



School Breakfast: Making It Work in Large School Districts

January 2014

FRAC

Food Research and Action Center

Acknowledgments

Special thanks go to the participating school district nutrition directors and their staff. This report would not be possible without their responsiveness and willingness to share their experiences with others. We also are grateful to state partners which provided data for this report—Maryland Hunger Solutions, Florida Impact, and Texas Hunger Initiative—and for assistance from the American Association of School Administrators.

This report was written by FRAC Senior Policy Analyst Madeleine Levin.

The Food Research and Action Center gratefully acknowledges major support of its work to expand and improve the School Breakfast Program in 2012–2013 from the following:

ConAgra Foods Foundation
Kellogg's Corporate Citizenship Fund
National Dairy Council/Dairy Management, Inc.

Newman's Own Foundation
Walmart Foundation

Additional support for our breakfast work in 2012–2013 has been provided by the following:

California Endowment
General Mills Foundation
Hillshire Brands

Kraft Foods Group Foundation
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

This research was funded by the supporters listed above. We thank them for their support but acknowledge that the findings and conclusions presented in this report are those of the author alone, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of our supporters.

About FRAC

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

Executive Summary

This report examines the performance of school breakfast programs in 63 large urban and suburban school districts during the 2012–2013 school year, with the goal of monitoring their progress in increasing school breakfast participation among low-income students. Given the concentration of poverty within the student population in most of the districts and the potential for economies of scale afforded by the large number of students, it is somewhat easier to reach children with breakfast in districts in large metropolitan areas than elsewhere. Yet 20 of these districts failed to reach, with the important morning nourishment they need to succeed in school, a majority of the low-income students who eat school lunch each day.

All 12 districts that met FRAC's goal of reaching at least 70 low-income children with breakfast through the School Breakfast Program for every 100 low-income children who received lunch through the National School Lunch Program had widespread breakfast in the classroom programs. These programs, where students eat breakfast in their classroom at the beginning of the school day, are clearly the most effective strategy to get school breakfast to the large number of students who need it. It is especially effective for schools with high concentrations of low-income students and that offer breakfast at no charge to all students.

Anniversary of the War on Poverty

This year marks the 50th anniversary of President Lyndon B. Johnson's State of the Union address declaring a national "War on Poverty." The speech spurred the passage of a number of Johnson's Great Society initiatives addressing economic opportunity, education, health, and nutrition—including the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, which created the School Breakfast Program. Other legislative hallmarks of Johnson's campaign include the Food Stamp Act of 1964 and the Social Security Act of 1965, which created Medicare and Medicaid. Fifty years later, there is still work to be done to eradicate the poverty, hunger, and health disparities that President Johnson brought to the forefront of American politics. Federal nutrition programs like the School Breakfast Program are important pieces of the safety net that support struggling families and improve health and educational outcomes for low-income children.

Key Findings:

- **The top 12 school districts served breakfast to 70 percent or more of the low-income students that received school lunch each day.** These districts all offer breakfast free to all or many students and all have extensive breakfast in the classroom programs: Atlanta, GA, Boise, ID, Boston, MA, Charleston, SC, Cincinnati, OH, Detroit, MI, Houston, TX, Los Angeles, CA, Memphis, TN, Newark, NJ, San Antonio, TX, and Washington, DC. If all 63 districts had reached this goal in the 2012–2013 school year, 582,906 additional children would have been eating a healthy school breakfast every day, and the districts combined would have collected an additional \$159.9 million in federal child nutrition funding.
- **The lowest performing four districts reached fewer than 40 low-income children with breakfast for every 100 with lunch.** Some very large districts with high poverty levels were in this group. These four were: Elgin, IL, Jefferson County, CO, New York City, NY, and Oakland, CA.
- **Ten districts increased low-income breakfast participation by 20 percent or more in the 2012-2013 school year, compared to the previous year.** Brentwood, NY, Des Moines, IA, Kansas City, KS, Los Angeles, CA, and Syracuse, NY had exceptional growth as they implemented extensive breakfast in the classroom programs during the 2012-2013 school year, resulting in many more children eating breakfast each day.
- **Breakfast in the classroom programs, offered to all children at no charge, are now found in at least some schools in most of the school districts included in this report.** Fifty-five of the 63 districts in this study had some type of alternative breakfast service method—where breakfast is offered after the school day begins—in at least some of their schools during the 2012–2013 school year. Serving models include breakfast brought to classrooms and offered to children during the first 10 minutes of class, and "grab and go" breakfast service from carts or kiosks set up in school hallways or cafeterias.

- **The federal community eligibility provision—in 11 states now and in all states beginning in the 2014-2015 school year—helps increase participation.** Syracuse City Schools began operating under community eligibility district-wide for the first time in the 2012-2013 school year. The district achieved a 34.9 percent increase in its low-income school breakfast participation as it simultaneously implemented breakfast in the classroom. This is consistent with findings in the recent report from FRAC and the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, "[Community Eligibility: Making High-Poverty Schools Hunger Free](#)", that breakfast participation increased by 25 percent in community eligibility schools in the first three implementing states.

Introduction

Effective school breakfast programs play an important role in ensuring the food security of low-income children, while also boosting diets, supporting improved attendance, greater academic success, good student behavior, improved health, and reduced obesity rates. (For a full discussion of the benefits of school breakfast see <http://frac.org/federal-foodnutrition-programs/school-breakfast-program/breakfast-in-the-classroom/>.) But too many children are missing out with just over half of low-income children getting both breakfast and lunch at school. Many of the children who do not eat breakfast start the school day unable to concentrate and not ready to learn.

FRAC publishes the *School Breakfast Scorecard* annually to document participation rates in each state, to identify where participation rates are lagging, and to highlight successful initiatives that are increasing breakfast participation around the country. Since the 1990-1991 school year the report has measured state breakfast success not only by comparing the breakfast numbers to lunch numbers in each state, but by comparing state performance to an attainable goal and then measuring how much money is forgone by states that have not attained that goal.

This report focuses on breakfast participation rates—and strategies to increase them—in large school districts with many low-income students. It does so because of the great need and such districts' unique position to benefit from economies of scale to increase breakfast participation. The concentration of poverty in many of these districts dictates an especially important mission to ensure that children have access to adequate nutrition in order to learn, grow, and thrive. This report describes both the successes and the gaps in current efforts to reach more children with a healthy morning meal.

How the School Breakfast Program Works

Who operates the School Breakfast Program:

Any public school, nonprofit private school, or residential child care institution can participate in the School Breakfast Program. The program is administered at the federal level by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and in each state through (typically) the state Department of Education or Agriculture.

Who can participate in the School Breakfast Program:

Any student attending a school that offers the program can eat breakfast. The share of his/her breakfast the federal government pays depends on income. Children from families with incomes at or below 130 percent of the federal poverty level are eligible for free school meals. Children from families with incomes between 130 and 185 percent of the federal poverty level qualify for reduced-price meals and can be charged no more than 30 cents per breakfast. Children from families with incomes above 185 percent of the federal poverty level pay charges (referred to as “paid meals”) which are set by the school, but schools receive a small federal reimbursement for such children. There are circumstances under which schools offer all children free breakfast, and they are discussed in this report.

Most children are certified for free or reduced-price meals via applications collected by the school district each year. However, children in households participating in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), and Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR), as well as foster youth, migrant, homeless, or runaway youth, and Head Start participants are “categorically eligible” (automatically eligible) for free school meals and can be certified without submitting a school meal application. School districts are required to “directly certify” children in SNAP participant households for free school meals through data matching of SNAP records with school enrollment lists, and have the option of directly certifying children in TANF and FDPIR households as well. However, some categorically eligible children are missed through these processes and are still certified by submitting an application.

How the School Breakfast Program is funded:

The School Breakfast Program is funded by the federal government through per meal reimbursements. The amount the school is reimbursed for each meal depends on whether a student qualifies for free, reduced-price, or paid meals. For the 2012-2013 school year, schools received \$1.55 per free breakfast, \$1.25 per reduced-price breakfast, and \$0.27 per paid breakfast. “Severe need” schools qualify for an additional 30 cents for each free or reduced-price breakfast served. Schools are considered severe need if at least 40 percent of the lunches served during the second preceding school year were free or reduced-price.

Survey Findings

Student Enrollment and Low-Income Student Eligibility Rates

The 63 districts that participated in this study ranged in size from 17,000 students to more than one million students during the 2012–2013 school year. The districts responding to FRAC’s survey reported the share of their students determined to be eligible for free and reduced-price meals. **Table 1** lists the participating districts’ reported student enrollment, and their reported enrollment of free and reduced-price eligible (i.e., low-income) students, and the resulting percentage of students eligible for free and reduced-price meals. These figures provide a snapshot of the relative level of poverty and nutritional need. The percentages varied from a low of 33.2 percent combined free and reduced-price eligible students in Montgomery County, MD to a high of nearly 100 percent in Detroit, MI and Syracuse, NY.

Breakfast Participation

Not all students certified eligible actually eat free or reduced-price meals. FRAC calculated the number of low-income students (i.e., those eligible for free or reduced-price school meals) eating breakfast and eating lunch each day (average daily participation, or ADP), as reported in the survey by each district. (See the Appendix for methodology.) **Table 2** provides data for each district on the average daily number of low-income children participating in free or reduced-price breakfast and lunch for the 2012-2013 school year.

FRAC also collected data on participation for the prior school year—2011-2012—for 60 of the 63 districts. (Three districts did not provide the data.) **Table 3** compares the average daily participation in breakfast of low-income students for each district in the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school years, and shows the percent change. Ten districts increased low-income breakfast participation by 20 percent or more. Most of the districts with the largest increases were implementing breakfast in the classroom programs during the 2012-2013 school year, resulting in many more children participating in the program each day. (See below for more information on breakfast in the classroom.)

**Top Ten Districts: Increase in Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Breakfast
from School Year 2011-12 to School Year 2012-13**

District	Low-Income Breakfast ADP SY 2011-12	Low-Income Breakfast ADP SY 2012-13	Percent Increase in Breakfast ADP
Brentwood, NY	3,268	6,468	97.9%
Kansas City, KS	6,649	9,927	49.3%
Washington, DC	11,865	17,136	44.4%
Syracuse, NY	7,667	10,344	34.9%
Des Moines, IA	6,169	8,285	34.3%
Los Angeles, CA	152,328	204,263	34.1%
Toledo, OH	5,039	6,402	27.0%
Baltimore, MD	21,879	27,769	26.9%
Richmond, VA	6,578	8,155	24.0%
Denver, CO	16,813	20,505	22.0%

For a full list of districts, see Table 3.

Effectiveness in Reaching Low-Income Students with School Breakfast

FRAC uses free and reduced-price student participation in the National School Lunch Program as a benchmark against which to measure low-income student participation in the School Breakfast Program. Because there is broad participation in the lunch program by low-income students in districts around the country, it is a useful measurement of how many students could and should be benefiting from school breakfast each day. Nationally, for every 100 low-income children who ate free or reduced-price lunch, 51.9 low-income children ate free or reduced-price breakfast on an average day in the 2012-2013 school year.¹ In the eight best performing states—the District of Columbia, Kentucky, New Mexico, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, and West Virginia—the ratio was 60:100 or higher.

A challenging, yet achievable, goal for a large district is to serve breakfast to at least 70 out of 100 low-income students who eat school lunch. Many school districts have been able to achieve this goal, with a number of states now nearing this level of breakfast participation statewide. Large districts can often exceed state averages: they have many low-income students, more geographic concentration, and economies of scale coupled with increased federal reimbursements for meals served. Most importantly, disproportionate numbers of poor children in many large metropolitan area districts underscore the imperative to ensure that children have access to adequate nutrition.

Table 4 ranks the districts in the report based on the ratio of low-income students eating school breakfast compared to lunch in the 2012-2013 school year. Twelve districts—Atlanta, GA, Boise, ID, Boston, MA, Charleston, SC, Cincinnati, OH, Detroit, MI, Houston, TX, Los Angeles, CA, Memphis, TN, Newark, NJ, San Antonio, TX, and Washington, DC—met or exceeded the goal of 70 to 100 low-income student breakfast to lunch participation in the 2012-2013 school year. Thirteen additional districts exceeded a breakfast to lunch ratio of 60:100 low-income students. Altogether, 42 of the 63 districts in this study met or exceeded the national average for low-income student breakfast participation, while 22 districts were below the national average of 51.9:100.

Low-Income Students Participating in the School Breakfast Program (SBP) per 100 in the National School Lunch Program (NSLP)			
Top 12 Districts	Ratio	Bottom 12 Districts	Ratio
Boise, ID	92.4	Polk County, FL	45.3
Newark, NJ	91.2	Austin, TX	45.1
Houston, TX	85.2	Fort Worth, TX	44.8
Charleston, SC	85.1	Broward County, FL	43.5
Detroit, MI	82.5	Anchorage, AK	43.1
San Antonio, TX	76.8	San Bernardino, CA	42.1
Los Angeles, CA	75.7	Hartford, CT	41.3
Cincinnati, OH	73.9	Miami-Dade County, FL	40.9
Memphis, TN	72.4	Oakland, CA	37.7
Boston, MA	71.6	Jefferson County, CO	37.3
Washington, DC	71.4	Elgin, IL	35.1
Atlanta, GA	70.0	New York City, NY	34.8

For a full list of districts, see Table 4.

¹ See FRAC School Breakfast Scorecard, School Year 2012-2013 <http://frac.org/reports-and-resources/publications-archives/>

Reaching All Children Who Need School Breakfast: The Educational, Nutritional, and Fiscal Benefits

When children eat breakfast at school, it reduces hunger, absenteeism, tardiness and nurse visits, and improves nutrition, learning, and test scores. There is strong evidence that school breakfast improves children’s behavior and classroom learning environments. See FRAC’s Breakfast for Learning² for more information on the links between school breakfast and academic performance. There is compelling evidence that school breakfast improves children’s health, and may help prevent obesity.

Research confirms that students in schools that offer school breakfast free to all children are more likely to eat a nutritionally substantive breakfast compared to students in schools with a traditional means-tested school breakfast program. These findings underscore the need to increase school breakfast participation for districts that are committed to reducing obesity and improving student health and achievement. See FRAC’s Breakfast for Health³ for more information on the links between school breakfast and favorable health outcomes.

Missed school breakfast meals also add up to tens of millions of dollars in federal child nutrition funding going unclaimed by districts every year. Each school day in the 2012–2013 school year, schools lost at least \$1.55 in federal nutrition funding for every child who would have received a free breakfast and \$1.25 for every child who would have received a reduced-price breakfast, but was not served. An additional 30 cents in federal funds per child per meal were forfeited if those low-income children attended a “severe need” school—one of the thousands of schools in which at least 40 percent of lunches served the prior year were free or reduced-price.

If each district in this survey had provided at least 70 low-income children with breakfast (through the School Breakfast Program) for every 100 low-income children that received lunch (through the National School Lunch Program) in the 2012–2013 school year, an additional 582,906 students would have eaten a healthy school breakfast every day and the 63 districts would have received a combined \$159,887,259 in additional child nutrition funding. **Table 5** provides these data for each district in the report. Most of the lost revenue and unserved low-income students are clustered in the largest districts, with over a quarter in New York City alone. The New York City Department of Education would have collected \$53,127,696 in additional federal funds, and served an additional 194,518 low-income students, if it met the 70:100 ratio. But 31 districts failed to collect at least \$1 million, and in all districts falling short of the 70:100 ratio the unnecessary loss of federal breakfast dollars hurts schools and their budgets at the same time that the missed breakfast hurts children.

Top Five Districts in Lost Federal Funds (Amounts Forgone Because District Failed to Reach 70 Free and Reduced-Price Students in the School Breakfast Program per 100 Such Students in the School Lunch Program)		
District	Additional Students	Dollars Lost
New York City, NY	194,518	\$53,127,696
Miami-Dade County, FL	50,828	\$13,934,809
Clark County, NV	30,071	\$8,230,834
Broward County, FL	26,980	\$7,412,769
Chicago, IL	26,753	\$7,115,732

For a full list, see Table 5.

² Breakfast for Learning <http://frac.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/09/breakfastforlearning.pdf>

³ Breakfast for Health <http://frac.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/08/breakfastforhealth.pdf>

Offering Breakfast Free to All Children and Breakfast in the Classroom

All of the districts in this report have numerous schools with significant concentrations of poverty. In such schools, federal program rules offer important options to help districts reach many more children with breakfast, including offering breakfast free to all children and making breakfast part of the school day. The pace at which districts are able to implement these options depends on a range of factors: administrative support and enthusiasm, resources for start-up expenses, and buy-in from the school community (parents, principals, teachers, janitors, and other school support personnel). This section provides information about and examines the effectiveness of the school districts' efforts to increase breakfast participation through the implementation of such programs. **Table 6** summarizes the status of choices by district.

Programs that offer meals at no charge to all students—breakfast and/or lunch—regardless of income (sometimes called “universal” meals), help reach more children. The traditional means-tested school breakfast served in the cafeteria before school (in which the higher-income children pay) creates a sense among the children that the program is just “for poor kids.” (This is less true for lunch, at least through middle school, because typically all children go into the cafeteria for lunch.) Offering breakfast free to everyone can be done in the cafeteria, but universal free also helps schools implement programs such as breakfast in the classroom or offering breakfast from “grab and go” carts in the hallways at the start of the school day. Of the school districts surveyed in this report, only five — Austin, TX, Cypress-Fairbanks, TX, Jackson, MS, Nashville, TN, and San Bernardino, CA — do not offer breakfast free to all students, regardless of income, at some or all of their schools.

The three most common models for offering breakfast at no charge to all children in schools are the federal Community Eligibility Provision; Provision 2; and “non-pricing.” The federal options discussed below allow schools to reduce administrative work and simplify the meal claiming process, making it more cost effective for them to offer breakfast at no charge.

Community Eligibility

Community eligibility is a successful new federal provision for offering meals at no charge to all students in high-poverty schools. Initially implemented in more than 2,200 schools in 11 states, community eligibility has been phased in since the 2011-2012 school year and will be available nationwide at the beginning of the 2014-2015 school year. Illinois, Kentucky, and Michigan implemented the provision in the 2011-2012 school year; the District of Columbia, New York, Ohio, and West Virginia were added in the 2012-2013 school year; and Florida, Georgia, Maryland, and Massachusetts were added in the 2013-2014 school year. In schools that have been participating in community eligibility for two years, average daily breakfast participation has increased by 25 percent.⁴

Established in the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010, community eligibility allows schools to offer breakfast and lunch free of charge to all students and to realize significant administrative savings by eliminating school meal applications. Any district, group of schools in a district, or school with 40 percent or more “identified students”—children eligible for free school meals who are already identified by other means than an individual household application—can choose to participate. The majority of identified students are directly certified through data matching because their households receive SNAP, TANF, or FDPIR, and in some states and areas, Medicaid benefits. Identified students also include children who are certified for free meals without an application because they are homeless, migrant, enrolled in Head Start, or in foster care.

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

Four districts included in this report utilized community eligibility in the 2012-2013 school year—Chicago, IL, Detroit, MI, Syracuse, NY, and Washington, DC. Detroit has been operating under community eligibility district-wide since

⁴Community Eligibility: Making High-Poverty Schools Hunger Free; http://frac.org/pdf/community_eligibility_report_2013.pdf

School Breakfast Continues to Get Healthier – New Standards Effective in the 2014-2015 School Year

Schools must meet all the new federal breakfast nutrition standards at the beginning of the 2014–2015 school year. The new standards have been phased in, with the following requirements going into effect at the start of the next school year:

- Fruit quantity to increase to 5 cups per week (minimum 1 cup per day)
- All grains must be whole grain-rich
- Average weekly sodium limit
- All meals selected by students must contain a fruit (or vegetable if using substitution)

Many schools already have implemented these improvements or have begun phasing them in, but some will need to incorporate all of the changes listed above next fall. Increasing school breakfast participation can help support the financial viability of the school nutrition programs—offsetting some of the increased costs of the additional fruit and whole grains by creating labor efficiencies and other savings from economies of scale.

the 2011-2012 school year, while the other three started for the first time in the 2012-2013 school year. Chicago, IL and Washington, DC implemented community eligibility in a group of schools, while Syracuse, NY implemented it district-wide. Syracuse coupled its implementation with alternative breakfast models and achieved a 34.9 percent increase in its low-income school breakfast participation. This is consistent with findings from other districts that have taken advantage of the simplified administrative procedures to implement alternative forms of breakfast service. In this case, Syracuse used community eligibility to support continued expansion of their breakfast in the classroom and “grab and go” programs, feeding 2,677 more low-income students each day. Participation did not change substantially in Chicago and Washington, DC, where breakfast in the classroom programs had been fully implemented well in advance of the change to community eligibility.

Provision 2

Of the 63 districts in this study that offer breakfast free to all children in all or many of their schools, 24 used “Provision 2” of the National School Lunch Act as a funding structure in the 2012-2013 school year. Provision 2 enables schools to offer meals (breakfast and/or lunch) at no charge to all of their students, while reducing paperwork and administrative costs. Under Provision 2, all students, regardless of income, are offered free meals. Schools collect applications for free and reduced-price meals only once every four years. The blended reimbursement rate for meals in all four years is based on the percentage of meals in the school that are served in each category (free, reduced-price, and paid) during the “base year.” Schools often make special outreach efforts in the base year. Provision 2 schools are responsible for the difference between the cost of serving meals at no charge to all students and the federal reimbursement for the meals. The increased participation, resulting in increased federal reimbursement, and the significant administrative savings (e.g., fewer applications to process) associated with Provision 2 help offset all or much of the cost differential.

Non-Pricing

School districts can provide free breakfast to all students in one or all of their schools by waiving fees even while they use the traditional approach of collecting applications and tracking which children eat by fee category: free, reduced-price, and paid. The only difference in this model is that schools do not collect fees from families for reduced-price and paid meals. Schools still must certify each child by fee category, track each child’s meals and fee status, and claim the meals served accordingly.

Alternative Service Methods

Breakfast in the Classroom: Food service staff packs breakfasts into coolers or insulated bags to be delivered to each classroom by school staff or designated students. Alternatively, schools can use a “grab and go” service model, described below, where students pick up breakfast meals and bring them to their classroom. Students eat during the first 10-15 minutes of class, during morning announcements, or while the teacher takes attendance or reviews lessons. Students clear trash and wipe down desks, and breakfast trash is placed in the hallway to be collected by custodial staff. Delivering breakfast to the classroom is ideal for lower grade levels where children start the day in the same classroom with the same teacher each day, making delivery and meal counting smoother for teachers and food service staff.

“Grab and Go”: Food service staff packs breakfast meals in individual bags for student pick-up, or students select items and put them in bags themselves in the cafeteria or at kiosks in the hallway. Students select breakfast meals as they arrive at school and eat on the way to class or at their desks after the bell during the first 10-15 minutes of class. If eating in the classroom, students clear trash and wipe down desks, and breakfast trash is placed in the hallway to be collected by custodial staff. “Grab and Go” works well for middle and high schools, and for schools that do not have the capacity to deliver food to each classroom or have infrastructure obstacles (e.g., multiple stories) that make delivery impracticable.

Breakfast after First Period or “Second Chance Breakfast”: Students eat breakfast after first period during a morning nutrition break. Depending on the model used, students can eat in the cafeteria (similar to traditional breakfast) or take a bagged meal from the cafeteria or kiosks in the hallway to be eaten in between classes or during the next period. Second chance breakfast works particularly well for secondary schools because older students often are not hungry early in the morning and tend to arrive at school closer to the start of the school day.

Breakfast in the Classroom

Fifty-five of the 63 districts in this study had some type of alternative breakfast service method—where breakfast is served after the school day begins—in at least some of their schools during the 2012–2013 school year. Districts used a variety of methods, including breakfast in the classroom, “grab and go,” and breakfast after first period for middle and high school students. Breakfast in the classroom is especially prevalent in elementary schools. Whether delivered to the classroom or served from carts in the hallway, allowing students to eat breakfast in the classroom dramatically increases participation by making it convenient and accessible to all. It helps families whose early morning schedules make it difficult to fit in breakfast—either at home or in the cafeteria before school starts—due to long commutes and nontraditional work hours. Also, it eliminates the problem caused by tight school bus schedules or school security lines when students do not always arrive at school in time for breakfast before the first bell rings. Notably, districts with the widest implementation of breakfast in the classroom have the highest participation rates. The top ten districts in this report have breakfast in the classroom programs in at least one-third of their schools. The practice of district-wide in-classroom breakfast programs is now widespread with strong programs in Chicago, IL, Dallas, TX, Detroit, MI, Houston, TX, Los Angeles, CA, Newark, NJ, and Washington, DC.

Breakfast in the Classroom Successes

Kansas City, Kansas

A strong commitment to increasing access to school breakfast through the successful implementation of breakfast in the classroom contributed to the growth of school breakfast participation in Kansas City, Kansas. Under the leadership of Food and Nutrition Services Director Karla Robinson, average daily breakfast participation increased in the 2012-2013 school year by 49.3 percent among the district's low-income students. This dramatic increase is result of the implementation of breakfast in the classroom in 13 of the district's schools at the start of the school year, made possible by the Partners for Breakfast in the Classroom grant funded by the Walmart Foundation and through additional support from local partners at the Kansas City Education Association, the Kansas Association of Elementary School Principals, and Harvesters – The Community Food Network to raise the profile of breakfast in the classroom among district and community stakeholders. In the 13 schools, breakfast participation grew from 43 percent of average daily participation in August 2012 to 76 percent in May 2013. Kansas City expanded breakfast in the classroom to eight additional schools at the start of the 2013-2014 school year.

Syracuse, New York

Syracuse City School District increased average daily participation among low-income students in breakfast by 34.9 percent—an additional 2,677 low-income students eating each day—in the 2012-2013 school year through implementation of breakfast in the classroom in elementary schools, “grab and go” in middle schools, and the addition of vending machines for reimbursable meals in high schools. The implementation of alternative serving methods was supported by a grant from the Walmart Foundation through the American Association of School Administrators, with additional support from Hunger Solutions New York. The district also successfully implemented community eligibility district-wide, making both breakfast and lunch available to all children at no charge. As a result, they experienced 10 percent growth in their lunch program as well, and are thrilled with the benefits to students and to the school nutrition program.

Toledo, Ohio

Toledo Public Schools increased average daily participation among low-income students in breakfast by 27.0 percent—an additional 1,363 low-income students eating each day—in the 2012-2013 school year through implementation of universal breakfast and a modified grab and go program in all elementary schools and two high schools. They have implemented a breakfast in the classroom model with support from Action for Healthy Kids Ohio and the Children's Hunger Alliance, who analyzed the district's school meal participation data, cafeteria viability, and staffing patterns to help determine needs and best approaches for the program. They also connected school district administrators with Lima City Schools, a neighboring school district that had implemented breakfast in the classroom, for a series of visits by administrators and union leaders to observe their successful program. Toledo expanded the breakfast in the classroom model in additional schools during the 2013-2014 school year.

Conclusion

Breakfast in the classroom free to all students accelerates the growth of school breakfast participation. With the spread of community eligibility, many more schools serving high concentrations of low-income students can offer school meals at no charge, also making it easier to move breakfast out of the cafeteria. As schools implement new federal meal standards for breakfast in the 2014-2015 school year, which will bring added costs, increased efficiency and participation levels will be more important than ever. And the benefits of breakfast will continue to improve outcomes for children and schools – better nutrition and health, higher attendance, lower absenteeism, reduced behavior problems, fewer visits to the school nurse, and higher student achievement.

Table 1: Total Student Enrollment, Free and Reduced-Price School Meal Enrollment, and Percent of Students Determined to be Eligible for Free and Reduced-Price Meals in School Year 2012-13

District	Total Student Enrollment	Free & Reduced-Price Enrollment*	Percent Free & Reduced-Price
Albuquerque Public Schools (NM)	88,051	54,995	62.5%
Anchorage School District (AK)	45,928	19,676	42.8%
Atlanta Public Schools (GA)	49,558	37,349	75.4%
Austin Independent School District (TX)	87,091	56,558	64.9%
Baltimore City Public Schools (MD)	85,031	71,505	84.1%
Boise School District (ID)	25,475	11,173	43.9%
Boston Public Schools (MA)	56,883	43,312	76.1%
Brentwood Union Free School District (NY)	17,434	13,753	78.9%
Broward County Public Schools (FL)	242,406	136,448	56.3%
Charleston County School District (SC)	46,319	24,466	52.8%
Chicago Public Schools (IL)	408,461	341,137	83.5%
Cincinnati Public Schools (OH)	32,540	25,661	78.9%
Clark County School District (NV)	316,287	186,538	59.0%
Columbus City Schools (OH)	51,209	40,724	79.5%
Cypress-Fairbanks Independent School District (TX)	110,422	56,181	50.9%
Dallas Independent School District (TX)	157,900	141,437	89.6%
DeKalb County Public Schools (GA)	98,811	70,651	71.5%
Denver Public Schools (CO)	78,704	55,748	70.8%
Des Moines Public Schools (IA)	30,844	21,042	68.2%
Detroit Public Schools (MI)	68,031	68,031	100.0%**
District of Columbia Public Schools (DC)	44,945	35,262	78.5%
Durham Public Schools (NC)	33,546	20,789	62.0%
Elgin School District (IL)	42,553	24,325	57.2%
Fort Worth Independent School District (TX)	84,168	70,097	83.3%
Fulton County Schools (GA)	90,045	40,599	45.1%
Guilford County Schools (NC)	69,350	39,707	57.3%
Gwinnett County Public Schools (GA)	164,556	93,139	56.6%
Hartford Public Schools (CT)	23,662	18,280	77.3%
Hillsborough County Public Schools (FL)	186,260	113,847	61.1%
Houston Independent School District (TX)	199,647	162,505	81.4%
Indianapolis Public Schools (IN)	30,037	25,836	86.0%
Jackson Public Schools (MS)	29,530	26,885	91.0%
Jeffco Public Schools (CO)	82,529	28,386	34.4%
Jefferson County Public Schools (KY)	101,212	65,577	64.8%
Kansas City, Kansas Public Schools (KS)	21,749	18,327	84.3%
Knox County Schools (TN)	58,802	28,180	47.9%
Little Rock School District (AR)	25,097	17,728	70.6%
Long Beach Unified School District (CA)	82,404	58,669	71.2%

District	Total Student Enrollment	Free & Reduced-Price Enrollment*	Percent Free & Reduced-Price
Los Angeles Unified School District (CA)	612,904	487,259	79.5%
Memphis/Shelby County Schools (TN)	106,000	91,908	86.7%
Mesa Public Schools (AZ)	64,648	38,754	59.9%
Miami-Dade Public Schools (FL)	298,760	230,880	77.3%
Minneapolis Public Schools (MN)	33,018	21,294	64.5%
Montgomery County Schools (MD)	148,593	49,349	33.2%
Nashville Public Schools (TN)	78,588	60,730	77.3%
New York City Dept. of Education (NY)	1,117,669	769,761	68.9%
Newark Public Schools (NJ)	37,194	30,412	81.8%
Oakland Unified School District (CA)	38,707	26,310	68.0%
Oklahoma City Public Schools (OK)	47,895	37,904	79.1%
Omaha Public Schools (NE)	49,324	36,176	73.3%
Orange County Schools (FL)	182,116	109,843	60.3%
Philadelphia School District (PA)	146,918	116,363	79.2%
Pittsburgh Public Schools (PA)	26,146	19,208	73.5%
Polk County Public Schools (FL)	85,482	61,686	72.2%
Portland Public Schools (OR)	44,026	19,405	44.1%
Prince George's County Public Schools (MD)	124,000	74,019	59.7%
Richmond City Public Schools (VA)	23,450	17,712	75.5%
San Antonio Independent School District (TX)	53,978	49,868	92.4%
San Bernardino City Unified School District (CA)	52,216	49,025	93.9%
San Diego Unified School District (CA)	131,547	79,133	60.2%
Savannah-Chatham County Public Schools (GA)	36,610	23,666	64.6%
Syracuse City School District (NY)	20,825	20,825	100.0%**
Toledo Public Schools (OH)	22,640	16,946	74.8%

*Students determined to be eligible for free and reduced-price meals through direct certification or paper applications.

**Detroit Public Schools and Syracuse City Public Schools utilize the community eligibility provision district-wide, which allows them to claim all meals in the Free category.

Table 2: Average Daily Participation (ADP) for Low-Income Students in School Lunch and Breakfast and Ratio of Low-Income Students in School Breakfast (SBP) per 100 in School Lunch (NSLP) for School Year 2012-2013

District	Free & Reduced-Price Breakfast ADP	Free & Reduced-Price Lunch ADP	Ratio F & RP Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	Rank Among Districts in Study
Albuquerque Public Schools (NM)	20,372	37,231	54.7	37
Anchorage School District (AK)	5,754	13,337	43.1	56
Atlanta Public Schools (GA)	18,426	26,340	70.0	12
Austin Independent School District (TX)	16,413	36,416	45.1	53
Baltimore City Public Schools (MD)	27,769	47,705	58.2	30
Boise School District (ID)	6,941	7,510	92.4	1
Boston Public Schools (MA)	22,762	31,796	71.6	10
Brentwood Union Free School District (NY)	6,468	10,117	63.9	19
Broward County Public Schools (FL)	44,183	101,660	43.5	55
Charleston County School District (SC)	15,489	18,193	85.1	4
Chicago Public Schools (IL)	138,743	236,423	58.7	28
Cincinnati Public Schools (OH)	13,266	17,950	73.9	8
Clark County School District (NV)	58,529	126,572	46.2	50
Columbus City Schools (OH)	20,399	30,398	67.1	16
Cypress-Fairbanks Independent School District (TX)	22,414	39,938	56.1	34
Dallas Independent School District (TX)	51,701	107,845	47.9	47
DeKalb County Public Schools (GA)	26,339	56,620	46.5	49
Denver Public Schools (CO)	20,505	38,938	52.7	41
Des Moines Public Schools (IA)	8,285	16,041	51.6	43
Detroit Public Schools (MI)	38,337	46,463	82.5	5
District of Columbia Public Schools (DC)	17,136	24,010	71.4	11
Durham Public Schools (NC)	7,550	15,679	48.2	46
Elgin School District (IL)	5,901	16,811	35.1	62
Fort Worth Independent School District (TX)	20,615	46,015	44.8	54
Fulton County Schools (GA)	17,704	31,320	56.5	33
Guilford County Schools (NC)	21,017	33,486	62.8	22
Gwinnett County Public Schools (GA)	48,429	78,291	61.9	24
Hartford Public Schools (CT)	6,018	14,586	41.3	58
Hillsborough County Public Schools (FL)	51,776	89,084	58.1	31
Houston Independent School District (TX)	99,473	116,686	85.2	3
Indianapolis Public Schools (IN)	13,156	21,715	60.6	25
Jackson Public Schools (MS)	12,872	22,986	56.0	35
Jeffco Public Schools (CO)	6,500	17,434	37.3	61
Jefferson County Public Schools (KY)	32,247	50,894	63.4	20
Kansas City, Kansas Public Schools (KS)	9,927	14,197	69.9	13
Knox County Schools (TN)	12,191	20,465	59.6	26
Little Rock School District (AR)	8,418	12,813	65.7	17
Long Beach Unified School District (CA)	17,947	38,817	46.2	51

District	Free & Reduced-Price Breakfast ADP	Free & Reduced-Price Lunch ADP	Ratio F & RP Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	Rank Among Districts in Study
Los Angeles Unified School District (CA)	204,263	269,700	75.7	7
Memphis/Shelby County Schools (TN)	47,015	64,934	72.4	9
Mesa Public Schools (AZ)	15,734	29,725	52.9	40
Miami-Dade Public Schools (FL)	71,601	174,898	40.9	59
Minneapolis Public Schools (MN)	9,685	16,706	58.0	32
Montgomery County Schools (MD)	19,097	35,653	53.6	38
Nashville Public Schools (TN)	22,989	43,115	53.3	39
New York City Dept. of Education (NY)	192,322	552,629	34.8	63
Newark Public Schools (NJ)	19,631	21,524	91.2	2
Oakland Unified School District (CA)	6,671	17,674	37.7	60
Oklahoma City Public Schools (OK)	15,083	25,397	59.4	27
Omaha Public Schools (NE)	13,365	28,610	46.7	48
Orange County Schools (FL)	43,086	86,422	49.9	44
Philadelphia School District (PA)	47,900	81,668	58.7	29
Pittsburgh Public Schools (PA)	9,357	14,555	64.3	18
Polk County Public Schools (FL)	20,944	46,263	45.3	52
Portland Public Schools (OR)	8,448	13,548	62.4	23
Prince George's County Public Schools (MD)	30,214	54,896	55.0	36
Richmond City Public Schools (VA)	8,155	12,890	63.3	21
San Antonio Independent School District (TX)	31,913	41,536	76.8	6
San Bernardino City Unified School District (CA)	14,897	35,367	42.1	57
San Diego Unified School District (CA)	40,458	58,765	68.8	15
Savannah-Chatham County Public Schools (GA)	9,275	18,937	49.0	45
Syracuse City School District (NY)	10,344	14,813	69.8	14
Toledo Public Schools (OH)	6,402	12,291	52.1	42

Table 3: Average Daily Participation (ADP) for Low-Income Students in Breakfast for SY 2011-2012 and SY 2012-2013, and Percent Change

District	Free & Reduced-Price Breakfast ADP SY 2011-12	Free & Reduced-Price Breakfast ADP SY 2012-13	Percent Change in F & RP SBP ADP
Albuquerque Public Schools (NM)	23,154	20,372	-12.0%
Anchorage School District (AK)	*	5,754	N/A
Atlanta Public Schools (GA)	19,528	18,426	-5.6%
Austin Independent School District (TX)	19,640	16,413	-16.4%
Baltimore City Public Schools (MD)	21,879	27,769	26.9%
Boise School District (ID)	6,373	6,941	8.9%
Boston Public Schools (MA)	22,777	22,762	-0.1%
Brentwood Union Free School District (NY)	3,268	6,468	97.9%
Broward County Public Schools (FL)	42,598	44,183	3.7%
Charleston County School District (SC)	13,792	15,489	12.3%
Chicago Public Schools (IL)	145,902	138,743	-4.9%
Cincinnati Public Schools (OH)	11,477	13,266	15.6%
Clark County School District (NV)	55,643	58,529	5.2%
Columbus City Schools (OH)	20,878	20,399	-2.3%
Cypress-Fairbanks Independent School District (TX)	22,606	22,414	-0.8%
Dallas Independent School District (TX)	48,057	51,701	7.6%
DeKalb County Public Schools (GA)	26,226	26,339	0.4%
Denver Public Schools (CO)	16,813	20,505	22.0%
Des Moines Public Schools (IA)	6,169	8,285	34.3%
Detroit Public Schools (MI)	36,551	38,337	4.9%
District of Columbia Public Schools (DC)	11,865	17,136	44.4%
Durham Public Schools (NC)	7,069	7,550	6.8%
Elgin School District (IL)	5,804	5,901	1.7%
Fort Worth Independent School District (TX)	22,866	20,615	-9.8%
Fulton County Schools (GA)	17,323	17,704	2.2%
Guilford County Schools (NC)	18,861	21,017	11.4%
Gwinnett County Public Schools (GA)	46,744	48,429	3.6%
Hartford Public Schools (CT)	5,770	6,018	4.3%
Hillsborough County Public Schools (FL)	50,829	51,776	1.9%
Houston Independent School District (TX)	96,709	99,473	2.9%
Indianapolis Public Schools (IN)	13,800	13,156	-4.7%
Jackson Public Schools (MS)	13,447	12,872	-4.3%
Jeffco Public Schools (CO)	6,487	6,500	0.2%
Jefferson County Public Schools (KY)	28,865	32,247	11.7%
Kansas City, Kansas Public Schools (KS)	6,649	9,927	49.3%
Knox County Schools (TN)	11,565	12,191	5.4%
Little Rock School District (AR)	7,646	8,418	10.1%
Long Beach Unified School District (CA)	18,336	17,947	-2.1%

District	Free & Reduced-Price Breakfast ADP SY 2011-12	Free & Reduced-Price Breakfast ADP SY 2012-13	Percent Change in F & RP SBP ADP
Los Angeles Unified School District (CA)	152,328	204,263	34.1%
Memphis/Shelby County Schools (TN)	41,577	47,015	13.1%
Mesa Public Schools (AZ)	15,550	15,734	1.2%
Miami-Dade Public Schools (FL)	64,212	71,601	11.5%
Minneapolis Public Schools (MN)	9,161	9,685	5.7%
Montgomery County Schools (MD)	17,363	19,097	10.0%
Nashville Public Schools (TN)	22,591	22,989	1.8%
New York City Dept. of Education (NY)	188,525	192,322	2.0%
Newark Public Schools (NJ)	23,947	19,631	-18.0%
Oakland Unified School District (CA)	7,030	6,671	-5.1%
Oklahoma City Public Schools (OK)	*	15,083	N/A
Omaha Public Schools (NE)	14,049	13,365	-4.9%
Orange County Schools (FL)	40,527	43,086	6.3%
Philadelphia School District (PA)	51,044	47,900	-6.2%
Pittsburgh Public Schools (PA)	*	9,357	N/A
Polk County Public Schools (FL)	20,816	20,944	0.6%
Portland Public Schools (OR)	8,097	8,448	4.3%
Prince George's County Public Schools (MD)	28,583	30,214	5.7%
Richmond City Public Schools (VA)	6,578	8,155	24.0%
San Antonio Independent School District (TX)	30,217	31,913	5.6%
San Bernardino City Unified School District (CA)	15,387	14,897	-0.1%
San Diego Unified School District (CA)	38,677	40,458	4.6%
Savannah-Chatham County Public Schools (GA)	9,135	9,275	1.5%
Syracuse City School District (NY)	7,667	10,344	34.9%
Toledo Public Schools (OH)	5,039	6,402	27.0%

*Data not received for the 2011-2012 school year.

Table 4: Districts, Ranked by Effectiveness in Reaching Low-Income Students with School Breakfast (SBP) as Ratio to School Lunch (NSLP) Participation in School Year 2012-2013

District	RATIO	
	F & RP Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	Rank Among Districts in Study
Boise School District (ID)	92.4	1
Newark Public Schools (NJ)	91.2	2
Houston Independent School District (TX)	85.2	3
Charleston County School District (SC)	85.1	4
Detroit Public Schools (MI)	82.5	5
San Antonio Independent School District (TX)	76.8	6
Los Angeles Unified School District (CA)	75.7	7
Cincinnati Public Schools (OH)	73.9	8
Memphis/Shelby County Schools (TN)	72.4	9
Boston Public Schools (MA)	71.6	10
District of Columbia Public Schools (DC)	71.4	11
Atlanta Public Schools (GA)	70.0	12
Kansas City, Kansas Public Schools (KS)	69.9	13
Syracuse City School District (NY)	69.8	14
San Diego Unified School District (CA)	68.8	15
Columbus City Schools (OH)	67.1	16
Little Rock School District (AR)	65.7	17
Pittsburgh Public Schools (PA)	64.3	18
Brentwood Union Free School District (NY)	63.9	19
Jefferson County Public Schools (KY)	63.4	20
Richmond City Public Schools (VA)	63.3	21
Guilford County Schools (NC)	62.8	22
Portland Public Schools (OR)	62.4	23
Gwinnett County Public Schools (GA)	61.9	24
Indianapolis Public Schools (IN)	60.6	25
Knox County Schools (TN)	59.6	26
Oklahoma City Public Schools (OK)	59.4	27
Chicago Public Schools (IL)	58.7	28
Philadelphia School District (PA)	58.7	29
Baltimore City Public Schools (MD)	58.2	30
Hillsborough County Public Schools (FL)	58.1	31
Minneapolis Public Schools (MN)	58.0	32
Fulton County Schools (GA)	56.5	33
Cypress-Fairbanks Independent School District (TX)	56.1	34
Jackson Public Schools (MS)	56.0	35
Prince George's County Public Schools (MD)	55.0	36
Albuquerque Public Schools (NM)	54.7	37
Montgomery County Schools (MD)	53.6	38
Nashville Public Schools (TN)	53.3	39

District	RATIO	
	F & RP Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	Rank Among Districts in Study
Mesa Public Schools (AZ)	52.9	40
Denver Public Schools (CO)	52.7	41
Toledo Public Schools (OH)	52.1	42
Des Moines Public Schools (IA)	51.6	43
Orange County Schools (FL)	49.9	44
Savannah-Chatham County Public Schools (GA)	49.0	45
Durham Public Schools (NC)	48.2	46
Dallas Independent School District (TX)	47.9	47
Omaha Public Schools (NE)	46.7	48
DeKalb County Public Schools (GA)	46.5	49
Clark County School District (NV)	46.2	50
Long Beach Unified School District (CA)	46.2	51
Polk County Public Schools (FL)	45.3	52
Austin Independent School District (TX)	45.1	53
Fort Worth Independent School District (TX)	44.8	54
Broward County Public Schools (FL)	43.5	55
Anchorage School District (AK)	43.1	56
San Bernardino City Unified School District (CA)	42.1	57
Hartford Public Schools (CT)	41.3	58
Miami-Dade Public Schools (FL)	40.9	59
Oakland Unified School District (CA)	37.7	60
Jeffco Public Schools (CO)	37.3	61
Elgin School District (IL)	35.1	62
New York City Dept. of Education (NY)	34.8	63

Table 5: School Districts' Additional Participation and Federal Funding if 70 Low-Income Students Were Served School Breakfast Per 100 Served School Lunch in School Year 2012-2013

District	Additional Low-Income Students in Breakfast if 70 per 100 in Lunch	Additional Federal Funding if 70 Low-Income Breakfast Students per 100 Receiving Lunch
Albuquerque Public Schools (NM)	5,690	\$1,540,248
Anchorage School District (AK)	3,582	\$934,293
Atlanta Public Schools (GA)	12	\$3,514
Austin Independent School District (TX)	9,078	\$2,912,237
Baltimore City Public Schools (MD)	5,624	\$1,507,967
Boise School District (ID)	*	N/A
Boston Public Schools (MA)	*	N/A
Brentwood Union Free School District (NY)	615	\$163,855
Broward County Public Schools (FL)	26,980	\$7,412,769
Charleston County School District (SC)	*	N/A
Chicago Public Schools (IL)	26,753	\$7,115,732
Cincinnati Public Schools (OH)	*	N/A
Clark County School District (NV)	30,071	\$8,230,834
Columbus City Schools (OH)	879	\$232,111
Cypress-Fairbanks Independent School District (TX)	5,543	\$1,587,531
Dallas Independent School District (TX)	23,790	\$6,703,188
DeKalb County Public Schools (GA)	13,295	\$3,676,462
Denver Public Schools (CO)	6,752	\$1,772,122
Des Moines Public Schools (IA)	2,944	\$810,718
Detroit Public Schools (MI)	*	N/A
District of Columbia Public Schools (DC)	*	N/A
Durham Public Schools (NC)	3,425	\$944,230
Elgin School District (IL)	5,867	\$1,595,231
Fort Worth Independent School District (TX)	11,596	\$3,540,131
Fulton County Schools (GA)	4,221	\$1,142,382
Guilford County Schools (NC)	2,423	\$665,388
Gwinnett County Public Schools (GA)	6,375	\$1,742,108
Hartford Public Schools (CT)	4,193	\$1,161,470
Hillsborough County Public Schools (FL)	10,583	\$2,907,809
Houston Independent School District (TX)	*	N/A
Indianapolis Public Schools (IN)	2,045	\$562,575
Jackson Public Schools (MS)	3,218	\$892,140
Jeffco Public Schools (CO)	5,703	\$1,495,588
Jefferson County Public Schools (KY)	3,379	\$905,829
Kansas City, Kansas Public Schools (KS)	12	\$3,167
Knox County Schools (TN)	2,135	\$576,679
Little Rock School District (AR)	551	\$149,199

District	Additional Low-Income Students in Breakfast if 70 per 100 in Lunch	Additional Federal Funding if 70 Low-Income Breakfast Students per 100 Receiving Lunch
Long Beach Unified School District (CA)	9,225	\$2,505,634
Los Angeles Unified School District (CA)	*	N/A
Memphis/Shelby County Schools (TN)	*	N/A
Mesa Public Schools (AZ)	5,074	\$1,391,995
Miami-Dade Public Schools (FL)	50,828	\$13,934,809
Minneapolis Public Schools (MN)	2,009	\$528,233
Montgomery County Schools (MD)	5,860	\$1,598,200
Nashville Public Schools (TN)	7,191	\$1,933,574
New York City Dept. of Education (NY)	194,518	\$53,127,696
Newark Public Schools (NJ)	*	N/A
Oakland Unified School District (CA)	5,701	\$1,569,597
Oklahoma City Public Schools (OK)	2,695	\$760,026
Omaha Public Schools (NE)	6,662	\$1,663,409
Orange County Schools (FL)	17,410	\$4,782,560
Philadelphia School District (PA)	9,268	\$2,556,311
Pittsburgh Public Schools (PA)	832	\$229,904
Polk County Public Schools (FL)	11,440	\$3,139,531
Portland Public Schools (OR)	1,035	\$270,827
Prince George's County Public Schools (MD)	8,213	\$2,233,053
Richmond City Public Schools (VA)	867	\$237,324
San Antonio Independent School District (TX)	*	N/A
San Bernardino City Unified School District (CA)	9,860	\$2,658,640
San Diego Unified School District (CA)	678	\$178,719
Savannah-Chatham County Public Schools (GA)	3,981	\$1,097,311
Syracuse City School District (NY)	25	\$6,935
Toledo Public Schools (OH)	2,201	\$595,470
TOTAL	582,906	\$159,887,259

*Already exceeds 70 free and reduced-price school breakfasts per 100 free and reduced-price school lunches.

Table 6: Schools in Districts Adopting Key Breakfast Options

District	Breakfast Offered Free to All	Provision 2 or Community Eligibility Provision*	Breakfast in the Classroom**
Albuquerque Public Schools (NM)	Some	yes	yes
Anchorage School District (AK)	Some	no	yes
Atlanta Public Schools (GA)	Some	yes	yes
Austin Independent School District (TX)	No	no	no
Baltimore City Public Schools (MD)	All	yes	yes
Boise School District (ID)	Some	yes	yes
Boston Public Schools (MA)	All	yes	yes
Brentwood Union Free School District (NY)	All	no	yes
Broward County Public Schools (FL)	Some	no	no
Charleston County School District (SC)	All	no	yes
Chicago Public Schools (IL)	All	yes	yes
Cincinnati Public Schools (OH)	All	yes	yes
Clark County School District (NV)	Some	yes	yes
Columbus City Schools (OH)	All	no	yes
Cypress-Fairbanks Independent School District (TX)	No	no	no
Dallas Independent School District (TX)	All	yes	yes
DeKalb County Public Schools (GA)	Some	yes	no
Denver Public Schools (CO)	All	no	yes
Des Moines Public Schools (IA)	Some	yes	yes
Detroit Public Schools (MI)	All	yes	yes
District of Columbia Public Schools (DC)	All	yes	yes
Durham Public Schools (NC)	Some	no	yes
Elgin School District (IL)	Some	no	yes
Fort Worth Independent School District (TX)	Some	no	yes
Fulton County Schools (GA)	Some	no	no
Guilford County Schools (NC)	Some	no	yes
Gwinnett County Public Schools (GA)	Some	no	yes
Hartford Public Schools (CT)	Some	yes	yes
Hillsborough County Public Schools (FL)	All	no	no
Houston Independent School District (TX)	All	no	yes
Indianapolis Public Schools (IN)	Some	yes	yes
Jackson Public Schools (MS)	No	no	yes
Jeffco Public Schools (CO)	Some	no	yes
Jefferson County Public Schools (KY)	Some	yes	yes
Kansas City, Kansas Public Schools (KS)	Some	no	yes
Knox County Schools (TN)	Some	yes	yes
Little Rock School District (AR)	Some	yes	yes
Long Beach Unified School District (CA)	Some	yes	yes
Los Angeles Unified School District (CA)	Some	yes	yes
Memphis/Shelby County Schools (TN)	All	no	yes

District	Breakfast Offered Free to All	Provision 2 or Community Eligibility Provision*	Breakfast in the Classroom**
Mesa Public Schools (AZ)	Some	yes	yes
Miami-Dade Public Schools (FL)	All	no	yes
Minneapolis Public Schools (MN)	All	no	yes
Montgomery County Schools (MD)	Some	no	yes
Nashville Public Schools (TN)	No	no	yes
New York City Dept. of Education (NY)	All	yes	yes
Newark Public Schools (NJ)	All	no	yes
Oakland Unified School District (CA)	All	yes	yes
Oklahoma City Public Schools (OK)	All	no	yes
Omaha Public Schools (NE)	All	yes	yes
Orange County Schools (FL)	All	yes	no
Philadelphia School District (PA)	All	no	yes
Pittsburgh Public Schools (PA)	Some	yes	no
Polk County Public Schools (FL)	Some	no	yes
Portland Public Schools (OR)	Some	yes	yes
Prince George's County Public Schools (MD)	Some	no	yes
Richmond City Public Schools (VA)	Some	no	yes
San Antonio Independent School District (TX)	All	no	yes
San Bernardino City Unified School District (CA)	No	no	yes
San Diego Unified School District (CA)	Some	yes	yes
Savannah-Chatham County Public Schools (GA)	Some	no	yes
Syracuse City School District (NY)	Some	no	yes
Toledo Public Schools (OH)	Some	no	yes

*Provision 2 and the Community Eligibility Provision of the National School Lunch Act enable schools to offer lunch and breakfast at no charge to all of their students, while reducing paperwork and administrative costs.

** In this chart breakfast in the classroom also includes “grab and go” and breakfast after first period.

Appendix

The Survey

In the summer of 2013, FRAC sent a survey regarding school year 2012-2013 school breakfast participation and practices to 87 large urban and suburban school districts. FRAC selected the districts based on size and geographic representation, seeking to look not just at the nation's largest districts but at large school districts in a substantial number of states. School food service staff in 60 districts responded between August and December 2013.

The major goals of the survey were to:

- determine the extent to which these districts reach low-income children with the School Breakfast Program;
- assess trends in reaching children with the School Breakfast Program;
- consider the additional number of low-income students who would be served if the districts achieved higher participation rates and determine the federal dollars lost to the districts as a result of not providing these meals;
- monitor progress and examine the effectiveness of school districts' efforts to increase school breakfast participation through the provision of "universal" breakfast (breakfast offered at no charge to all students) and the implementation of programs where breakfast is eaten in the classroom at the start of the school day; and
- collect information on promising practices in the districts that might serve as national models for increasing school breakfast participation by low-income students.

Methodology

The data in this report were collected directly from the school districts' food and nutrition department personnel through an email survey and follow-up phone interviews. Additional data were collected from three state anti-hunger organizations—Maryland Hunger Solutions, Florida Impact, and the Texas Hunger Initiative.

Student Participation

Student participation data are based on the total number of breakfasts and lunches served during the school year, with average daily participation determined by dividing the data by the number of serving days provided by each district.

The Cost of Low Participation Rates

The cost estimate is based on a calculation of the average daily number of children receiving free or reduced-price breakfasts for every 100 children receiving free or reduced-price lunches during the same school year. FRAC then calculated the number of additional children who would be reached if each district reached a ratio of 70 in breakfast to 100 in lunch. FRAC then multiplied this unserved population by the reimbursement rate for 169 school days of breakfast. (While some districts served breakfast for more or fewer days during the 2012–2013 school year, 169 was the national average.) FRAC assumed each district's mix of free and reduced-price students would apply to any new participants, and conservatively assumed that no additional student's meal would be reimbursed at the higher rate that "severe need" schools receive.

School District Contacts					
District	State	Contact	Title	Phone	Email
Albuquerque Public Schools	NM	Mary Swift	Director	505-345-5661 x37041	swift@aps.edu
Anchorage Public Schools	AK	Dennis Pitt	Financial Analyst	907-348-5274	pitt_dennis@asdk12.org
Atlanta Public Schools	GA	Marilyn Hughes	Director, Nutrition Administration	404-802-1599	mhhughes@atlanta.k12.ga.us
Austin Independent School District	TX	Chris Carrillo-Spano	Director	512-414-0228	chriscar@austinisd.org
Baltimore City Public Schools	MD	Elizabeth Marchetta	Office of the CFO	410-396-8768	eamarchetta@bcps.k12.md.us
Boise Public Schools	ID	Peggy Bodnar	Supervisor	208-854-4104	peggy.moorebodnar@boiseschools.org
Boston Public Schools	MA	Michael Peck	Director	617.635.9144	mpeck@boston.k12.ma.us
Brentwood Union Free School District	NY	Nancy Padrone	Director of Operations	631-434-2316	npadrone@bufsd.org
Broward County Public Schools	FL	Mary Mulder	Director	754-321-0215	mary.mulder@browardschools.com
Charleston County School District	SC	Walter Campbell	Director	843-566-8180	walter_campbell@charleston.k12.sc.us
Chicago Public Schools	IL	Leslie Fowler	Director	773-553-2833	Lafowler@cps.edu
Cincinnati Public Schools	OH	Jessica Shelly	Director	513-363-0818	Shellyj@cps-K12.org
Clark County School District (Las Vegas)	NV	Virginia Beck	Coordinator	702-799-8123	vkbeck@interact.ccsd.net
Columbus City Schools	OH	Joe Brown	Director	614-365-5671	jbrown@columbus.k12.oh.us
Cypress-Fairbanks Independent School District	TX	Darrin Crawford	Director	281-897-4541	jeffery.crawford@cfisd.net
Dallas Independent School District	TX	Dora Rivas	Executive Director	214-932-5503	drivas@dallasisd.org
DeKalb County School District	GA	Joyce Wimberly	Director	678-676-0156	joyce_r_wimberly@fc.dekalb.k12.ga.us
Denver Public Schools	CO	Theresa Hafner	Director	720-423-5611	theresa_hafner@dpsk12.org
Des Moines Public Schools	IA	Sandy Huisman	Director	515-242-7712	sandy.huisman@dmschools.org
Detroit Public Schools	MI	Betti Wiggins	Director	313-578-7220	betti.wiggins@detroitk12.org
District of Columbia Public Schools	DC	Elizabeth Leach	Director of Compliance	202-412-8429	Elizabeth.leach@dc.gov
Durham Public Schools	NC	James Keaton	Executive Director	919-560-2370	James.Keaten@dpsnc.net
Elgin School District	IL	Claudie Phillips	Director	847-888-5000 x5036	ClaudiePhillips@u-46.org
Fort Worth Independent School District	TX	Glenn Headlee	Director	817-814-3500	roy.headlee@fwisd.org
Fulton County Schools	GA	Alyssia Wright	Executive Director	404-669-8960	WrightAL@fulton.k12.ga.us
Guilford County Schools (Greensboro)	NC	James Faggione	Director	336-370-3266	faggioj@gcsnc.com
Gwinnett County Schools	GA	Ken Yant	Director	678-301-6246	ken_yant@gwinnett.k12.ga.us
Hartford Public Schools	CT	Lonnie Burt	Director	860-695-8490	burty001@hartfordschools.org
Hillsborough County Public Schools (Tampa)	FL	Mary Kate Harrison	Director	813-840-7092	marykate.harrison@sdhc.k12.fl.us
Houston Independent School District	TX	Mark Welch	General Manager of Operations	713-491-5849	mwelch@houstonisd.org
Indianapolis Public Schools	IN	Jane Cookson	Director	317-226-4772	cooksonj@ips.k12.in.us
Jackson Public Schools	MS	Mary Hill	Director	601-960-8794	mhill@jackson.k12.ms.us
Jeffco Public Schools	CO	Linda Stoll	Executive Director	303-982-6746	lstoll@jeffco.k12.co.us
Jefferson County Public Schools (Louisville)	KY	Julie Bauscher	Director	502-485-3186	Julia.Bauscher@jefferson.kyschools.us
Kansas City, Kansas Public Schools	KS	Karla Robinson	Director	913-627-3914	karobin@kckps.org
Knox County Schools (Knoxville)	TN	Jon Dickl	Director	865-594-3614	jon.dickl@knoxschools.org

District	State	Contact	Title	Phone	Email
Little Rock School District	AR	Lilly Bouie	Director of Nutrition	501-447-2452	Lilly.bouie@lrsd.org
Long Beach Unified School District	CA	Cecelia Slater	Director	562-427-7923 x249	cslater@lbschools.net
Los Angeles Unified School District	CA	Laura Benavidez	Assistant Director, Food Services Division	213-241-2993	laura.benavidez@lausd.net
Memphis/Shelby County Schools	TN	Anthony Geraci	Food Service Director	901-416-5556	GERACIA@mcsk12.net
Mesa Public Schools	AZ	Loretta Zullo	Director	480-472-0909	lzullo@mpsaz.org
Miami-Dade County Public Schools	FL	Susan Rothstein	Coordinator, Nutritional Wellness	786-275-0438	srothstein@dadeschools.net
Minneapolis Public Schools	MN	Bertrand Weber	Director	612-668-8463	bertrand.weber@mpls.k12.mn.us
Montgomery County Public Schools	MD	Marla R. Caplon	Director	301-840-8170	Marla_R_Caplon@mcpsmd.org
Nashville (Metro) Public Schools	TN	Sheila Clark	Assistant Director, Business Support, Nutrition Services	615-259-8467	sheila.clark@mnpss.org
New York City Dept. of Education	NY	Robert Deschak	Strategic Initiatives, School Food	718-707-4334	rdeschak@schools.nyc.gov
Newark Public Schools	NJ	Tonya Riggins	Director	973-733-7172	triggins@nps.k12.nj.us
Oakland Unified School District	CA	Jennifer LeBarre	Director	510-879-8345	Jennifer.lebarre@ousd.k12.ca.us
Oklahoma City Public Schools	OK	Debra Woody	Child Nutrition Specialist III	405-587-1024	drwoody@okcps.org
Omaha Public Schools	NE	Tammy Yarmon	Director	402-557-2230	Tammy.Yarmon@ops.org
Orange County Public Schools (Orlando)	FL	Lora Gilbert	Director	407-317-3963	Lora.gilbert@ocps.net
Philadelphia School District	PA	Wayne Grasela	Director	215-400-5531	wgrasela@philasd.org
Pittsburgh Public Schools	PA	Curtistine Walker	Director	412-488-3302	cwalker2@pghboe.net
Polk County Public Schools	FL	Susan Ehrhart	Director	863-534-0590	susan.ehrhart@polk-fl.net
Portland Public Schools	OR	Gitta Grether-Sweeney	Director	503-916-3397	gsweeney@pps.net
Prince George's County Public Schools	MD	Joan Shorter	Director	301-952-6580	jshorter@pgcps.org
Richmond Public Schools	VA	Susan Roberson	Director	804-780-8240	sroberso@richmond.k12.va.us
San Antonio Independent School District	TX	Sally Cody	Director	210-227-3522 x122	scody1@saisd.net
San Bernardino City Unified School District	CA	Amelia A. Toledo	Interim Business Manager	909-881-8000	amelia.toledo@sbcusd.com
San Diego Unified School District	CA	Gary Petill	Director	858-627-7301	gpetill@sandi.net
Savannah Chatham County Public Schools	GA	Lydia Martin	Director	912-395-1130	lydia.martin@sccpss.com
Syracuse City School District	NY	Cindy Bonura Sturgeon	Director	315-435-4207	Cbonura@scsd.us
Toledo Public Schools	OH	Reynald Debroas	Executive Director	419-244-8893	rdebroas@tps.org