.9 %	59,652
Indiana	14.7 %	29.7 %	55.6 %	41,026
Iowa	11.7 %	14.2 %	74.0 %	10,560
Kansas	10.7 %	31.7 %	57.7 %	16,981
Kentucky	15.0 %	64.3 %	20.7 %	38,248
Louisiana	2.7 %	38.0 %	59.3 %	47,877
Maine	14.2 %	36.3 %	49.5 %	5,625
Maryland	33.2 %	59.4 %	7.4 %	36,257
Massachusetts	18.1 %	32.5 %	49.4 %	40,300
Michigan	17.4 %	48.3 %	34.3 %	46,560
Minnesota	27.9 %	31.1 %	41.0 %	44,509
Mississippi	23.2 %	26.6 %	50.2 %	14,838
Missouri	13.5 %	63.7 %	22.8 %	54,985
Montana	11.2 %	36.5 %	52.2 %	4,973
Nebraska	6.8 %	32.1 %	61.1 %	12,113
Nevada	10.0 %	78.4 %	11.6 %	18,421
New Hampshire	41.2 %	22.4 %	36.4 %	5,700
New Jersey	10.5 %	35.0 %	54.5 %	54,308
New Mexico	5.5 %	30.0 %	64.5 %	27,199
New York	10.0 %	33.7 %	56.3 %	257,950
North Carolina	16.0 %	35.3 %	48.7 %	49,757
North Dakota	12.1 %	5.1 %	82.8 %	4,202
Ohio	14.2 %	45.6 %	40.2 %	38,290
Oklahoma	10.5 %	53.6 %	35.9 %	42,766
Oregon	8.7 %	70.4 %	20.9 %	25,079
Pennsylvania	25.9 %	47.7 %	26.3 %	52,611
Rhode Island	10.0 %	43.2 %	46.7 %	6,397
South Carolina	7.9 %	34.5 %	57.6 %	54,671
South Dakota	22.4 %	26.3 %	51.3 %	3,877
Tennessee	21.6 %	42.3 %	36.1 %	79,264
Texas	6.8 %	70.8 %	22.4 %	383,900
Utah	11.9 %	43.3 %	44.8 %	10,316
Vermont	6.7 %	66.2 %	27.1 %	4,621
Virginia	37.2 %	48.1 %	14.7 %	43,349
Washington	26.7 %	40.5 %	32.8 %	22,902
West Virginia	22.8 %	42.5 %	34.7 %	23,207
Wisconsin	6.7 %	33.8 %	59.6 %	26,634
Wyoming	1.8 %	25.4 %	72.9 %	1,481
US	11.5 %	49.4 %	39.1 %	2,904,324

Table 5:**Change¹ in Number of Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) Snacks, National School Lunch Program (NSLP) Snacks, and CACFP Suppers Served, October 2018 and 2019, by State**

State	CACFP Snacks			NSLP Snacks			CACFP Suppers		
	October 2018	October 2019	Percent Change	October 2018	October 2019	Percent Change	October 2018	October 2019	Percent Change
Alabama	225,402	197,447	-12.4 %	225,128	221,107	-1.8 %	612,035	610,013	-0.3 %
Alaska	12,588	12,770	1.4 %	38,349	35,758	-6.8 %	33,683	32,921	-2.3 %
Arizona	79,404	86,821	9.3 %	628,121	521,023	-17.1 %	210,743	325,219	54.3 %
Arkansas	203,475	180,140	-11.5 %	184,148	190,052	3.2 %	295,099	270,216	-8.4 %
California	702,078	600,146	-14.5 %	4,378,684	4,001,701	-8.6 %	7,491,774	7,209,432	-3.8 %
Colorado	115,695	111,606	-3.5 %	212,883	255,534	20.0 %	109,720	107,723	-1.8 %
Connecticut	19,603	15,475	-21.1 %	187,584	150,422	-19.8 %	113,147	135,570	19.8 %
Delaware	17,054	44,672	161.9 %	21,333	26,828	25.8 %	113,933	103,708	-9.0 %
District of Columbia	11,711	10,887	-7.0 %	233,929	277,249	18.5 %	195,986	179,738	-8.3 %
Florida	429,351	333,570	-22.3 %	2,420,099	2,348,296	-3.0 %	2,413,344	2,556,908	5.9 %
Georgia	344,015	433,933	26.1 %	1,201,853	1,266,483	5.4 %	450,622	610,124	35.4 %
Hawaii	3,485	5,903	69.4 %	104,604	95,533	-8.7 %	4,255	4,644	9.1 %
Idaho	24,930	23,987	-3.8 %	61,944	59,569	-3.8 %	32,333	35,537	9.9 %
Illinois	175,587	179,008	1.9 %	408,152	383,113	-6.1 %	596,575	602,513	1.0 %
Indiana	101,359	102,513	1.1 %	407,401	387,063	-5.0 %	182,418	206,642	13.3 %
Iowa	17,926	25,189	40.5 %	162,240	158,956	-2.0 %	22,230	30,599	37.6 %
Kansas	30,339	34,361	13.3 %	186,685	185,883	-0.4 %	95,912	101,995	6.3 %
Kentucky	85,882	100,800	17.4 %	146,790	139,027	-5.3 %	354,139	431,022	21.7 %
Louisiana	21,507	24,748	15.1 %	514,075	539,318	4.9 %	373,592	345,870	-7.4 %
Maine	20,088	15,272	-24.0 %	63,856	53,422	-16.3 %	20,944	39,132	86.8 %
Maryland	198,837	239,389	20.4 %	77,395	53,219	-31.2 %	401,581	428,702	6.8 %
Massachusetts	187,721	143,314	-23.7 %	461,378	391,824	-15.1 %	198,862	257,693	29.6 %
Michigan	171,582	165,885	-3.3 %	324,307	327,298	0.9 %	397,520	460,146	15.8 %
Minnesota	168,707	233,814	38.6 %	352,542	344,373	-2.3 %	210,901	261,299	23.9 %
Mississippi	91,196	67,474	-26.0 %	137,845	146,276	6.1 %	77,699	77,364	-0.4 %
Missouri	123,683	146,605	18.5 %	275,274	247,757	-10.0 %	418,508	691,473	65.2 %
Montana ²	8,645	10,769	24.6 %	61,069	50,207	-17.8 %	37,892	35,123	-7.3 %
Nebraska	18,125	16,198	-10.6 %	138,877	145,740	4.9 %	86,397	76,523	-11.4 %
Nevada	35,121	37,296	6.2 %	45,990	43,524	-5.4 %	294,135	293,104	-0.4 %
New Hampshire	45,560	47,053	3.3 %	41,888	41,507	-0.9 %	21,555	25,535	18.5 %
New Jersey	130,110	127,699	-1.9 %	750,822	659,640	-12.1 %	488,362	423,818	-13.2 %
New Mexico	30,593	28,438	-7.0 %	320,996	332,414	3.6 %	125,934	154,400	22.6 %
New York	530,998	470,922	-11.3 %	3,204,927	2,664,844	-16.9 %	1,873,890	1,596,802	-14.8 %
North Carolina	154,749	162,480	5.0 %	464,426	494,982	6.6 %	312,798	358,321	14.6 %
North Dakota	5,576	9,571	71.6 %	52,789	65,307	23.7 %	3,651	4,014	9.9 %
Ohio	129,596	109,981	-15.1 %	336,658	310,369	-7.8 %	335,269	352,009	5.0 %
Oklahoma	105,980	81,349	-23.2 %	287,080	277,945	-3.2 %	301,724	414,384	37.3 %
Oregon	39,651	42,748	7.8 %	101,723	102,747	1.0 %	330,083	345,480	4.7 %
Pennsylvania	282,338	276,182	-2.2 %	272,410	280,729	3.1 %	471,665	508,543	7.8 %
Rhode Island	14,510	12,740	-12.2 %	70,935	59,229	-16.5 %	47,669	54,808	15.0 %
South Carolina	123,737	88,429	-28.5 %	639,907	645,459	0.9 %	363,149	386,853	6.5 %
South Dakota	17,790	16,914	-4.9 %	39,350	38,690	-1.7 %	15,111	19,888	31.6 %
Tennessee	325,614	287,689	-11.6 %	461,358	480,712	4.2 %	534,202	563,968	5.6 %
Texas	596,634	523,903	-12.2 %	1,909,762	1,727,624	-9.5 %	4,744,739	5,461,145	15.1 %
Utah	27,475	22,727	-17.3 %	100,329	85,727	-14.6 %	75,465	82,820	9.7 %
Vermont	7,706	6,193	-19.6 %	34,052	25,132	-26.2 %	56,440	61,471	8.9 %
Virginia	326,996	330,793	1.2 %	189,647	130,336	-31.3 %	427,905	427,024	-0.2 %
Washington	119,941	123,229	2.7 %	189,098	151,361	-20.0 %	176,547	186,758	5.8 %
West Virginia	90,009	108,056	20.1 %	145,462	164,690	13.2 %	185,058	201,734	9.0 %
Wisconsin	36,761	35,677	-2.9 %	312,065	319,517	2.4 %	184,043	181,031	-1.6 %
Wyoming	410	525	28.0 %	25,371	21,742	-14.3 %	2,724	7,568	177.8 %
US	6,787,830	6,513,290	-4.0 %	23,613,590	22,127,258	-6.3 %	26,923,962	28,339,327	5.3

¹ Year-to-year fluctuations in the number of days of service can cause average daily participation to increase, even though fewer suppers or snacks are served (or vice versa).² Montana reported a revised number of CACFP suppers for October 2018.

Table 6:**Change in Number of Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) and National School Lunch Program (NSLP) Sites From October 2018 to October 2019, by State**

State	CACFP Sites ¹			NSLP Sites ²		
	October 2018	October 2019	Percent Change	October 2018	October 2019	Percent Change
Alabama	482	500	3.7 %	291	280	-3.8 %
Alaska	81	79	-2.5 %	66	56	-15.2 %
Arizona	290	479	65.2 %	648	596	-8.0 %
Arkansas	253	250	-1.2 %	299	308	3.0 %
California	3,930	4,226	7.5 %	2,681	2,508	-6.5 %
Colorado	308	330	7.1 %	262	243	-7.3 %
Connecticut	145	145	0.0 %	179	158	-11.7 %
Delaware	181	163	-9.9 %	42	42	0.0 %
District of Columbia	166	159	-4.2 %	101	102	1.0 %
Florida	1,591	1,807	13.6 %	1,739	1,692	-2.7 %
Georgia	584	688	17.8 %	1,109	1,099	-0.9 %
Hawaii	9	13	44.4 %	93	98	5.4 %
Idaho	71	72	1.4 %	120	114	-5.0 %
Illinois	945	1,049	11.0 %	489	522	6.7 %
Indiana	338	367	8.6 %	501	457	-8.8 %
Iowa	50	61	22.0 %	222	216	-2.7 %
Kansas	296	229	-22.6 %	242	263	8.7 %
Kentucky	443	517	16.7 %	245	228	-6.9 %
Louisiana	345	379	9.9 %	328	335	2.1 %
Maine	50	75	50.0 %	177	131	-26.0 %
Maryland	661	751	13.6 %	247	163	-34.0 %
Massachusetts	366	366	0.0 %	332	297	-10.5 %
Michigan	607	635	4.6 %	399	430	7.8 %
Minnesota	366	456	24.6 %	357	339	-5.0 %
Mississippi	123	113	-8.1 %	166	182	9.6 %
Missouri	476	601	26.3 %	314	294	-6.4 %
Montana	54	43	-20.4 %	178	170	-4.5 %
Nebraska	81	82	1.2 %	154	153	-0.6 %
Nevada	338	355	5.0 %	87	77	-11.5 %
New Hampshire	43	39	-9.3 %	50	51	2.0 %
New Jersey	313	308	-1.6 %	694	708	2.0 %
New Mexico	187	192	2.7 %	435	470	8.0 %
New York	1,864	1,845	-1.0 %	1,455	1,546	6.3 %
North Carolina	365	408	11.8 %	636	621	-2.4 %
North Dakota	13	19	46.2 %	71	106	49.3 %
Ohio	692	712	2.9 %	487	451	-7.4 %
Oklahoma ³	239	289	20.9 %	691	607	-12.2 %
Oregon	407	425	4.4 %	160	162	1.3 %
Pennsylvania	1,007	994	-1.3 %	342	362	5.8 %
Rhode Island	78	97	24.4 %	50	47	-6.0 %
South Carolina	373	340	-8.8 %	573	565	-1.4 %
South Dakota	31	32	3.2 %	34	61	79.4 %
Tennessee	756	784	3.7 %	592	600	1.4 %
Texas	3,547	3,858	8.8 %	1,595	1,497	-6.1 %
Utah	127	136	7.1 %	132	115	-12.9 %
Vermont	87	113	29.9 %	63	55	-12.7 %
Virginia	708	753	6.4 %	193	337	74.6 %
Washington	386	312	-19.2 %	354	306	-13.6 %
West Virginia	338	346	2.4 %	217	218	0.5 %
Wisconsin ⁴	187	224	19.8 %	396	395	-0.3 %
Wyoming	8	11	37.5 %	36	31	-13.9 %
US	25,386	27,227	7.3 %	21,324	20,864	-2.2 %

¹ CACFP sites offer afterschool snacks and suppers to students, reimbursable through the Child and Adult Care Food Program (reported by USDA as 'Outlets After Sch At-Risk').

² NSLP sites serve snacks through the National School Lunch Program (reported by USDA as 'NSLP Total Sch and RCCI's Serving Snacks').

³ Oklahoma reported a revised number of NSLP sites for October 2018.

⁴ Wisconsin reported a revised number of NSLP sites for October 2018.



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

202.986.2200
www.frac.org

Copyright © 2020 Food Research & Action Center



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



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



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



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