



Afterschool Suppers: A Snapshot of Participation

2018 Afterschool Nutrition Report

October 2018 ■ www.FRAC.org



Afterschool Suppers: A Snapshot of Participation

2018 Afterschool Nutrition Report

Acknowledgments

This report was prepared by Clarissa Hayes, Randy Rosso, and Crystal FitzSimons. The Food Research & Action Center (FRAC) gratefully acknowledges support of its work to expand and improve the Afterschool Nutrition Programs in 2016–2017 from

- The California Endowment;
- ConAgra Foods Foundation;
- National Dairy Council/Dairy Management, Inc.;
- National League of Cities Institute;
- Tyson Foods, Inc.;
- Walmart Foundation; and
- YMCA of the USA.

General support of FRAC's work to expand and improve the child nutrition programs has been provided by the following:

- Annie E. Casey Foundation;
- Anonymous Donor;
- Bainum Family Foundation;
- Eos Foundation;
- Evangelical Lutheran Church in America;
- General Mills Foundation;
- Hunger Is, a joint program of the Albertsons Companies Foundation and the Entertainment Industry Foundation;

- The JPB Foundation;
- Kellogg Company Fund;
- Leaves of Grass Fund;
- MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger;
- The Moriah Fund;
- New Directions Foundation;
- Robert Wood Johnson Foundation;
- Smithfield Foods; and
- Turrell 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: Summer & Afterschool Newsletter*, visit frac.org.



Introduction

The federal Afterschool Nutrition Programs¹ provide funding to serve suppers and snacks alongside educational and enrichment programming during the hours after school ends. In October 2017, 1.2 million children received an afterschool supper, an 11 percent increase from October 2016, and 1.6 million children received a snack. More than 46,000 afterschool programs provided a supper, a snack, or both through the Afterschool Nutrition Programs in October 2017.

Federal funding to provide afterschool suppers in low-income communities around the nation became available relatively recently, through the Healthy, Hunger Free-Kids Act of 2010, whereas afterschool snacks have been available broadly since 1998. Federally funded afterschool suppers can be a game-changer for reducing childhood hunger in low-income communities and supporting the establishment, growth, and quality of afterschool enrichment programs. Children from struggling families can receive a healthy late afternoon or evening meal, instead of returning home hungry from their afterschool program, often to empty cupboards. And the meal helps draw children into programs that keep them safe, engaged, and learning while their parents are working.

Participation in afterschool suppers is moving in the right direction, but much more needs to be done to increase its reach. Nationally, only one child for every 19 low-income children who participated in school lunch in October 2017 received an afterschool supper. More children received afterschool snacks than suppers

through the Afterschool Nutrition Programs on an average school day in October 2017, with 1.2 million children receiving afterschool snacks through the National School Lunch Program (NSLP), and another 335,000 children through the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP). Participation in both CACFP and NSLP snacks dropped by 62,347 children. This was likely driven by some afterschool programs moving from snacks to suppers.

The limited participation in afterschool suppers and snacks mirrors the limited number of afterschool programs serving low-income communities. Afterschool programs, an important tool for leveling the educational playing field for low-income children, either do not exist or are too costly and out of reach for struggling families if they are not supported with public or private dollars. Federal, state, and local public funding for afterschool programs is too limited. The 21st Century Community Learning Centers program, the largest federal funding source for afterschool and summer educational and enrichment programming, supports afterschool funding for only 1.7 million children on an average day. Despite the clear need for additional funding, the Trump Administration has proposed to cut funding for the program. Moreover, only 17 states invest state funds to specifically support afterschool programs. In fact, according to the report *America After 3PM*, while there are 10 million students participating in afterschool programs, more than 19 million students would participate if a program were accessible or affordable to them.

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.

Advocacy efforts to increase funding for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers, and to dedicate state and municipal funding to support afterschool programs that in turn provide afterschool suppers, can help support academic achievement and reduce childhood hunger. Such efforts also would provide access to much-needed child care for working families, while helping to stretch tight household budgets.

Federal, state, and local advocacy is needed to increase the availability of afterschool programming, but at the same time there are too many existing and eligible afterschool programs that are missing out on the opportunity to better meet the nutritional needs of children. Too many programs are serving a snack instead of a supper, or are not participating in the Afterschool Nutrition Programs at all. In other words, there are too few afterschool programs in low-income communities, and too many of the existing programs do not take advantage of available funding to serve supper.

Fortunately, there are a number of successful strategies to increase participation in afterschool suppers. These include switching the offering from snacks to suppers (or serving both snacks and suppers); recruiting more school districts to provide afterschool suppers and snacks; engaging schools in sponsoring other sites in the community; supporting and expanding year-round participation; streamlining and simplifying the Afterschool Supper Program; serving meals during

Federally funded afterschool suppers can be a game-changer for reducing childhood hunger in low-income communities and supporting the establishment, growth, and quality of afterschool enrichment programs.

weekends, holidays, and school closures; and improving meal quality.

The important work by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, state agencies, and anti-hunger, afterschool, and child advocates to promote afterschool suppers, as well as reduce barriers to participation, has supported the implementation and growth of the program. Still, there remains much room for expansion. Efforts to increase the number of schools, local government agencies, and private nonprofits offering afterschool suppers and benefiting from the federal dollars available through the Afterschool Nutrition Programs must continue. It also is crucial to advocate for more funding for afterschool programs so children truly have what they need after school: quality programs with nutritious suppers and snacks served at those programs.

About This Report

This report measures the reach of 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).² This report focuses on participation in October 2017, with comparisons to October 2016, nationally and in each state. Based on a variety of metrics, this report examines the impacts of trends and policies on program participation.

The focus in particular is on afterschool **supper** participation through CACFP, using the extent of free and reduced-price 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 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 2017 in each state that is not meeting this goal. In some states, fewer schools meet the area eligibility requirement for the Afterschool Supper Program, which can impact the program's reach. FRAC sets a modest goal to help ensure that states can reach it.



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, and the growth in participation.

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

² 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 nonprofits for providing a **supper, snack, or both** to children 18 years old and younger³ who participate in educational or enrichment programming after school, on weekends, and during school holidays throughout the school year.⁴ 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, youth service nonprofit (like a YMCA or a Boys & Girls Club), or 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; they designate which afterschool programs at which they are sponsoring snacks. 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 its children at the free 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 can still participate, but the reimbursement rate is based on the participating children's eligibility for free or reduced-price school meals.

³ Children who turn 19 during the school year are still able to participate in the Afterschool Nutrition Programs for the remainder of the year.

⁴ 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 2017

In 2017, looking at year-to-year data from previous Octobers, participation in afterschool suppers continued to grow. At the same time, afterschool snack participation decreased slightly in both the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) and the National School Lunch Program (NSLP), a drop that was likely driven by some programs providing suppers instead of snacks.

- The Afterschool Supper Program served 1.2 million children on an average weekday in October 2017, an increase of 11.3 percent, or 124,000 children, from October 2016.
- Despite the growth, the Afterschool Supper Program still served only a small fraction of the low-income

students who participated in the school-day free or reduced-price school lunch program in October 2017, reaching just one child for every 19 low-income children who participated in school lunch.

- The Afterschool Snack Programs served 1.6 million children; 1.2 million through NSLP, and 335,000 through CACFP.
- More than 46,000 afterschool programs participated in the Afterschool Nutrition Programs in October 2017, with participation slightly higher in CACFP (23,605 sites) compared to NSLP (22,985 sites).
- CACFP's increase in afterschool sites (6.3 percent) outpaced NSLP (4.3 percent).

State Findings for October 2017

States all have room to increase participation in the 2018–2019 school year and beyond, given how recent the passage of the Afterschool Supper Program is. Still, the take-up rate in the states varied tremendously, with some states having moved in recent years much more quickly to implement and expand the reach of afterschool suppers. That take-up rate in this report is measured by the ratio of afterschool suppers to free and reduced-price school lunches.

- In October 2017, the District of Columbia (21.7 to 100) reached FRAC'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 (13.5 to 100) and Vermont (10.4 to 100).
- Ten additional states reached more children with afterschool suppers than the national average of 5.4 to 100: Oregon (8 to 100); Delaware (7 to 100); Nevada (6.7 to 100); New York (6.5 to 100); Maryland (6.3 to 100); Texas (6.3 to 100); Alabama (6.2 to 100); Florida (6 to 100); Arkansas (5.9 to 100); and Tennessee (5.7 to 100). Virginia (5.4 to 100) reached the national average.

- Thirty-seven states served supper to fewer than one child for every 20 low-income children who participated in school lunch; six of them served fewer than 1 to 100: North Dakota (0.2 to 100); Hawaii (0.3 to 100); Wyoming (0.4 to 100); Maine (0.5 to 100); Iowa (0.6 to 100); and Mississippi (0.8 to 100).
- Comparing October 2017 to October 2016, 35 states moved in the right direction and increased the participation rate in afterschool suppers; 24 of these states increased their average daily participation by more than 10 percent.
- Three states increased the number of children participating in supper by more than 50 percent: Oklahoma (121 percent); North Carolina (66.9 percent); and Mississippi (53.9 percent).
- Sixteen states saw a decrease in supper participation when comparing October 2016 to October 2017; three states dropped by more than 10 percent: Arkansas (-32.2 percent), Louisiana (-26.2 percent), and Maryland (-12.6 percent).
- Three large states together served afterschool suppers to just over half of the 1.2 million children who participated nationwide: California (348,878 children); Texas (177,581 children); and Florida (107,445 children).

Missed Opportunities

Federal funding is available from the Child and Adult Care Food Program to serve children a supper at afterschool programs in low-income communities. When states fail to use these dollars, children miss out on the nutritious evening meals they need to keep hunger at bay, and afterschool programs in the states miss out on important federal funding that would help support their ability to strengthen their programs and reach more children.

If every state had served supper to 15 children for every 100 low-income children who participated in school lunch in October 2017, then nearly 2.1 million additional

children would have benefited from a nutritious meal after school, and an additional \$131 million in federal funding would have supported the provision of supper at afterschool programs in October 2017 alone.

Seven states each lost out on more than \$5 million in federal reimbursements in October 2017 and failed to serve the most children: Texas (\$14.8 million; 242,575 children); Florida (\$9.9 million; 163,188 children); Georgia (\$7.6 million; 124,225 children); New York (\$7.3 million; 120,419 children); Illinois (\$6 million; 99,267 children); North Carolina (\$5.6 million; 91,810 children); and Ohio (\$5.2 million; 85,118 children).



Increased Support for Afterschool Programming Equals More Afterschool Meals

Good afterschool programs are a critical resource for communities — they provide measurable benefits to students academically, socially, and behaviorally.⁵ In addition to providing valuable learning opportunities, afterschool programs also support working families. In a study conducted by the Afterschool Alliance, 8 in 10 parents reported that afterschool programs help them keep their jobs.⁶ Unfortunately, the study also found that there is not enough afterschool programming available — or accessible — to low-income families. In fact, only 1 in 3 families that want access to afterschool programs for their children have it.⁷

To maximize participation in the Afterschool Nutrition Programs, there must be enough programs offering educational and enrichment activities that every family can access and afford. Afterschool programming not only draws children into safe and engaging learning environments, it also provides a critical — and required — foundation for providing federally reimbursable afterschool meals. Combined, afterschool programming and meals contribute to the healthy growth and academic achievement of children. Increasing public (federal, state, and local) and private funding to operate afterschool programs in low-income communities is key to ensuring more students have access to afterschool meals.

The 21st Century Community Learning Centers program, the largest federal funding source for afterschool and summer programming, helps support students' academic achievement. Many states have proactively tied this funding to the Afterschool Nutrition Programs. Oregon requires 21st Century Community Learning Centers to participate in the Afterschool Supper Program, and California requires that programs at

a minimum seek to qualify for a federally funded afterschool snack or meal program. Despite ongoing efforts by some in Congress and by the current administration to eliminate federal funding for the program completely in both fiscal years (FY) 2018 and 2019, Congress approved \$1.21 billion in funding for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program for FY 2018 (\$20 million above the previous year) and \$1.22 billion for FY 2019 (\$10 million above the previous year). Despite these small increases in funding, millions of children remain unserved, and the program remains vulnerable to future funding cuts. Congress must continue investing more resources into the 21st Century Community Learning Centers as well as other afterschool programming.

In addition to 21st Century Community Learning Centers funding, the federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) creates additional opportunities for states to prioritize afterschool programs that address the opportunity gap that exists for low-income children. ESSA, the most recent iteration of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, requires each state to develop a plan for how it will close educational achievement gaps for its students. Many states have included additional support for afterschool programming in their plans. Anti-hunger and education advocates should work with their state out-of-school time organizations to ensure that best practices to combine afterschool programming and meals are included.

Finally, more efforts to establish stable afterschool funding opportunities on state and municipal levels are needed. Currently, only 17 states have invested state funds to support specifically afterschool programming. California provides \$600 million annually through its After School Education & Safety Program. Other states are finding new ways to allocate funding to afterschool programming. Tennessee and Oklahoma, for example, have designated unclaimed lottery funds to support

⁵ Afterschool Alliance. (2018). *This Is Afterschool*. Available at: http://afterschoolalliance.org/documents/factsResearch/This_Is_Afterschool_2018.pdf. Accessed on September 18, 2018.

⁶ Afterschool Alliance. (2016). *America After 3PM: Afterschool Programs in Demand*. Available at: <http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/AA3PM/>. Accessed on September 18, 2018.

⁷ Ibid.

afterschool programs. In Tennessee, this fund came to \$17 million in 2017. A number of municipalities, including Boston, Massachusetts, Chicago, Illinois, and Nashville, Tennessee, have invested in afterschool programming, but more needs to be done to create stable, sustainable funding streams in every state and community.

Further investments in afterschool programming would not only help level the educational playing field for low-income children, but also are a crucially effective way to expand participation in the Afterschool Nutrition Programs.

Additional Opportunities for Maximizing Supper Participation

While positive gains have been made over the last eight years since the Afterschool Supper Program became available nationwide, it is important that advocates, state agencies, and providers continue to build on this expansion and identify additional strategies to grow participation. Implementing the following best practices — in addition to increasing funding for afterschool programming — will help support the continued growth of this important program.

Schools and the Afterschool Nutrition Programs

School districts can play an important role in increasing access to afterschool suppers and snacks. As a trusted source and service provider with food service experience, the ability to achieve economies of scale, and established systems in place to provide meals to students after classes have ended for the day, schools are a natural fit for operating the program at both school and community sites. By incorporating afterschool meal planning into existing operations, schools can take advantage of the program's flexibility by implementing a service model that works for them. For example, school nutrition departments can serve afterschool suppers that are cold or hot; in the cafeteria, or wherever programming is taking place; by cafeteria staff or afterschool programming staff; and right when the bell rings or later in the afternoon.

Redlands Unified School District (California)

Serving afterschool suppers benefits not only afterschool programs and the students they reach, but it also supports the school's bottom line. A supper program allows schools to receive additional federal reimbursements and can be implemented without many added overhead costs. In California, Redlands Unified School District (RUSD) worked to transition its afterschool program sites from serving snacks through the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) to suppers. By simply adding three components to their existing cold snack service, RUSD was able to serve meals — branded as “supersnacks” — with minimal added labor. Centralizing meal preparation to one kitchen, and using afterschool program staff instead of cafeteria staff to serve meals were other strategies used by the school district to run a financially viable program. With these small steps, RUSD was able to increase the amount of afterschool reimbursement it received by over 250 percent within a year and expand the number of sites from six to 22.

School districts can and should provide afterschool suppers at schools or in areas with 50 percent or more of the students certified for free and reduced-price school meals. Advocates and state agencies can identify eligible nonparticipating schools, and partner with them to ensure they have the support and technical assistance to build a successful, sustainable afterschool meal program.

Serve Meals During Weekends, Holidays, Vacations, and Unanticipated School Closures

Afterschool programs can receive federal funding to serve meals and snacks through the Afterschool Nutrition Programs not just after school, but also on weekends, school holidays, and school breaks during the school year. This allows programs to ensure children have access to the nutrition they need when school is not in session and children do not have

access to school breakfast and lunch. Non-school days during the school year create additional nutritional and financial burdens on struggling families. And these days are significant — for an average school year that runs 36 weeks, weekends equal more than 70 days of missed meal service days, and school holidays and vacations can total an additional 15 days or more of missed meals.

Many state agencies are actively supporting efforts to provide meals outside of the after school hours. The Louisiana Department of Education includes information on serving during nontraditional times in its regional trainings and workshops. The Kansas Department of Education shares information about weekend meal service during webinars and in monthly updates sent out to all sponsors. The New Jersey Department of Agriculture has found success in promoting this opportunity to summer food sponsors that serve on weekends during the summer months, as they may have capacity to maintain year-round service on weekends. Many states also are encouraging schools to create a contingency plan before the school year begins in case of unexpected school closures, such as snow days or teacher strikes.

There is much room to grow meal service to ensure students have access to meals 365 days a year. The easiest way to add more meals on weekends, school holidays, and school breaks during the school year is to recruit programs already operating during those times. Many faith-based groups, libraries, YMCAs, parks and recreation centers, and similar organizations provide programming on weekends and school breaks. Many also already may be serving meals out of their program budget. As these programs already have the existing infrastructure and staff available on non-school days, they can easily incorporate meals through the Afterschool Nutrition Programs and obtain the funding for that. Advocates, state agencies, and sponsors can identify these existing programs while also including weekend and school break outreach in their afterschool meal expansion plans.

Expanding Afterschool Nutrition Access in Rural Communities

The Afterschool Nutrition Programs are a key way to help fill the hunger gap that exists after school for millions of low-income children in rural communities. Research shows that rural households with children are more likely to experience food insecurity than households with children in metropolitan areas.⁸ Children living in rural areas also have higher rates of obesity compared to children living in metropolitan areas. In addition to providing healthy food that helps combat hunger and improve nutrition, sites participating in the Afterschool Nutrition Programs offer students a safe place to be active, engaged, and healthy after the school day ends. These afterschool programs also help support working families, with 72 percent of rural parents agreeing that they help working parents keep their jobs.⁹

With less than 13 percent of children in rural areas — approximately 1.2 million — enrolled in an afterschool program, the reach of afterschool suppers in rural areas has been limited.¹⁰ One of the most effective ways to increase access to afterschool programs in rural areas (as in other areas) is to increase the amount of federal and state funding.

Rural communities also have unique challenges that schools, anti-hunger partners, and other leaders should work together to overcome. For example, long travel distances may make it challenging for some children to stay after school, even when programs are offered. To alleviate this barrier, schools can work to adjust bus schedules to allow for meal service and an enrichment activity before buses leave. Schools also can consider serving meals immediately after the bell rings in the classroom, alongside offering homework help.

Additionally, U.S. Department of Agriculture Rural Development provides grants through its Community Facilities Programs initiative to construct, expand, or

⁸ Afterschool Alliance. (2016). *America After 3PM Special Report: The Growing Importance of Afterschool in Rural Communities*. Available at: <http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/AA3PM/>. Accessed on September 18, 2018.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid.

improve facilities that provide health care, education, public safety, and public services. This funding stream can support programs that serve afterschool meals.

Other partners in rural areas may include 4-H, cooperative extension, universities, community colleges, libraries, and faith-based organizations. These groups may be able to provide space, transportation, programming, or other support for the Afterschool Nutrition Programs.

Four-day School Weeks

As more rural school districts implement four-day school weeks as a cost-cutting measure, many thousands of students are at risk of missing out on a school breakfast and school lunch they normally receive during the school week. The Afterschool Nutrition Programs can help fill this gap. Afterschool sites may serve up to one meal and one snack any day of the week during the school year, even on days when schools are not open. Programs operating on days when school is not in session can choose to provide breakfast, lunch, or supper (and a snack), based on what works best for the program. Several state agencies surveyed for this report shared that while districts were adopting the four-day school week, many had not yet started serving meals on the resulting non-school day.

Schools, advocates, and community leaders should work together to ensure that meals and snacks are provided every day during the school year, including on weekends, school holidays, and breaks. Efforts should be made to identify community sites that can provide meals in the school's place.

Cities Combatting Hunger: Alabama Expands Access to Afterschool Meals

In 2012, the National League of Cities and the Food Research & Action Center launched Cities Combatting Hunger (CHAMPS) to work with cities across the country to increase participation in the Afterschool Nutrition Programs and Summer Nutrition Programs through funding from the Walmart Foundation. CHAMPS has provided almost 80 city agencies with funding, technical assistance, and training opportunities to increase access to year-round, out-of-school time nutrition programs.

In 2016–2017, CHAMPS awarded 12 cities in Alabama, along with the Alabama Association of Food Banks, grant funding to help expand access to the Afterschool Nutrition Programs and Summer Nutrition Programs. Efforts across the state have included creating marketing campaigns, adding new meal sites and sponsors, and engaging elected officials to raise awareness. Two statewide convenings also were held to give cities an opportunity to share best practices and collaborate. As a result of these efforts and the continued leadership of the Alabama Department of Education, Alabama saw the number of suppers served on an average day increase from 16,000 in October 2016 to 24,000 in October 2017 (a 49.2 percent increase) and the number of sites increase by 43 (a 12 percent increase).

To learn more about CHAMPS and how city agencies and leaders can get involved with the Afterschool and Summer Nutrition Programs, visit <http://www.nlc.org/CHAMPS>.

Eligibility Barriers to Afterschool Meals

In order to provide meals and snacks through the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) at-risk option, an afterschool program must be located in the service area of a school with at least 50 percent of its students certified to receive free or reduced-price school meals. The 50 percent threshold, which also is used to qualify sites for the Summer Nutrition Programs and child care homes for CACFP meals and snacks, is too high. It disproportionately limits low-income children's access to healthy meals in rural and suburban areas that do not have the same concentrations of poverty as urban areas. It also has unnecessarily different standards from other programs, and keeps numerous federally funded afterschool programs that are designed to provide educational and enrichment programming for low-income children from participating in the nutrition programs. For example, the threshold to receive afterschool program funding through the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program is 40 percent. Lowering the threshold for the Afterschool Nutrition Programs to 40 percent would help mesh the programs and would help ensure that children in low-income communities across the country are receiving the healthy afterschool nutrition they need.

There are other ways in which the eligibility test for the Afterschool Nutrition Programs is too restrictive, particularly when compared to other federal child nutrition programs. For example, the Summer Nutrition Programs, which often serve the same children participating in afterschool programs, can use a variety of methods to qualify a site for federally funded meals and snacks. These include school or census data demonstrating either that the site is located in a community meeting the 50 percent threshold or demonstrating that at least 50 percent of the children enrolled in a program are low-income. This allows summer meals to be provided in pockets of poverty within a school's larger catchment area, whereas the use of only school data for afterschool means that fewer afterschool programs can provide afterschool meals and snacks through CACFP, making it more difficult for the millions of low-income children who rely on school lunch to receive a healthy evening meal.

The next Child Nutrition Reauthorization creates the opportunity for Congress to address both of these issues that have been limiting participation — lowering the threshold to 40 percent and allowing afterschool sites to qualify using the same data as the Summer Nutrition Programs.

Conclusion

The number of afterschool suppers served increased in October 2017, maintaining the trajectory of growth seen since the program became broadly available in 2010. National participation increased by 11 percent — 124,000 children — from the previous year. This rate of increase was more than double the growth seen between October 2015 and October 2016 (4.6 percent), demonstrating the impact that comprehensive outreach, collaboration, and implementation of best practices can have on reaching more children with this important program.

Despite this success, afterschool suppers are still falling short of the need — serving 1.2 million children during an average day in October 2017 meant only 1 in 19 of the low-income children who participate in school lunch during the school year received an afterschool supper. Much more needs to be done to reach the millions of children who may not have a supper waiting for them when they return home after school.

Proven strategies detailed in this report for increasing afterschool meal participation include switching the offering from snacks to suppers (or serving both snacks and suppers); recruiting more school districts to provide afterschool suppers and snacks; engaging schools in sponsoring other sites in the community; supporting and expanding year-round participation; streamlining and simplifying the Afterschool Supper Program; serving meals during weekends, holidays, and school closures; and improving meal quality.

National participation increased by 11 percent — 124,000 children — from the previous year ... demonstrating the impact that comprehensive outreach, collaboration, and implementation of best practices can have on reaching more children with this important program.

The most effective way to connect more children to afterschool suppers, however, is first to ensure that there are enough afterschool programs available for children to participate in and that families can afford. This means maintaining and investing more in existing funding streams, such as the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program. Further investment also is needed at the federal, state, and local levels.

Partners from every level — the U.S. Department of Agriculture; state agencies; and anti-hunger, afterschool, and child advocates — need to intensify their efforts to ensure there are enough afterschool programs serving children — and serving meals — so that every child has access to the nutrition and programming they need to support their academic achievement, health, and well-being.

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 2017–2018 school year (based on October 2017 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 in 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 for October 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 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 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 2017–2018: \$3.23. 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 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 that the target ratio of 15 to 100 is achievable by all states. For details, see FRAC's previous 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 2016 and 2017, by State**

State	Supper ADP, October 2016	Lunch ADP, October 2016	Ratio ³	Supper ADP, October 2017	Lunch ADP, October 2017	Ratio ³	Change in Ratio	Percent Change in Supper ADP
Alabama	16,393	403,530	4.1	24,461	395,071	6.2	2.1	49.2 %
Alaska	1,927	42,661	4.5	1,756	42,402	4.1	-0.4	-8.9 %
Arizona	9,817	500,002	2.0	11,721	491,924	2.4	0.4	19.4 %
Arkansas	21,641	249,535	8.7	14,679	247,153	5.9	-2.7	-32.2 %
California	318,882	2,609,780	12.2	348,878	2,588,949	13.5	1.3	9.4 %
Colorado	4,730	236,620	2.0	5,848	230,267	2.5	0.5	23.6 %
Connecticut	3,369	175,924	1.9	4,081	179,406	2.3	0.4	21.1 %
Delaware	4,421	69,051	6.4	4,817	68,727	7.0	0.6	9.0 %
District of Columbia	7,780	45,282	17.2	10,240	47,273	21.7	4.5	31.6 %
Florida	97,487	1,434,623	6.8	107,445	1,804,224	6.0	-0.8	10.2 %
Georgia	17,873	942,785	1.9	17,695	946,132	1.9	0.0	-1.0 %
Hawaii	198	67,612	0.3	182	66,065	0.3	0.0	-8.1 %
Idaho	1,446	99,902	1.4	1,446	96,523	1.5	0.0	-0.1 %
Illinois	26,098	843,575	3.1	27,551	845,455	3.3	0.2	5.6 %
Indiana	8,927	443,883	2.0	10,824	452,330	2.4	0.4	21.3 %
Iowa	931	185,999	0.5	1,043	183,784	0.6	0.1	12.0 %
Kansas	3,011	199,722	1.5	2,992	194,686	1.5	0.0	-0.6 %
Kentucky	14,843	437,331	3.4	17,219	441,388	3.9	0.5	16.0 %
Louisiana	27,568	460,504	6.0	20,333	473,075	4.3	-1.7	-26.2 %
Maine	341	63,165	0.5	331	61,327	0.5	0.0	-2.9 %
Maryland	22,934	313,792	7.3	20,046	319,371	6.3	-1.0	-12.6 %
Massachusetts	13,123	355,300	3.7	13,303	352,630	3.8	0.1	1.4 %
Michigan	21,337	578,419	3.7	19,696	571,738	3.4	-0.2	-7.7 %
Minnesota	6,395	297,372	2.2	8,647	294,074	2.9	0.8	35.2 %
Mississippi	1,702	323,942	0.5	2,619	317,407	0.8	0.3	53.9 %
Missouri	13,279	382,285	3.5	16,009	374,498	4.3	0.8	20.6 %
Montana	1,768	51,171	3.5	1,805	50,398	3.6	0.1	2.1 %
Nebraska ⁴	4,748	126,812	3.7	5,003	130,055	3.8	0.1	5.4 %
Nevada	10,740	183,307	5.9	12,430	184,194	6.7	0.9	15.7 %
New Hampshire	1,087	37,734	2.9	1,032	35,227	2.9	0.0	-5.0 %
New Jersey	17,389	464,396	3.7	19,708	457,978	4.3	0.6	13.3 %
New Mexico	5,551	188,319	2.9	5,934	184,657	3.2	0.3	6.9 %
New York	84,604	1,265,545	6.7	91,620	1,413,589	6.5	-0.2	8.3 %
North Carolina	7,021	698,607	1.0	11,719	690,196	1.7	0.7	66.9 %
North Dakota	35	34,036	0.1	52	34,120	0.2	0.1	48.7 %
Ohio	13,519	675,694	2.0	15,093	668,071	2.3	0.3	11.6 %
Oklahoma	6,735	330,713	2.0	14,887	328,857	4.5	2.5	121.0 %
Oregon	18,104	223,866	8.1	17,465	219,501	8.0	-0.1	-3.5 %
Pennsylvania	25,711	686,509	3.7	26,729	698,334	3.8	0.1	4.0 %
Rhode Island	2,802	54,852	5.1	2,610	54,349	4.8	-0.3	-6.8 %
South Carolina	14,338	368,818	3.9	15,686	370,034	4.2	0.4	9.4 %
South Dakota	841	53,083	1.6	827	50,066	1.7	0.1	-1.6 %
Tennessee	25,457	519,379	4.9	30,182	533,436	5.7	0.8	18.6 %
Texas	140,905	2,573,481	5.5	177,581	2,801,038	6.3	0.9	26.0 %
Utah	3,497	166,644	2.1	4,001	165,577	2.4	0.3	14.4 %
Vermont	3,029	28,124	10.8	2,885	27,642	10.4	-0.3	-4.8 %
Virginia	18,819	443,412	4.2	24,897	459,124	5.4	1.2	32.3 %
Washington	7,810	368,623	2.1	8,933	357,614	2.5	0.4	14.4 %
West Virginia	7,570	142,766	5.3	7,380	153,543	4.8	-0.5	-2.5 %
Wisconsin	8,132	297,290	2.7	8,743	288,513	3.0	0.3	7.5 %
Wyoming	86	26,590	0.3	109	25,728	0.4	0.1	26.5 %
US	1,096,754	21,772,368	5.0	1,221,175	22,467,723	5.4	0.4	11.3 %

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 Nebraska reported a revised number of afterschool suppers served in CACFP in October 2016, resulting in an average daily participation that does not match what FRAC reported in *Afterschool Suppers: A Snapshot of Participation (March 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 2017	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	24,461	6.2	59,261	34,800	\$2,116,583
Alaska	1,756	4.1	6,360	4,605	\$280,057
Arizona	11,721	2.4	73,789	62,068	\$3,775,088
Arkansas	14,679	5.9	37,073	22,394	\$1,362,037
California	348,878	13.5	388,342	39,465	\$2,400,328
Colorado	5,848	2.5	34,540	28,692	\$1,745,127
Connecticut	4,081	2.3	26,911	22,830	\$1,388,542
Delaware	4,817	7.0	10,309	5,492	\$334,043
District of Columbia	10,240	21.7	7,091	met goal	met goal
Florida	107,445	6.0	270,634	163,188	\$9,925,434
Georgia	17,695	1.9	141,920	124,225	\$7,555,593
Hawaii	182	0.3	9,910	9,727	\$591,635
Idaho	1,446	1.5	14,479	13,033	\$792,685
Illinois	27,551	3.3	126,818	99,267	\$6,037,625
Indiana	10,824	2.4	67,849	57,025	\$3,468,374
Iowa	1,043	0.6	27,568	26,525	\$1,613,296
Kansas	2,992	1.5	29,203	26,211	\$1,594,179
Kentucky	17,219	3.9	66,208	48,989	\$2,979,621
Louisiana	20,333	4.3	70,961	50,628	\$3,079,289
Maine	331	0.5	9,199	8,868	\$539,356
Maryland	20,046	6.3	47,906	27,860	\$1,694,493
Massachusetts	13,303	3.8	52,894	39,591	\$2,408,000
Michigan	19,696	3.4	85,761	66,065	\$4,018,188
Minnesota	8,647	2.9	44,111	35,464	\$2,156,978
Mississippi	2,619	0.8	47,611	44,992	\$2,736,510
Missouri	16,009	4.3	56,175	40,165	\$2,442,929
Montana	1,805	3.6	7,560	5,755	\$350,001
Nebraska ²	5,003	3.8	19,508	14,505	\$882,240
Nevada	12,430	6.7	27,629	15,199	\$924,455
New Hampshire	1,032	2.9	5,284	4,252	\$258,605
New Jersey	19,708	4.3	68,697	48,989	\$2,979,583
New Mexico	5,934	3.2	27,699	21,764	\$1,323,750
New York	91,620	6.5	212,038	120,419	\$7,324,097
North Carolina	11,719	1.7	103,529	91,810	\$5,584,068
North Dakota	52	0.2	5,118	5,066	\$308,103
Ohio	15,093	2.3	100,211	85,118	\$5,177,032
Oklahoma	14,887	4.5	49,329	34,441	\$2,094,792
Oregon	17,465	8.0	32,925	15,461	\$940,338
Pennsylvania	26,729	3.8	104,750	78,021	\$4,745,398
Rhode Island	2,610	4.8	8,152	5,542	\$337,065
South Carolina	15,686	4.2	55,505	39,819	\$2,421,875
South Dakota	827	1.7	7,510	6,683	\$406,458
Tennessee	30,182	5.7	80,015	49,833	\$3,030,960
Texas	177,581	6.3	420,156	242,575	\$14,753,879
Utah	4,001	2.4	24,837	20,835	\$1,267,254
Vermont	2,885	10.4	4,146	1,262	\$76,735
Virginia	24,897	5.4	68,869	43,972	\$2,674,443
Washington	8,933	2.5	53,642	44,709	\$2,719,297
West Virginia	7,380	4.8	23,031	15,652	\$951,957
Wisconsin	8,743	3.0	43,277	34,534	\$2,100,406
Wyoming	109	0.4	3,859	3,750	\$228,079
US	1,221,175	5.4	3,370,158	2,148,983	\$130,705,288

¹ Additional federal reimbursement dollars are calculated assuming that the sites are reimbursed for each child at the federal reimbursement rate for free suppers (\$3.23 per supper) for the national average days of service in October.

² Nebraska reported a revised number of afterschool suppers served in CACFP in October 2016, resulting in an average daily participation that does not match what FRAC reported in *Afterschool Suppers: A Snapshot of Participation (March 2018)*.

Table 3:**Change in Average Daily Participation (ADP) in CACFP Snacks and NSLP Snacks, October 2016 and 2017, by State**

State	CACFP Snacks, October 2016	CACFP Snacks, October 2017	Percent Change, CACFP Snacks	NSLP Snacks, October 2016	NSLP Snacks, October 2017	Percent Change, NSLP Snacks
Alabama	10,006	9,035	-9.7 %	10,601	10,782	1.7 %
Alaska	790	648	-17.9 %	2,412	2,123	-12.0 %
Arizona ¹	5,632	5,210	-7.5 %	44,078	37,799	-14.2 %
Arkansas	16,658	10,292	-38.2 %	8,569	8,256	-3.7 %
California	43,376	38,991	-10.1 %	234,440	227,416	-3.0 %
Colorado	6,777	5,622	-17.0 %	10,605	9,355	-11.8 %
Connecticut	1,032	909	-11.9 %	12,196	9,942	-18.5 %
Delaware	685	1,053	53.9 %	1,025	1,155	12.6 %
District of Columbia	904	652	-27.9 %	11,799	12,764	8.2 %
Florida	20,598	21,653	5.1 %	124,831	127,346	2.0 %
Georgia	17,760	17,190	-3.2 %	61,789	62,957	1.9 %
Hawaii	199	207	3.9 %	6,400	5,874	-8.2 %
Idaho	1,279	1,339	4.7 %	3,374	3,472	2.9 %
Illinois	8,573	8,322	-2.9 %	23,200	22,524	-2.9 %
Indiana	7,730	6,911	-10.6 %	28,297	25,669	-9.3 %
Iowa	955	1,250	30.8 %	8,285	8,022	-3.2 %
Kansas	1,721	1,744	1.3 %	11,981	10,925	-8.8 %
Kentucky	1,454	4,065	179.6 %	10,271	10,277	0.1 %
Louisiana	6,706	1,213	-81.9 %	28,558	29,505	3.3 %
Maine	686	689	0.5 %	3,895	3,764	-3.4 %
Maryland	9,955	4,006	-59.8 %	5,348	8,346	56.1 %
Massachusetts	7,356	6,912	-6.0 %	23,677	24,626	4.0 %
Michigan	7,927	8,129	2.5 %	17,133	15,495	-9.6 %
Minnesota	5,133	8,191	59.6 %	19,865	19,298	-2.9 %
Mississippi	3,643	5,507	51.2 %	12,733	6,678	-47.6 %
Missouri	4,571	4,697	2.8 %	15,677	15,353	-2.1 %
Montana	674	696	3.2 %	3,587	3,170	-11.6 %
Nebraska ¹	621	882	42.0 %	5,796	6,722	16.0 %
Nevada	1,180	1,460	23.8 %	1,888	1,663	-11.9 %
New Hampshire	2,176	2,098	-3.6 %	2,458	2,140	-12.9 %
New Jersey	5,084	5,588	9.9 %	35,927	35,402	-1.5 %
New Mexico	2,097	1,996	-4.8 %	14,701	15,862	7.9 %
New York	27,035	27,485	1.7 %	125,089	140,834	12.6 %
North Carolina	7,882	9,145	16.0 %	27,878	26,841	-3.7 %
North Dakota	270	348	28.8 %	3,210	3,055	-4.8 %
Ohio	5,583	6,314	13.1 %	19,600	16,525	-15.7 %
Oklahoma	6,280	4,441	-29.3 %	17,754	19,486	9.8 %
Oregon	1,909	2,079	8.9 %	5,246	5,025	-4.2 %
Pennsylvania	13,810	14,640	6.0 %	11,191	12,344	10.3 %
Rhode Island	848	609	-28.1 %	2,832	2,873	1.5 %
South Carolina	529	4,474	746.1 %	29,905	31,009	3.7 %
South Dakota	991	902	-9.0 %	2,107	2,241	6.3 %
Tennessee	15,762	16,427	4.2 %	27,849	28,238	1.4 %
Texas	36,543	30,191	-17.4 %	134,124	98,811	-26.3 %
Utah	1,041	1,228	18.0 %	6,122	5,371	-12.3 %
Vermont	431	343	-20.4 %	2,200	1,956	-11.1 %
Virginia	14,507	16,247	12.0 %	8,328	7,351	-11.7 %
Washington	6,102	5,805	-4.9 %	10,653	9,931	-6.8 %
West Virginia	4,633	5,030	8.6 %	6,253	6,516	4.2 %
Wisconsin	1,754	1,978	12.8 %	20,394	15,690	-23.1 %
Wyoming	15	21	39.2 %	1,303	1,306	0.2 %
US	349,861	334,862	-4.3 %	1,267,434	1,220,086	-3.7 %

¹ Arizona and Nebraska reported revised numbers of afterschool snacks served in NSLP in October 2016, resulting in average daily participation values that do not match what FRAC reported in *Afterschool Suppers: A Snapshot of Participation (March 2018)*.

Table 4:

Percent of Overall Afterschool Average Daily Participation (ADP) Coming From CACFP Snacks, CACFP Suppers, and NSLP Snacks, October 2017, by State

State	CACFP Snacks ADP as Percent of Overall Afterschool ADP	CACFP Suppers ADP as Percent of Overall Afterschool ADP	NSLP Snacks ADP as Percent of Overall Afterschool ADP	Overall Afterschool ADP
Alabama	20.4 %	55.2 %	24.4 %	44,277
Alaska	14.3 %	38.8 %	46.9 %	4,527
Arizona	9.5 %	21.4 %	69.1 %	54,730
Arkansas	31.0 %	44.2 %	24.8 %	33,227
California	6.3 %	56.7 %	37.0 %	615,285
Colorado	27.0 %	28.1 %	44.9 %	20,825
Connecticut	6.1 %	27.3 %	66.6 %	14,932
Delaware	15.0 %	68.6 %	16.4 %	7,025
District of Columbia	2.8 %	43.3 %	54.0 %	23,656
Florida	8.4 %	41.9 %	49.7 %	256,444
Georgia	17.6 %	18.1 %	64.3 %	97,842
Hawaii	3.3 %	2.9 %	93.8 %	6,264
Idaho	21.4 %	23.1 %	55.5 %	6,256
Illinois	14.3 %	47.2 %	38.6 %	58,398
Indiana	15.9 %	24.9 %	59.1 %	43,404
Iowa	12.1 %	10.1 %	77.8 %	10,315
Kansas	11.1 %	19.1 %	69.8 %	15,662
Kentucky	12.9 %	54.6 %	32.6 %	31,562
Louisiana	2.4 %	39.8 %	57.8 %	51,051
Maine	14.4 %	6.9 %	78.7 %	4,784
Maryland	12.4 %	61.9 %	25.8 %	32,398
Massachusetts	15.4 %	29.7 %	54.9 %	44,841
Michigan	18.8 %	45.5 %	35.8 %	43,320
Minnesota	22.7 %	23.9 %	53.4 %	36,136
Mississippi	37.2 %	17.7 %	45.1 %	14,804
Missouri	13.0 %	44.4 %	42.6 %	36,059
Montana	12.3 %	31.8 %	55.9 %	5,671
Nebraska	7.0 %	39.7 %	53.3 %	12,607
Nevada	9.4 %	79.9 %	10.7 %	15,553
New Hampshire	39.8 %	19.6 %	40.6 %	5,270
New Jersey	9.2 %	32.5 %	58.3 %	60,698
New Mexico	8.4 %	24.9 %	66.7 %	23,793
New York	10.6 %	35.2 %	54.2 %	259,939
North Carolina	19.2 %	24.6 %	56.3 %	47,706
North Dakota	10.1 %	1.5 %	88.4 %	3,455
Ohio	16.6 %	39.8 %	43.6 %	37,931
Oklahoma	11.4 %	38.4 %	50.2 %	38,814
Oregon	8.5 %	71.1 %	20.5 %	24,569
Pennsylvania	27.3 %	49.8 %	23.0 %	53,713
Rhode Island	10.0 %	42.8 %	47.2 %	6,093
South Carolina	8.7 %	30.7 %	60.6 %	51,168
South Dakota	22.7 %	20.8 %	56.4 %	3,970
Tennessee	21.9 %	40.3 %	37.7 %	74,847
Texas	9.8 %	57.9 %	32.2 %	306,582
Utah	11.6 %	37.7 %	50.7 %	10,601
Vermont	6.6 %	55.7 %	37.7 %	5,183
Virginia	33.5 %	51.3 %	15.2 %	48,495
Washington	23.5 %	36.2 %	40.3 %	24,669
West Virginia	26.6 %	39.0 %	34.4 %	18,926
Wisconsin	7.5 %	33.1 %	59.4 %	26,411
Wyoming	1.4 %	7.6 %	90.9 %	1,436
US	12.1 %	44.0 %	43.9 %	2,776,123

Table 5:**Change¹ in Number of CACFP Snacks, NSLP Snacks, and CACFP Suppers Served, October 2016 and 2017, by State**

State	CACFP Snacks, October 2016	CACFP Snacks, October 2017	Percent Change, CACFP Snacks	NSLP Snacks, October 2016	NSLP Snacks, October 2017	Percent Change, NSLP Snacks	CACFP Suppers, October 2016	CACFP Suppers, October 2017	Percent Change, CACFP Suppers
Alabama	175,482	166,005	-5.4 %	185,912	198,107	6.6 %	287,492	449,454	56.3 %
Alaska	14,391	12,414	-13.7 %	43,947	40,642	-7.5 %	35,099	33,620	-4.2 %
Arizona ²	82,712	81,913	-1.0 %	647,372	594,223	-8.2 %	144,174	184,260	27.8 %
Arkansas	312,579	200,960	-35.7 %	160,792	161,216	0.3 %	406,070	286,633	-29.4 %
California	806,986	764,765	-5.2 %	4,361,629	4,460,514	2.3 %	5,932,613	6,842,833	15.3 %
Colorado	122,053	106,558	-12.7 %	191,005	177,319	-7.2 %	85,197	110,835	30.1 %
Connecticut	18,439	17,179	-6.8 %	217,922	187,898	-13.8 %	60,198	77,138	28.1 %
Delaware	12,266	20,111	64.0 %	18,372	22,049	20.0 %	79,213	91,967	16.1 %
District of Columbia	17,132	12,184	-28.9 %	223,682	238,665	6.7 %	147,488	191,482	29.8 %
Florida	349,049	426,149	22.1 %	2,115,363	2,506,257	18.5 %	1,651,996	2,114,593	28.0 %
Georgia	303,743	313,274	3.1 %	1,056,775	1,147,364	8.6 %	305,676	322,483	5.5 %
Hawaii	2,892	3,275	13.2 %	92,903	92,903	0.0 %	2,881	2,886	0.2 %
Idaho	21,808	24,035	10.2 %	57,548	62,309	8.3 %	24,672	25,946	5.2 %
Illinois	153,444	155,725	1.5 %	415,261	421,479	1.5 %	467,126	515,539	10.4 %
Indiana	117,026	110,544	-5.5 %	428,388	410,582	-4.2 %	135,147	173,141	28.1 %
Iowa	17,626	24,053	36.5 %	152,831	154,394	1.0 %	17,178	20,068	16.8 %
Kansas	29,422	31,381	6.7 %	204,853	196,613	-4.0 %	51,486	53,850	4.6 %
Kentucky	23,276	67,335	189.3 %	164,426	170,231	3.5 %	237,635	285,207	20.0 %
Louisiana	122,002	22,369	-81.7 %	519,544	544,242	4.8 %	501,542	375,059	-25.2 %
Maine	12,050	12,025	-0.2 %	68,447	65,665	-4.1 %	5,996	5,780	-3.6 %
Maryland	171,509	77,633	-54.7 %	92,140	161,744	75.5 %	395,115	388,480	-1.7 %
Massachusetts	130,906	129,276	-1.2 %	421,330	460,575	9.3 %	233,511	248,817	6.6 %
Michigan	148,722	159,659	7.4 %	321,431	304,352	-5.3 %	400,307	386,860	-3.4 %
Minnesota	87,064	146,345	68.1 %	336,913	344,802	2.3 %	108,457	154,504	42.5 %
Mississippi	65,662	103,645	57.8 %	229,492	125,681	-45.2 %	30,675	49,289	60.7 %
Missouri	82,084	88,470	7.8 %	281,524	289,163	2.7 %	238,468	301,535	26.4 %
Montana	11,696	12,704	8.6 %	62,238	57,897	-7.0 %	30,679	32,965	7.5 %
Nebraska ^{2,3}	11,122	16,674	49.9 %	103,789	127,091	22.5 %	85,023	94,589	11.3 %
Nevada	21,748	28,304	30.1 %	34,800	32,236	-7.4 %	198,010	240,937	21.7 %
New Hampshire	39,856	38,244	-4.0 %	45,020	39,021	-13.3 %	19,905	18,819	-5.5 %
New Jersey	86,414	105,341	21.9 %	610,638	667,347	9.3 %	295,559	371,505	25.7 %
New Mexico	36,254	36,067	-0.5 %	254,189	286,588	12.7 %	95,985	107,215	11.7 %
New York	430,146	515,695	19.9 %	1,990,252	2,642,426	32.8 %	1,346,115	1,719,029	27.7 %
North Carolina	135,402	179,552	32.6 %	478,936	526,990	10.0 %	120,614	230,091	90.8 %
North Dakota	4,655	6,370	36.8 %	55,373	55,975	1.1 %	608	960	57.9 %
Ohio	102,747	121,745	18.5 %	360,735	318,641	-11.7 %	248,823	291,034	17.0 %
Oklahoma	100,944	75,372	-25.3 %	285,398	330,739	15.9 %	108,268	252,683	133.4 %
Oregon	33,749	38,813	15.0 %	92,724	93,804	1.2 %	320,004	326,016	1.9 %
Pennsylvania	249,448	285,673	14.5 %	202,144	240,878	19.2 %	464,416	521,565	12.3 %
Rhode Island	15,459	11,457	-25.9 %	51,647	54,055	4.7 %	51,112	49,112	-3.9 %
South Carolina	8,413	87,855	944.3 %	475,828	608,931	28.0 %	228,137	308,035	35.0 %
South Dakota	17,812	16,900	-5.1 %	37,871	41,977	10.8 %	15,112	15,493	2.5 %
Tennessee	240,480	254,816	6.0 %	424,878	438,031	3.1 %	388,383	468,189	20.5 %
Texas	689,165	593,218	-13.9 %	2,529,473	1,941,547	-23.2 %	2,657,369	3,489,303	31.3 %
Utah	17,585	21,832	24.2 %	103,383	95,461	-7.7 %	59,054	71,110	20.4 %
Vermont	7,871	6,443	-18.1 %	40,150	36,721	-8.5 %	55,288	54,167	-2.0 %
Virginia	269,441	318,356	18.2 %	154,673	144,042	-6.9 %	349,539	487,848	39.6 %
Washington	112,502	112,647	0.1 %	196,423	192,734	-1.9 %	143,996	173,357	20.4 %
West Virginia	88,742	99,201	11.8 %	119,772	128,497	7.3 %	144,998	145,541	0.4 %
Wisconsin	32,126	38,408	19.6 %	373,539	304,679	-18.4 %	148,945	169,781	14.0 %
Wyoming	271	398	46.9 %	23,719	25,073	5.7 %	1,572	2,097	33.4 %
US	6,164,373	6,299,367	2.2 %	22,117,394	22,970,370	3.9 %	19,562,926	23,333,700	19.3 %

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 Arizona and Nebraska reported revised numbers of afterschool snacks served in NSLP in October 2016, resulting in average daily participation values that do not match what FRAC reported in *Afterschool Suppers: A Snapshot of Participation (March 2018)*.³ Nebraska reported a revised number of afterschool suppers served in CACFP in October 2016, resulting in an average daily participation that does not match what FRAC reported in *Afterschool Suppers: A Snapshot of Participation (March 2018)*.

Table 6:**Change in Number of CACFP and NSLP Sites From October 2016 to October 2017, by State**

State	CACFP Sites ¹ , October 2016	CACFP Sites ¹ , October 2017	Percent Change in CACFP Sites	NSLP Sites ² , October 2016	NSLP Sites ² , October 2017	Percent Change in NSLP Sites
Alabama	342	384	12.3 %	272	275	1.1 %
Alaska	78	70	-10.3 %	74	67	-9.5 %
Arizona	274	248	-9.5 %	746	642	-13.9 %
Arkansas	340	224	-34.1 %	344	293	-14.8 %
California	3,791	3,907	3.1 %	2,881	2,868	-0.5 %
Colorado	290	291	0.3 %	255	242	-5.1 %
Connecticut	96	117	21.9 %	199	188	-5.5 %
Delaware	141	148	5.0 %	39	46	17.9 %
District of Columbia	156	154	-1.3 %	124	109	-12.1 %
Florida	1,301	1,462	12.4 %	1,738	1,718	-1.2 %
Georgia	519	543	4.6 %	1,108	2,385	115.3 %
Hawaii	6	7	16.7 %	94	94	0.0 %
Idaho	60	68	13.3 %	124	118	-4.8 %
Illinois	691	718	3.9 %	533	652	22.3 %
Indiana	330	345	4.5 %	519	513	-1.2 %
Iowa	40	53	32.5 %	215	219	1.9 %
Kansas	170	194	14.1 %	307	284	-7.5 %
Kentucky	344	405	17.7 %	303	292	-3.6 %
Louisiana	457	363	-20.6 %	315	308	-2.2 %
Maine	31	31	0.0 %	180	184	2.2 %
Maryland	629	654	4.0 %	256	347	35.5 %
Massachusetts	351	362	3.1 %	326	328	0.6 %
Michigan	529	571	7.9 %	426	399	-6.3 %
Minnesota	217	314	44.7 %	390	331	-15.1 %
Mississippi	82	114	39.0 %	291	160	-45.0 %
Missouri	342	371	8.5 %	380	361	-5.0 %
Montana	36	34	-5.6 %	196	183	-6.6 %
Nebraska	77	99	28.6 %	144	153	6.3 %
Nevada	311	306	-1.6 %	89	40	-55.1 %
New Hampshire	44	40	-9.1 %	62	52	-16.1 %
New Jersey	318	321	0.9 %	496	510	2.8 %
New Mexico	179	192	7.3 %	389	432	11.1 %
New York	1,779	1,813	1.9 %	1,291	1,359	5.3 %
North Carolina	267	343	28.5 %	681	661	-2.9 %
North Dakota	10	6	-40.0 %	87	86	-1.1 %
Ohio	568	606	6.7 %	525	497	-5.3 %
Oklahoma	200	213	6.5 %	207	536	158.9 %
Oregon	422	412	-2.4 %	157	156	-0.6 %
Pennsylvania	951	1,003	5.5 %	300	295	-1.7 %
Rhode Island	87	79	-9.2 %	53	48	-9.4 %
South Carolina	308	314	1.9 %	516	549	6.4 %
South Dakota	32	29	-9.4 %	105	73	-30.5 %
Tennessee	609	655	7.6 %	581	580	-0.2 %
Texas	2,820	3,172	12.5 %	2,012	1,740	-13.5 %
Utah	106	126	18.9 %	154	142	-7.8 %
Vermont	113	109	-3.5 %	84	76	-9.5 %
Virginia	519	689	32.8 %	219	211	-3.7 %
Washington	350	390	11.4 %	383	353	-7.8 %
West Virginia	331	351	6.0 %	392	394	0.5 %
Wisconsin	152	178	17.1 %	422	396	-6.2 %
Wyoming	6	7	16.7 %	44	40	-9.1 %
US	22,202	23,605	6.3 %	22,028	22,985	4.3 %

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').



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

202.986.2200
www.frac.org

Copyright © 2018 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)