



School Breakfast Scorecard

School Year 2018–2019

February 2020 ■ www.FRAC.org



School Breakfast Scorecard

School Year 2018–2019

Acknowledgments

The Food Research & Action Center (FRAC) gratefully acknowledges major dedicated support of its work to increase participation and improve the School Breakfast Program from the following:

- Chobani;
- Eos Foundation;
- General Mills Foundation;
- Hunger Is, a program of Albertsons Companies Foundation;
- Kellogg Company Fund;
- National Dairy Council/Dairy Management, Inc.;
- Newman's Own Foundation; and
- Walmart Foundation.

Additional support for FRAC's breakfast and child nutrition work has been provided by the following:

- Annie E. Casey Foundation;
- Anonymous;
- The From Now On Fund of Tides Foundation; and
- The JPB Foundation.

This report was written by FRAC's Etienne Melcher Philbin and Crystal FitzSimons, with special assistance from Randy Rosso. The findings and conclusions presented in this report are those of FRAC alone.

About FRAC

For 50 years, the Food Research & Action Center (FRAC) has been 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* and monthly *Meals Matter: School Breakfast Newsletter*, go to: frac.org.



I. Introduction

During the 2018–2019 school year, 14.6 million children, with 12.4 million of them from low-income families, started the day right with a nutritious school breakfast. Study after study has shown that participation in the School Breakfast Program boosts student achievement, reduces absenteeism, and improves student nutrition.

Since the creation of a nationwide School Breakfast Program in 1975, participation has lagged behind participation in the National School Lunch Program. Much work has been done by anti-hunger advocates, educators, state child nutrition agencies, and the U.S. Department of Education to increase the reach of school breakfast, resulting in substantial growth over the past decade — 3.6 million more low-income children received school breakfast on an average day in the 2018–2019 school year than in the 2008–2009 school year.

To drive program expansion, this report analyzes three measures of student participation — the number of low-income students participating, the total participation, and the number of low-income children participating in school breakfast compared to their participation in school lunch — at the national and state levels.

- 12.4 million children received a free or reduced-price school breakfast on an average school day in the 2018–2019 school year. Participation remained relatively stable from the prior school year, with a nominal decrease of just 0.1 percent or just over 6,000 students.
- 14.6 million children ate breakfast at school on an average day in the 2018–2019 school year. This was an increase of over 46,000 students from the previous school year.

- The School Breakfast Program served 57.5 low-income students for every 100 who participated in the National School Lunch Program, an increase from 56.9 to 100 in the prior school year. This increase in reach at a time when breakfast participation experienced a nominal decrease in participation was driven by the 200,000 drop in students participating in school lunch among low-income students.

The flattening of school breakfast participation among low-income students, while overall participation in school breakfast grew, and the decrease in school lunch participation are due to a myriad of factors. These include a growing economy that is shrinking the number of low-income students who are eligible to receive free or reduced-price school meals and decreased school enrollment overall, which have helped drive the school breakfast and lunch decreases among low-income students. Natural disasters also have impacted school nutrition operations in a few states, driving shifts in school breakfast and lunch participation.

In addition, there are more schools offering breakfast at no charge to all students (to decrease the stigma of school breakfasts being for “poor kids”) and implementing innovative school breakfast programs, such as breakfast in the classroom, which have helped drive the growth in overall school breakfast participation.

The national trends were not mirrored in every state. Some states continued to make gains, particularly when more schools implemented breakfast after the bell models and adopted the Community Eligibility Provision, which allows free breakfast and lunch to be offered to all students in high-poverty schools and districts. Gains also were due to

improvements to how low-income children are identified as eligible for free school meals without separate school meal applications. For the states that saw participation stall or decrease, it was often the consequence of some districts moving away from breakfast after the bell programs or the loss of stakeholder support within a district for expanding school breakfast participation.

States that are increasing school breakfast participation understand that strong breakfast participation pays off through better test scores,¹ improved student health² and dietary intake, fewer distractions in the classroom throughout the morning,³ and reduced food insecurity. It also can greatly improve the school nutrition department's finances.

To help drive greater participation among low-income children, the Food Research & Action Center sets an

ambitious but attainable goal of serving 70 low-income students breakfast for every 100 who eat school lunch. If every state had met this goal, 2.7 million additional children a year would have experienced the positive academic and health outcomes that are linked to participating in school breakfast, and states would have received an additional \$783.9 million in federal funding to support their school breakfast programs.

Given the participation gaps that remain and the huge benefits of school breakfast, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, state child nutrition agency staff, policy makers, district and school leaders, educators, and anti-hunger advocates must continue to work in partnership so that all students can start their school day ready to learn.

About the Scorecard

This report measures the reach of the School Breakfast Program in the 2018–2019 school year — nationally and in each state — based on a variety of metrics, and examines the impact of select trends and policies on program participation.

The report measures free and reduced-price school breakfast participation to determine how many low-income students school breakfast is reaching nationally and in each state, using the ratio to free and reduced-price school lunch participation as a benchmark. Because there is broad participation in the National School Lunch Program by low-income students across the states, it is a useful comparison by which to measure how many

students could and should be benefiting from school breakfast each day. The report also compares the number of schools offering the School Breakfast Program to the number of schools operating the National School Lunch Program, as this is an important indicator of access to the program for low-income children in the states.

Finally, the Food Research & Action Center sets an ambitious but achievable goal of reaching 70 low-income students with breakfast for every 100 participating in school lunch; and calculates the number of children not being served and the federal dollars lost in each state as a result of not meeting this goal.

¹ Food Research & Action Center. (2016). *Breakfast for Learning*. Available at: <http://frac.org/wp-content/uploads/breakfastforlearning-1.pdf>. Accessed on January 29, 2020.

² Food Research & Action Center. (2016). *Breakfast for Health*. Available at: <http://frac.org/wp-content/uploads/breakfastforhealth-1.pdf>. Accessed on January 29, 2020.

³ Food Research & Action Center. (2018). *The Connections Between Food Insecurity, the Federal Nutrition Programs, and Student Behavior*. Available at: <http://www.frac.org/wp-content/uploads/breakfast-for-behavior.pdf>. Accessed on January 29, 2020.

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 national School Breakfast Program and receive federal funds for each breakfast served. The program is administered at the federal level by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and in each state, typically through 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. What the federal government covers, and what a student pays, depends on family income.

- Children from families with incomes at or below 130 percent of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) are eligible for free school meals.
- Children from families with incomes between 130 to 185 percent of the FPL 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 FPL pay charges (referred to as “paid meals”), which are set by the school.

Other federal and, in some cases, state rules, however, make it possible to offer free meals to all children, or to all children in households with incomes under 185 percent of the FPL, especially in schools with high proportions of low-income children.

How are Children Certified for Free or Reduced-Price Meals?

Most children are certified for free or reduced-price meals via applications collected by the school district at the beginning of the school year or during the year. However, children in households participating in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), and the 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 households participating in SNAP for free school meals through data matching of SNAP records with school enrollment lists. School districts have the option of directly certifying other categorically eligible children as well. Some states also utilize income information from Medicaid to directly certify students as eligible for free and reduced-price school meals.

Schools also should use data from the state to certify categorically eligible students. Schools can coordinate with other personnel, such as the school district’s homeless and migrant education liaisons, to obtain documentation to certify children for free school meals. Some categorically eligible children may be missed in this process, requiring the household to submit a school meals application. However, these households are not required to complete the income information section of the application.

How are School Districts Reimbursed?

The federal reimbursement rate schools receive for each meal served depends on whether a student is receiving free, reduced-price, or paid meals.

For the 2018–2019 school year, schools received reimbursements at the following rates:

- \$1.79 per free breakfast;
- \$1.49 per reduced-price breakfast; and
- \$0.31 per “paid” breakfast.

“Severe-need” schools received an additional 35 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.

Offering Breakfast Free to All

Many high-poverty schools are able to offer free meals for all students, with federal reimbursements based on the proportions of low-income children in the school. Providing breakfast at no charge to all students helps remove the stigma often associated with means-tested school breakfast (that breakfast in school is for “the poor kids”), opens the program to children from families who would struggle to pay the reduced-price copayment or the paid breakfast charges, and streamlines the implementation of breakfast in the classroom and other alternative service models. Schools can offer free breakfast to all students through the following options:

- **Community Eligibility Provision:** Community eligibility schools are high-poverty schools that offer free breakfast and lunch to all students and do not have to collect, process, or verify school meal applications, or keep track of meals by fee category, resulting in significant administrative savings and increased participation. For more information on community eligibility, see page 13.

- **Provision 2:** Schools using Provision 2 (referring to a provision of the National School Lunch Act) do not need to collect, process, or verify school meal applications or keep track of meals by fee category for at least three out of every four years. Schools collect school meal applications and count and claim meals by fee category during year one of the multi-year cycle, called the “base year.” Those data then determine the federal reimbursement and are used for future years in the cycle. Provision 2 schools have the option to serve only breakfast or lunch, or both breakfast and lunch, to all students at no charge, and use economies of scale from increased participation and significant administrative savings to offset the cost of offering free meals to all students.
- **Nonpricing:** No fees are collected from students while schools continue to receive federal reimbursements for the breakfasts served under the three-tier federal fee categories (free, reduced-price, and paid).



II. National Findings

In the 2018–2019 school year, school breakfast participation among low-income children remained flat with only a nominal decrease, while overall student participation in the program continued to grow.

- On an average school day, 14.6 million children participated in the School Breakfast Program; 12.4 million of them were low-income children who received a free or reduced-price school breakfast.
- Breakfast participation among low-income (free or reduced-price certified) children slightly decreased by just over 6,000 students, or by 0.1 percent, compared to the previous school year.
- The ratio of low-income children participating in school breakfast to low-income children participating in school lunch increased slightly, to 57.5 per 100 in school year 2018–2019, up from 56.9 per 100 in the previous school year.
- If all states met the Food Research & Action Center's goal of reaching 70 low-income children with school breakfast for every 100 participating in school lunch, an additional 2.7 million children would start the day with a healthy breakfast at school. States and school districts would tap into an additional \$783.9 million in federal funding to support school food services and local economies.
- The number of schools offering school meal programs increased slightly, with 90,587 schools offering breakfast and 96,781 offering school lunch. The share of schools offering school breakfast, compared to those that offer school lunch, improved slightly to 93.6 percent, an increase from 93.2 percent in the previous school year.

Natural Disasters

In the aftermath of a disaster, school districts can provide critical nutrition support to students through the school, summer, and afterschool nutrition programs. When a major disaster declaration is issued by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) has the authority to waive program requirements that limit access to meals in situations resulting from damage or disruptions due to natural or man-made disasters, or other exceptional emergency situations. Natural disasters in Florida and North Carolina drove dramatic swings in breakfast participation between the 2017–2018 and 2018–2019 school years.

After Hurricane Irma hit Florida in September 2017, and much of the state was struggling to recover, 49 counties were declared major disaster areas and were able to serve free school meals to all students for several months. The areas impacted included some of the largest counties in the state. In the 2018–2019 school

year, most of these school districts resumed their normal operations, which resulted in a 3.8 percent drop in participation among children receiving free or reduced-price school meals from the prior school year.

Hurricane Florence caused many schools in North Carolina to close (some for as many as 45 days) after making landfall in September 2019. While there was robust community feeding in many of the impacted communities through programs, such as the Summer Food Service Program, those meals were not counted in this report. Much of North Carolina's decrease in breakfast participation was driven by the fact that many schools in the state were closed for a significant portion of the fall semester.

To learn more about how the child nutrition programs can respond to disasters, read the Food Research & Action Center's [Opportunities for Schools to Assist in Disasters](#).

III. State Findings

For the sixth year in a row, West Virginia was the top-performing state in terms of school breakfast participation, reaching 83 low-income students with school breakfast for every 100 who participated in school lunch.

Two states — New Mexico and Vermont — were less than one point away from meeting the Food Research & Action Center’s (FRAC) national benchmark of reaching 70 low-income students participating in school breakfast for every 100 in school lunch.

Fifteen states — Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Georgia, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia — and the District of Columbia reached at least 60 low-income children with school breakfast for every 100 participating in school lunch, while an additional three states — Louisiana, Michigan, and New Jersey — were less than one point shy of meeting that ratio.

Legislation has been instrumental in achieving sustainable success in many of the top-performing states — Nevada, New Mexico, Texas, and West Virginia — and the District of

Top 10 States: Ratio of Free and Reduced-Price School Breakfast to Lunch Participation, School Year 2018–2019

State	Ratio of Free and Reduced-Price Students in School Breakfast per 100 in School Lunch
West Virginia	83.0
Vermont	69.6
New Mexico	69.4
District of Columbia	68.9
Kentucky	67.4
Arkansas	66.5
Tennessee	64.9
Maine	64.2
Texas	63.3
Missouri	62.7

Columbia for requiring high-poverty schools to implement best practices, such as breakfast after the bell, free breakfast to all students, or both, to ensure all children in those schools have access to school breakfast.

Top 10 States Based on the Percentage of Growth in the Number of Free and Reduced-Price Breakfast Participants, School Year 2017–2018 to School Year 2018–2019

State	Percent Increase of Free and Reduced-Price Students in School Breakfast Program
Connecticut	10.6%
Michigan	5.2%
Kentucky	3.1%
Pennsylvania	2.8%
California	2.5%
Kansas	2.3%
Iowa	2.2%
Texas	2.2%
Wisconsin	1.9%
New York	1.6%

Hawaii was the lowest-performing state in school year 2018–2019, serving 39.3 students breakfast for every 100 receiving lunch, a 2.7 percent decrease compared to the prior school year. An additional seven states — Iowa, Nebraska, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming — failed to reach even half of the low-income students who ate school lunch in the 2018–2019 school year.

In the 2018–2019 school year, 22 states experienced growth in the School Breakfast Program. Connecticut had the largest percentage of growth — a 10.6 percent increase in participation among low-income students compared to the prior year. Michigan followed with a 5.2 percent increase in the number of low-income students participating in school breakfast.

At the same time, breakfast participation growth slowed considerably in many states compared to the 2017–2018 school year. This was due in part to implementation of breakfast after the bell models stalling in some states; some school districts that were early adopters of breakfast after the bell models halted programs or stopped planned expansion when there was a change in district leadership or a loss of stakeholder support.

States must regain the momentum seen over the past decade and continue to work with school districts to expand the number of eligible schools adopting

Breakfast After the Bell

Implementing a breakfast after the bell model that moves breakfast out of the cafeteria and makes it more accessible and a part of the regular school day has proven to be the most successful strategy for increasing school breakfast participation. Breakfast after the bell service models overcome timing, convenience, and stigma barriers that get in the way of children participating in school breakfast, and are even more impactful when they are combined with offering breakfast at no charge to all students. Schools have three options when offering breakfast after the bell:

- **Breakfast in the Classroom:** Meals are delivered to and eaten in the classroom at the start of the school day;
- **“Grab and Go”:** Children (particularly older students) can quickly grab the components of their breakfast from carts or kiosks in the hallway or the cafeteria line to eat in their classroom or in common areas; and
- **Second Chance Breakfast:** Students are offered a second chance to eat breakfast after homeroom or first period. Many middle and high school students are not hungry first thing in the morning. Serving these students breakfast after first period allows them ample time to arrive to class on time, while still providing them the opportunity to get a nutritious start to the day.

community eligibility and breakfast after the bell models to meet FRAC’s goal of reaching 70 low-income students with school breakfast for every 100 who participate in school lunch.

The Fiscal Cost of Low Participation

Low participation in the School Breakfast Program is costly on many levels. Students miss out on the educational and health benefits associated with eating school breakfast, while states miss out on substantial federal funding. West Virginia was the only state that met FRAC’s challenging but attainable goal of reaching 70 low-income students with school breakfast for every 100 participating in school lunch, proving there is ample opportunity for growth in many states.

Bottom 10 States: Ratio of Free and Reduced-Price School Breakfast to Lunch Participation, School Year 2018–2019

State	Ratio of Free and Reduced-Price Students in School Breakfast per 100 in School Lunch
Illinois	51.4
Indiana	51.0
Wyoming	49.2
Washington	47.1
South Dakota	46.0
New Hampshire	44.8
Nebraska	44.7
Iowa	42.7
Utah	39.9
Hawaii	39.3

For the 49 states and the District of Columbia that did not meet this goal, FRAC calculated that 2.7 million additional children who would have started the day ready to learn, as well as the additional funding that the state would have received if it had achieved this goal. In total, over \$783.9 million was left on the table in the 2018–2019 school year, with 11 states each passing up more than \$20 million in additional federal funding. The four largest states — California, Florida, New York, and Texas — together missed out on more than \$300 million.

**Top 10 States for School Participation,
School Year 2018–2019**

State	Ratio of Schools Offering Breakfast to Schools Offering Lunch
Delaware	100.8
Texas	100.5
Virginia	100.1
South Carolina	99.7
Arkansas	99.3
District of Columbia	99.1
Oklahoma	98.9
West Virginia	98.9
Florida	98.8
North Carolina	98.6

School Participation

In 39 states and the District of Columbia, 90 percent or more of schools that operated the National School Lunch Program offered school breakfast in the 2018–2019 school year. The number of schools offering breakfast compared to lunch is an important indicator of access to the School Breakfast Program, and more work should be done to increase breakfast service, especially in states with low school participation in the School Breakfast Program.

Delaware, Texas, and Virginia operated school breakfast programs in more schools than the number of schools that ran school lunch programs, resulting in a school breakfast-to-school lunch program ratio of more than 100. In Arkansas, South Carolina, and the District of Columbia, almost all (99 percent or more) schools that offered school lunch also offered school breakfast in the 2018–2019 school year. The lowest performers in the School Breakfast Program were New Jersey and Wisconsin. In New Jersey, 82.8 percent of schools that offered lunch also offered breakfast; 83.6 percent of Wisconsin’s schools did the same.

**Bottom 10 States for School Participation,
School Year 2018–2019**

State	Ratio of Schools Offering Breakfast to Schools Offering Lunch
Ohio	89.1
Minnesota	89.0
Connecticut	86.4
Massachusetts	86.4
Colorado	85.9
Illinois	84.6
South Dakota	84.3
Nebraska	84.2
Wisconsin	83.6
New Jersey	82.8

A History of the School Breakfast Program

The Food Research & Action Center (FRAC) turns 50 this year, and throughout its history, FRAC has worked to expand the reach of the School Breakfast Program through research, advocacy, and training efforts to make it robust, accessible, and effective at decreasing childhood hunger and undernutrition. Since the creation of the School Breakfast Program, participation has grown to 14.6 million students on an average school day in school year 2018–2019; 12.4 million of whom are low-income. FRAC’s work, in partnership with national, state, and local partners, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, state child nutrition agencies, and educators, to identify barriers to participation — and to knock them down — has driven this growth in participation. Below are major milestones in the history of the School Breakfast Program and FRAC’s role in it.

1966 — School Breakfast Program piloted through the Child Nutrition Act of 1966

1975 — Nationwide School Breakfast Program created

1987 — FRAC released *Fuel for Excellence*

This first-ever guide to the School Breakfast Program launched a multi-year expansion campaign with over 70 national partners.

1989 — Child Nutrition Amendments of 1989 created direct certification and school breakfast incentives

FRAC’s research and lobbying were central to the enactment of the Child Nutrition Amendments of 1989. Direct certification has allowed eligible children to be easily certified for free school meals without an application. Incentives for school breakfast expansion have supported increased participation.

1992 — FRAC released the first *School Breakfast Scorecard*

The *Scorecard* found that only one-third of low-income children receiving school lunch ate school breakfast, and that about half of the schools operating the National School Lunch Program also ran the School Breakfast Program. This report set the first national benchmark for school breakfast participation. The report’s release, along with FRAC’s breakfast organizers, contributed to over 25 states passing legislation requiring schools with a high proportion of low-income students to serve breakfast.

2007 — FRAC released *School Breakfast in America’s Big Cities*

The report was the first to analyze school breakfast participation in numerous large school districts, and highlight the role that offering breakfast at no charge and implementing innovative breakfast models, such as breakfast in the classroom, had on increasing school breakfast participation. It has challenged many of the large school districts to take steps to increase participation in their school breakfast program.

2010 — D.C. passed the Healthy Schools Act

D.C. Hunger Solutions, an initiative of FRAC, ushered passage and funding of the Healthy Schools Act — the first legislation of its kind — which required schools to offer breakfast at no charge to all students, and required schools with 40 percent or more students certified for free and reduced-price meals to implement a breakfast after the bell program. Since the bill’s implementation, D.C. has remained in the top four for breakfast participation in the nation.

CONTINUED

2010 — Partners for Breakfast in the Classroom launched

FRAC joined with the National Association of Elementary School Principals Foundation, the NEA Foundation, and the School Nutrition Foundation to form the Partners for Breakfast in the Classroom to provide technical assistance and funding to implement breakfast after the bell models. With funding from the Walmart Foundation, the Partners for Breakfast in the Classroom have worked with more than 500 schools in 70 districts, leading to over 100,000 additional students eating school breakfast since 2010.

2010 — Community Eligibility created through the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act

The Community Eligibility Provision allows high-poverty schools to offer free school breakfast and lunch and can make it easier for schools to implement breakfast after the bell programs. Evaluations link the provision to increased breakfast participation.

2011 — New Mexico passed the first state breakfast in the classroom legislation

New Mexico Appleseed led the effort, with support from FRAC, to pass Senate Bill 144, which mandated low-income elementary schools to implement breakfast after the bell programs and offer breakfast to all students at no charge. Since the bill's passage, New Mexico has continued to be a leader in school breakfast, and numerous states have followed New Mexico's lead.

2014 — FRAC launched the *Breakfast for Learning Education Alliance*

The Alliance — comprised of AASA: the School Superintendents Association, the American School Health Association, the American Federation of Teachers, the Education Trust, the National Association of Elementary School Principals Foundation, the National Association of School Nurses, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the National Association of State Boards of Education, the National Education Foundation, the National PTA, the National Rural Education Association, the School Nutrition Foundation, and the School Social Work Association of America — works together to elevate school breakfast's role in improving student achievement and health and to promote best practices to increase participation.

2019 — Oregon legislation made breakfast (and lunch) free for nearly all students

[Partners for a Hunger Free Oregon](#) led an effort to increase the number of high-poverty schools able to implement community eligibility: approximately three out of five children in Oregon will attend a school offering free breakfast and lunch to all students. Children who do not attend a community eligibility school will be able to qualify for free school meals if their household income is 300 percent or below the poverty line. The federal threshold for free school meals is 130 percent. FRAC worked with Partners for a Hunger Free Oregon to support this effort.

2020 — Dramatic gains made, but there's still work to do

In the last 15 years alone, school breakfast participation has grown by nearly 5 million low-income children. States have passed school breakfast expansion legislation to require breakfast after the bell programs, to eliminate the reduced-price copayment, and to encourage the implementation of community eligibility. Just over 28,600 schools are offering free breakfast to all students through the Community Eligibility Provision, and a growing number of schools are implementing innovative school breakfast programs. Because the program reaches just over half of the low-income children who participate in school lunch, there remains much work to do even as we celebrate the tremendous gains in program access.

IV. Best Practices in 2018–2019 School Year

Community Eligibility Continues to Grow

In the 2018–2019 school year, the fifth year of its nationwide availability, just over 28,600 schools and nearly 4,700 school districts participated in community eligibility, using this option to offer free breakfast and lunch to more than 13.6 million children. This represents a 14 percent increase in the number schools participating compared to the 2017–2018 school year. More than half of all eligible schools nationwide have adopted community eligibility, with participation expected to grow further in the 2019–2020 school year, as more school districts fully understand the provision and its benefits.

Community eligibility makes it easier for schools to implement breakfast after the bell programs. When combined, the two approaches can have a particularly dramatic impact on breakfast participation. States where community eligibility was implemented broadly have experienced high participation in the School Breakfast Program. In the 2018–2019 school year, the five states with the highest school breakfast participation were among the top 20 states for the percentage of eligible schools participating in community eligibility.

How Community Eligibility Works

Authorized by the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010, and phased in select states before being rolled out nationwide, the Community Eligibility Provision allows high-poverty 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 who are eligible for free school meals who already are identified by means other than an individual household application — can choose to participate.

“Identified students” include those who are in two categories:

- children who are directly certified for free school meals through data matching because their households receive SNAP, TANF, or FDIPIR benefits, or, in some states, Medicaid benefits;
- children who are certified for free meals without an application because they are homeless, migrant, enrolled in Head Start, or in foster care.

Community eligibility schools are reimbursed for meals served, based on a formula. Because of evidence that the ratio of all eligible children-to-children in these identified categories would be 1.6-to-1, Congress built that into the formula. Reimbursements to the school are calculated by multiplying the percentage of identified students by 1.6 to determine the percentage of meals that will be reimbursed at the federal free rate. For example, a school with 50 percent identified students would be reimbursed at the free rate for 80 percent of the meals eaten (50 multiplied by 1.6 = 80), and at the paid rate for 20 percent.

School districts also may choose to participate districtwide or group schools however they choose if the district or group has an overall identified student percentage of 40 percent or higher.

Find out which schools in your state or community are participating or eligible for the Community Eligibility Provision with the [Food Research & Action Center's database](#).

Since its initial rollout, best practices have been established to support broad implementation of community eligibility by high-poverty school districts. These include strategies to implement community eligibility in schools with [lower identified student percentages](#), to increase the identified student percentage, to better group schools to maximize funding, and to collect alternative forms.

Even though the number of schools adopting community eligibility has grown each year, there remain thousands of eligible high-poverty schools that could adopt the provision. Advocates should continue to work with local and state stakeholders to build support for the provision and improve communication with all parties to address issues that have thus far discouraged some eligible schools and school districts from participating, such as challenges associated with the loss of traditional school meal application data and low direct certification rates.

State School Breakfast Legislation

States with legislation focused on building strong school breakfast programs continued to take the top-performing spots in the 2018–2019 school year. Four of the top 10 — the District of Columbia, New Mexico, Texas, and West Virginia — have passed and implemented legislation that requires all or some schools to operate breakfast after the bell models or offer breakfast at no charge to all students in high-poverty schools.⁴ In all of these states, school breakfast participation increased after the passage of state legislation and the subsequent implementation.

In the 2018–2019 school year, schools in New York with 70 percent or more students who were certified for free or reduced-price meals were required to implement breakfast after the bell models. Participation has surged since then, with over 11,000 more students eating breakfast, compared to the prior year.

School breakfast legislation provides an important opportunity to increase and expand school breakfast participation, especially as growth in participation has decelerated. Advocates and allies should work to create policies that address the two main barriers to school breakfast participation — timing and stigma. School

breakfast legislation that requires schools to offer breakfast at no charge to all students after the bell eliminates both of these barriers. Legislation that encourages or requires school districts to offer universal meals through provisions, like community eligibility, and addresses concerns regarding school meals debt will have positive impacts on school breakfast participation.

For more information on state legislation and policy that supports the expansion of the School Breakfast Program, refer to the Food Research & Action Center's (FRAC) [School Meals Legislation and Funding Chart](#).

Building and Maintaining Robust Breakfast After the Bell Programs

The implementation of breakfast after the bell programs has been one of the main engines driving the growth in the School Breakfast Program over the past decade. Participation in the 2018–2019 school year decreased or stagnated in large part due to a number of school districts that were early adopters of breakfast after the bell models stopped the program altogether, or reduced the number of schools operating these innovative programs while others stopped planned expansion due to a lack of stakeholder support or a change in district leadership.

A strong and sustainable breakfast after the bell program includes a planning process that engages all district stakeholders from the beginning and requires a thorough assessment.

Getting the go-ahead from district leadership is only the beginning. School breakfast advocates must continually show the importance and impact of the program to district leadership and the community. In order to ensure that the program is maintained, school districts must be responsive year-round to feedback from stakeholders, especially from educators and students. As part of the implementation strategy, districts need to take the steps necessary to ensure that breakfast after the bell becomes part of the culture of the district, with many breakfast champions in the district and community. Cultivating strong buy-in makes it harder for new leadership or a single stakeholder to cut or eliminate the program.

⁴ Maine is in the top 10 for its ratio of free and reduced-price school breakfast to lunch participation. The state recently passed breakfast after the bell legislation, but it has not been implemented yet.

School breakfast advocates can share information about the impact that participation in the School Breakfast Program can have on students' educational achievement, behavior, and health, and what it means for the school nutrition department's finances. Many school districts have found that community eligibility is feasible with high breakfast participation, which is driven by the implementation of breakfast after the bell models.

[FRAC](#) and the [Partners for Breakfast in the Classroom](#) have developed a number of resources to help breakfast champions navigate the stakeholder engagement and implementation process required to build strong programs, including assessment tools, financial calculators, and toolkits created for specific stakeholders such as educators and administrators.

Unpaid School Meal Fee Policies

In 2016, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) published [guidance](#) requiring all school districts participating in the School Breakfast Program and National School Lunch Program to establish and clearly communicate a local meal charge policy for the 2017–2018 school year by July 1, 2017. A school district's policy guides schools on how to handle situations that arise when students — who are not certified for free school meals — arrive in the cafeteria without cash in hand or in their school meals account. The policy impacts two categories of students: those who are not certified for free or reduced-price school meals and are charged the meal price set by the district, and those who are certified for reduced-price school meals and are charged 30 cents per day for breakfast and 40 cents for lunch.

USDA did not establish national standards for these policies, nor set any baseline of protections for students and their families, but all policies should prohibit students from being singled out or embarrassed if they are unable to pay for their school meal; require schools to communicate directly with the parent or guardian — not the students — about unpaid school meals debt; take steps to qualify students for free or reduced-price school meals when they are eligible, especially if they have unpaid school meals debt; and support a positive school

environment. In addition, two best practices described in this report — offering free breakfast to all students and eliminating the reduced-price copay — can help dramatically reduce unpaid school meals debt while increasing school breakfast participation.

States can develop a policy to be implemented by all participating school districts or can provide guidelines for school districts to create a policy that complies with the state requirement. Since 2017, many states, including California, New Mexico, and Oregon, have passed legislation to require school districts in their respective states to create policies that protect children from stigma and ensure that eligible families are certified for school meals benefits. States, such as West Virginia, have established guidelines (without passing state legislation) to protect students from stigma that all school districts must follow when creating their policy.

For more information on this issue, including model policies, see the Food Research & Action Center's resources: [Establishing Unpaid Meal Fee Policies: Best Practices to Ensure Access and Prevent Stigma](#), [Unpaid School Meal Fees: A Review of 50 Districts](#), and [Best Practices for Preventing or Reducing School Meal Debt](#).

V. Child Nutrition Reauthorization

The upcoming Child Nutrition Reauthorization process presents an important opportunity for Congress to reduce childhood hunger, decrease childhood overweight and obesity, improve child nutrition and wellness, enhance child development and school readiness, and support academic achievement. The School Breakfast Program and National School Lunch Program provide funding to school districts to serve nutritious breakfasts, lunches, and afterschool snacks. Yet, there are shortfalls. The School Breakfast Program serves just over half of the low-income children who participate in school lunch; too many children who are eligible for free or reduced-price school meals are not certified to receive them. Schools across the nation also are struggling to respond to school meals debt.

The Food Research & Action Center (FRAC) urges Congress to enact a child nutrition bill that supports and strengthens program access and participation by underserved children and communities, ensures nutrition quality, and simplifies program administration and operation. The reauthorization should maintain and build upon the critical gains made in 2010 through the last reauthorization. In order to achieve

these goals, FRAC asks Congress to make the following improvements to the school meals programs.

- Increase the number of low-income children who are directly certified to receive free school meals without an application.
- Invest in the Community Eligibility Provision to increase the number of high-poverty schools that can participate.
- Eliminate the reduced-price fee category so that children up to 185 percent of the poverty line are able to receive free school meals.
- Move toward free school meals for all by creating statewide community eligibility pilots.
- Direct USDA to set federal policy for school meals debt that protects students.
- Allow school districts to retroactively claim and receive reimbursements for school meals served to low-income students who are certified for free or reduced-price school meals later in the school year, starting with the first day of the school year.

For more information on FRAC's priorities, visit FRAC's [Child Nutrition Reauthorization](#) website.

The upcoming Child Nutrition Reauthorization process presents an important opportunity for Congress to reduce childhood hunger, decrease childhood overweight and obesity, improve child nutrition and wellness, enhance child development and school readiness, and support academic achievement.

VI. Conclusion

School breakfast participation among low-income children remained flat in school year 2018–2019, with a nominal decrease of 0.1 percent even as overall participation in the program grew. The growing economy, natural disasters, decreases in enrollment, as well as many districts stopping or scaling back their breakfast after the bell programs drove this stagnation in participation among low-income students.

These findings show how incredibly important it is for school districts, state agencies, anti-hunger advocates, and community stakeholders to collaborate to implement and sustain robust breakfast after the bell programs that become part of a school district's culture and maintain broad support within the district and community. Building or expanding diverse coalitions in states can help these efforts, as evidenced by the top-performing states.

Additionally, more states need to follow the path of the top performers and pass breakfast legislation as a vehicle for change.

Community eligibility makes it easier for schools to operate breakfast after the bell programs and is linked to increased school breakfast participation. Increasing the number of eligible schools implementing community eligibility offers an important strategy to grow breakfast (and lunch) participation.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture, state child nutrition agencies, policymakers, educators, and anti-hunger advocates should continue to collaborate to expand the use of best practices to ensure all students start the day with a healthy breakfast.

These findings show how incredibly important it is for school districts, state agencies, anti-hunger advocates, and community stakeholders to collaborate to implement and sustain robust breakfast after the bell programs that become part of a school district's culture and maintain broad support within the district and community.

Technical Notes

The data in this report are collected from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and an annual survey of state child nutrition officials conducted by the Food Research & Action Center (FRAC). This report does not include data for students or schools that participate in school meals programs in Puerto Rico, Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands, or Department of Defense schools.

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

Student participation data for the 2018–2019 school year and prior years are based on daily averages of the number of breakfasts and lunches served on school days during the nine months from September through May of each year, as provided by USDA. States report to USDA the number of meals they serve each month. The 2018–2019 school year participation data in this report for Oklahoma used the same days of service as 2017–2018 school year since data were not available at the time of release. These numbers may undergo later revisions by states as accounting procedures find errors, or other estimates become confirmed.

The participation data for the 2017–2018 school year in this report for Louisiana and the total for the U.S. do not match the previous *School Breakfast Scorecard* released in February 2019 due to a revision in student participation data made by the Louisiana Department of Education. This change also caused Louisiana’s national ranking in 2017–2018 to drop from 16th to 23rd, resulting in seven states (Alabama, Colorado, Georgia, Mississippi, New Jersey, Michigan, and Montana) improving their national ranking by 1 from the ranking listed in the 2019 Scorecard. Louisiana’s data update reduced the total number of children participating in school breakfast in the 2017–2018 school year from 14,610,076 children (listed in the 2019 Scorecard) to 14,598,970.

For consistency, all USDA data used in this report are from the states’ 90-day revisions of the monthly reports. The 90-day revisions are the final required reports from the states, but states have the option to change numbers at any time after that point.

Based on information from USDA, FRAC applies a formula (divide average daily participation by an attendance factor) to adjust numbers upwards to account for children who were absent from school on a particular day. FRAC uses an attendance factor of 0.927 to adjust the average daily participation numbers in breakfast and lunch for the 2018–2019 school year.

The number of participating schools is reported by states to USDA in October of the relevant school year. The number includes not only public schools, but also private schools, residential child care institutions, and other institutions that operate school meals programs. FRAC’s *School Breakfast Scorecard* uses the October number, which is verified by FRAC with state officials, and FRAC provides an opportunity for state officials to update or correct the school numbers.

For each state, FRAC calculates the average daily number of children receiving free or reduced-price breakfasts for every 100 children who were receiving free or reduced-price lunches during the same school year. Based on the top states’ performance, FRAC has set an attainable benchmark of every state reaching a ratio of 70 children receiving free or reduced-price school breakfast for every 100 receiving free or reduced-price school lunch. FRAC then calculates the number of additional children who would be reached if each state reached this 70-to-100 ratio. FRAC multiplies this unserved population by the reimbursement rate for breakfast for each state’s average number of school days of breakfast service during the 2018–2019 school year.

FRAC assumes each state’s mix of free and reduced-price students would apply to any new participants, and conservatively assumes that no additional students’ meals are reimbursed at the somewhat higher rate that severe-need schools receive for breakfast. Severe-need schools are those where more than 40 percent of lunches served in the second preceding school year were free or reduced-price.

Table 1:**Low-Income Student Participation in School Lunch (NSLP) and School Breakfast (SBP), School Years 2017–2018 and 2018–2019**

State	School Year 2017–2018				School Year 2018–2019				Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Percent Change in Number of F&RP Students in SBP
	Free & Reduced-Price (F&RP) SBP Students	F&RP NSLP Students	F&RP Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	Rank Among States	Free & Reduced-Price (F&RP) SBP Students	F&RP NSLP Students	F&RP Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	Rank Among States		
Alabama	227,749	381,580	59.7	19	229,960	381,690	60.2	19	0.5	1.0%
Alaska	22,984	41,672	55.2	29	22,196	40,101	55.4	29	0.2	-3.4%
Arizona	269,293	488,816	55.1	30	265,387	475,335	55.8	28	0.7	-1.5%
Arkansas	157,877	240,289	65.7	6	159,276	239,627	66.5	6	0.8	0.9%
California	1,451,915	2,582,731	56.2	28	1,488,463	2,609,162	57.0	27	0.8	2.5%
Colorado	142,030	235,143	60.4	16	129,448	225,045	57.5	25	-2.9	-8.9%
Connecticut	91,829	178,530	51.4	37	101,576	197,440	51.4	41	0.0	10.6%
Delaware	41,979	66,831	62.8	8	40,942	65,426	62.6	11	-0.2	-2.5%
District of Columbia	32,317	47,708	67.7	4	29,575	42,908	68.9	4	1.2	-8.5%
Florida	792,185	1,548,519	51.2	40	762,038	1,478,971	51.5	40	0.3	-3.8%
Georgia	553,981	922,180	60.1	18	548,478	894,473	61.3	15	1.2	-1.0%
Hawaii	26,170	65,867	39.7	50	25,476	64,810	39.3	51	-0.4	-2.7%
Idaho	54,956	96,490	57.0	26	50,813	92,404	55.0	32	-2.0	-7.5%
Illinois	410,643	825,852	49.7	43	409,682	797,483	51.4	42	1.7	-0.2%
Indiana	233,605	455,988	51.2	38	231,077	453,523	51.0	43	-0.2	-1.1%
Iowa	80,426	184,169	43.7	49	82,205	192,364	42.7	49	-1.0	2.2%
Kansas	96,866	193,888	50.0	42	99,046	190,002	52.1	38	2.1	2.3%
Kentucky	283,974	430,425	66.0	5	292,773	434,270	67.4	5	1.4	3.1%
Louisiana ¹	268,633	460,391	58.3	23	271,145	456,192	59.4	21	1.1	0.9%
Maine	36,802	59,874	61.5	13	37,173	57,900	64.2	8	2.7	1.0%
Maryland	195,775	315,147	62.1	12	188,504	305,040	61.8	14	-0.3	-3.7%
Massachusetts	186,747	347,189	53.8	33	187,236	342,327	54.7	33	0.9	0.3%
Michigan	331,976	563,343	58.9	21	349,149	591,565	59.0	22	0.1	5.2%
Minnesota	158,570	289,591	54.8	32	155,679	282,314	55.1	31	0.3	-1.8%
Mississippi	185,268	308,253	60.1	17	180,493	298,367	60.5	17	0.4	-2.6%
Missouri	226,474	371,665	60.9	15	224,681	358,404	62.7	10	1.8	-0.8%
Montana	29,479	50,041	58.9	22	29,793	48,606	61.3	16	2.4	1.1%
Nebraska	57,068	129,298	44.1	47	57,946	129,648	44.7	48	0.6	1.5%
Nevada	114,691	184,484	62.2	11	111,943	185,342	60.4	18	-1.8	-2.4%
New Hampshire	15,513	35,389	43.8	48	15,393	34,385	44.8	47	1.0	-0.8%
New Jersey	267,998	453,791	59.1	20	262,957	442,019	59.5	20	0.4	-1.9%
New Mexico	128,556	183,284	70.1	2	121,777	175,458	69.4	3	-0.7	-5.3%
New York	717,607	1,384,373	51.8	36	728,780	1,389,734	52.4	36	0.6	1.6%
North Carolina	397,039	681,966	58.2	24	383,888	661,170	58.1	24	-0.1	-3.3%
North Dakota	17,351	34,236	50.7	41	17,497	33,735	51.9	39	1.2	0.8%
Ohio	373,380	658,813	56.7	27	365,425	636,939	57.4	26	0.7	-2.1%
Oklahoma ²	188,879	326,695	57.8	25	185,781	319,031	58.2	23	0.4	-1.6%
Oregon	118,377	215,096	55.0	31	111,462	201,935	55.2	30	0.2	-5.8%
Pennsylvania	352,458	688,140	51.2	39	362,368	688,965	52.6	35	1.4	2.8%
Rhode Island	27,672	52,702	52.5	34	27,927	51,860	53.9	34	1.4	0.9%
South Carolina	231,515	368,719	62.8	9	227,651	364,049	62.5	12	-0.3	-1.7%
South Dakota	23,007	49,649	46.3	45	22,403	48,720	46.0	46	-0.3	-2.6%
Tennessee	333,413	515,934	64.6	7	316,379	487,223	64.9	7	0.3	-5.1%
Texas	1,670,472	2,666,261	62.7	10	1,706,449	2,694,377	63.3	9	0.6	2.2%
Utah	65,572	166,263	39.4	51	63,497	159,295	39.9	50	0.5	-3.2%
Vermont	18,922	27,224	69.5	3	17,796	25,567	69.6	2	0.1	-6.0%
Virginia	280,210	457,822	61.2	14	282,822	457,001	61.9	13	0.7	0.9%
Washington	166,162	354,622	46.9	44	166,310	353,105	47.1	45	0.2	0.1%
West Virginia	122,378	146,284	83.7	1	120,683	145,420	83.0	1	-0.7	-1.4%
Wisconsin	150,866	287,665	52.4	35	153,752	294,868	52.1	37	-0.3	1.9%
Wyoming	11,773	25,542	46.1	46	11,825	24,029	49.2	44	3.1	0.4%
TOTAL	12,441,379	21,846,422	56.9		12,434,975	21,619,624	57.5		0.6	-0.1%

¹ The 2017–2018 school year participation data in this report for Louisiana and the total for the U.S. do not match the previous *School Breakfast Scorecard* released in 2019 due to a revision in student participation data made by the Louisiana Department of Education. This change also resulted in Louisiana's national ranking in 2017–2018 to drop from 16th to 23rd, resulting in seven states (Alabama, Colorado, Georgia, Mississippi, New Jersey, Michigan, and Montana) improving their national ranking by 1 from the ranking listed in the 2019 Scorecard.

² The 2018–2019 participation data in this report for Oklahoma used the same days of service as 2017–2018 school year because data were not available at time of release.

Table 2:**School Participation in School Lunch (NSLP) and School Breakfast (SBP),
School Years 2017–2018 and 2018–2019**

State	School Year 2017–2018				School Year 2018–2019				Percent Change in Number of SBP Schools
	SBP Schools	NSLP Schools	SBP Schools as % of NSLP Schools	Rank Among States	SBP Schools	NSLP Schools	SBP Schools as % of NSLP Schools	Rank Among States	
Alabama	1,435	1,477	97.2%	17	1,429	1,467	97.4%	18	-0.4%
Alaska	405	437	92.7%	34	400	431	92.8%	35	-1.2%
Arizona	1,724	1,815	95.0%	25	1,728	1,809	95.5%	23	0.2%
Arkansas	1,080	1,091	99.0%	5	1,069	1,077	99.3%	5	-1.0%
California	8,867	9,698	91.4%	36	9,236	10,071	91.7%	37	4.2%
Colorado	1,489	1,749	85.1%	46	1,517	1,765	85.9%	46	1.9%
Connecticut	879	1,031	85.3%	45	882	1,021	86.4%	45	0.3%
Delaware	248	249	99.6%	3	247	245	100.8%	1	-0.4%
District of Columbia	229	231	99.1%	4	232	234	99.1%	6	1.3%
Florida	3,866	3,920	98.6%	8	3,910	3,959	98.8%	9	1.1%
Georgia	2,313	2,380	97.2%	16	2,326	2,370	98.1%	13	0.6%
Hawaii	285	293	97.3%	15	283	291	97.3%	19	-0.7%
Idaho	663	692	95.8%	22	669	698	95.8%	22	0.9%
Illinois	3,393	4,036	84.1%	48	3,406	4,025	84.6%	47	0.4%
Indiana	1,945	2,132	91.2%	39	1,928	2,105	91.6%	38	-0.9%
Iowa	1,281	1,375	93.2%	33	1,275	1,365	93.4%	32	-0.5%
Kansas	1,267	1,353	93.6%	29	1,423	1,519	93.7%	31	12.3%
Kentucky	1,269	1,300	97.6%	13	1,271	1,302	97.6%	17	0.2%
Louisiana	1,450	1,526	95.0%	24	1,440	1,511	95.3%	24	-0.7%
Maine	591	610	96.9%	19	590	602	98.0%	14	-0.2%
Maryland	1,462	1,483	98.6%	9	1,466	1,488	98.5%	11	0.3%
Massachusetts	1,834	2,171	84.5%	47	1,872	2,167	86.4%	44	2.1%
Michigan	3,021	3,301	91.5%	35	3,038	3,287	92.4%	36	0.6%
Minnesota	1,753	1,993	88.0%	43	1,777	1,997	89.0%	43	1.4%
Mississippi	868	908	95.6%	23	844	890	94.8%	25	-2.8%
Missouri	2,302	2,460	93.6%	31	2,298	2,443	94.1%	28	-0.2%
Montana	734	804	91.3%	38	720	788	91.4%	39	-1.9%
Nebraska	775	928	83.5%	49	765	909	84.2%	49	-1.3%
Nevada	583	623	93.6%	30	590	628	93.9%	29	1.2%
New Hampshire	400	438	91.3%	37	406	436	93.1%	33	1.5%
New Jersey	2,172	2,630	82.6%	51	2,175	2,626	82.8%	51	0.1%
New Mexico	861	893	96.4%	20	863	895	96.4%	21	0.2%
New York	5,563	5,864	94.9%	26	5,612	5,927	94.7%	26	0.9%
North Carolina	2,538	2,571	98.7%	7	2,521	2,557	98.6%	10	-0.7%
North Dakota	364	410	88.8%	41	370	408	90.7%	40	1.6%
Ohio	3,247	3,674	88.4%	42	3,241	3,637	89.1%	42	-0.2%
Oklahoma	1,779	1,807	98.5%	11	1,806	1,826	98.9%	7	1.5%
Oregon	1,275	1,325	96.2%	21	1,276	1,320	96.7%	20	0.1%
Pennsylvania	3,215	3,442	93.4%	32	3,139	3,380	92.9%	34	-2.4%
Rhode Island	357	368	97.0%	18	352	360	97.8%	16	-1.4%
South Carolina	1,188	1,191	99.7%	2	1,191	1,194	99.7%	4	0.3%
South Dakota	613	711	86.2%	44	582	690	84.3%	48	-5.1%
Tennessee	1,815	1,843	98.5%	10	1,775	1,805	98.3%	12	-2.2%
Texas	7,853	7,872	99.8%	1	8,503	8,457	100.5%	2	8.3%
Utah	867	968	89.6%	40	874	972	89.9%	41	0.8%
Vermont	338	347	97.4%	14	312	319	97.8%	15	-7.7%
Virginia	1,945	1,983	98.1%	12	1,955	1,954	100.1%	3	0.5%
Washington	1,920	2,032	94.5%	27	1,991	2,121	93.9%	30	3.7%
West Virginia	722	730	98.9%	6	703	711	98.9%	8	-2.6%
Wisconsin	2,034	2,456	82.8%	50	2,014	2,410	83.6%	50	-1.0%
Wyoming	300	318	94.3%	28	295	312	94.6%	27	-1.7%
TOTAL	89,377	95,939	93.2%		90,587	96,781	93.6%		1.4%

Table 3:
**Average Daily Student Participation In School Breakfast Program (SBP),
 School Year 2018–2019**

State	Free (F) SBP Students		Reduced Price (RP) SBP Students		Total F&RP SBP Students		Paid SBP Students		Total SBP Students
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Alabama	217,895	80.1%	12,065	4.4%	229,960	84.5%	42,026	15.5%	271,986
Alaska	21,156	80.2%	1,040	3.9%	22,196	84.1%	4,173	15.9%	26,369
Arizona	245,036	78.4%	20,351	6.5%	265,387	84.9%	47,253	15.1%	312,640
Arkansas	142,539	73.8%	16,737	8.7%	159,276	82.5%	33,849	17.5%	193,125
California	1,369,669	80.7%	118,794	7.0%	1,488,463	87.7%	208,472	12.3%	1,696,935
Colorado	110,848	65.8%	18,600	11.0%	129,448	76.8%	39,103	23.2%	168,551
Connecticut	98,007	86.4%	3,569	3.1%	101,576	89.5%	11,917	10.5%	113,493
Delaware	39,794	74.2%	1,148	2.1%	40,942	76.3%	12,688	23.7%	53,630
District of Columbia	29,229	82.8%	346	1.0%	29,575	83.8%	5,746	16.2%	35,321
Florida	722,040	83.3%	39,998	4.6%	762,038	87.9%	104,255	12.1%	866,293
Georgia	512,636	78.9%	35,842	5.5%	548,478	84.4%	101,608	15.6%	650,086
Hawaii	22,822	70.5%	2,654	8.2%	25,476	78.7%	6,876	21.3%	32,352
Idaho	44,084	62.2%	6,729	9.5%	50,813	71.7%	20,090	28.3%	70,903
Illinois	402,551	91.4%	7,131	1.6%	409,682	93.0%	30,620	7.0%	440,302
Indiana	210,747	74.5%	20,330	7.2%	231,077	81.7%	51,906	18.3%	282,983
Iowa	76,146	73.3%	6,059	5.8%	82,205	79.1%	21,629	20.9%	103,834
Kansas	86,299	69.8%	12,747	10.3%	99,046	80.1%	24,639	19.9%	123,685
Kentucky	289,789	88.8%	2,984	.9%	292,773	89.7%	33,434	10.3%	326,207
Louisiana ¹	267,332	90.6%	3,813	1.3%	271,145	91.9%	23,786	8.1%	294,931
Maine	33,083	63.5%	4,090	7.9%	37,173	71.4%	14,910	28.6%	52,083
Maryland	166,909	63.7%	21,595	8.2%	188,504	71.9%	73,452	28.1%	261,956
Massachusetts	181,594	85.2%	5,642	2.6%	187,236	87.8%	25,892	12.2%	213,128
Michigan	334,787	83.4%	14,362	3.6%	349,149	87.0%	52,092	13.0%	401,241
Minnesota	129,476	54.1%	26,203	10.9%	155,679	65.0%	83,758	35.0%	239,437
Mississippi	171,113	86.5%	9,380	4.7%	180,493	91.2%	17,247	8.8%	197,740
Missouri	203,876	70.3%	20,805	7.2%	224,681	77.5%	65,327	22.5%	290,008
Montana	27,411	69.5%	2,382	6.0%	29,793	75.5%	9,637	24.5%	39,430
Nebraska	49,766	61.1%	8,180	10.0%	57,946	71.1%	23,481	28.9%	81,427
Nevada	103,250	78.0%	8,693	6.6%	111,943	84.6%	20,499	15.4%	132,442
New Hampshire	13,915	62.7%	1,478	6.7%	15,393	69.4%	6,797	30.6%	22,190
New Jersey	244,808	75.1%	18,149	5.6%	262,957	80.7%	63,023	19.3%	325,980
New Mexico	118,050	83.1%	3,727	2.6%	121,777	85.7%	20,338	14.3%	142,115
New York	716,269	90.9%	12,511	1.6%	728,780	92.5%	59,343	7.5%	788,123
North Carolina	364,055	80.7%	19,833	4.4%	383,888	85.1%	67,150	14.9%	451,038
North Dakota	14,824	50.8%	2,673	9.2%	17,497	60.0%	11,695	40.0%	29,192
Ohio	345,574	77.2%	19,851	4.4%	365,425	81.6%	82,115	18.4%	447,540
Oklahoma ²	169,808	73.9%	15,973	7.0%	185,781	80.9%	43,921	19.1%	229,702
Oregon	101,599	70.1%	9,863	6.8%	111,462	76.9%	33,413	23.1%	144,875
Pennsylvania	351,643	84.4%	10,725	2.6%	362,368	87.0%	54,370	13.0%	416,738
Rhode Island	26,166	76.2%	1,761	5.1%	27,927	81.3%	6,395	18.7%	34,322
South Carolina	218,099	81.4%	9,552	3.6%	227,651	85.0%	40,147	15.0%	267,798
South Dakota	20,275	68.7%	2,128	7.2%	22,403	75.9%	7,121	24.1%	29,524
Tennessee	300,084	78.7%	16,295	4.3%	316,379	83.0%	64,950	17.0%	381,329
Texas	1,632,122	84.5%	74,327	3.8%	1,706,449	88.3%	225,174	11.7%	1,931,623
Utah	55,148	64.5%	8,349	9.8%	63,497	74.3%	21,975	25.7%	85,472
Vermont	15,470	61.3%	2,326	9.2%	17,796	70.5%	7,427	29.5%	25,223
Virginia	259,671	72.5%	23,151	6.5%	282,822	79.0%	75,130	21.0%	357,952
Washington	145,865	72.2%	20,445	10.1%	166,310	82.3%	35,780	17.7%	202,090
West Virginia	119,048	81.3%	1,635	1.1%	120,683	82.4%	25,769	17.6%	146,452
Wisconsin	143,723	73.2%	10,029	5.1%	153,752	78.3%	42,476	21.7%	196,228
Wyoming	9,667	56.7%	2,158	12.6%	11,825	69.3%	5,239	30.7%	17,064
TOTAL	11,695,767	79.9%	739,208	5.0%	12,434,975	84.9%	2,210,113	15.1%	14,645,088

¹ The 2017–2018 school year participation data in this report for Louisiana and the total for the U.S. do not match the previous *School Breakfast Scorecard* released in 2019 due to a revision in student participation data made by the Louisiana Department of Education.

² The 2018–2019 participation data in this report for Oklahoma used the same days of service as 2017–2018 school year because data were not available at time of release.

Table 4:**Additional Participation and Funding if 70 Low-Income Students Were Served School Breakfast (SBP) Per 100 Served School Lunch (NSLP), School Year 2018–2019**

State	Actual Total Free & Reduced Price (F&RP) SBP Students	F&RP Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	Total F&RP Students if 70 SBP per 100 NSLP	Additional F&RP Students if 70 SBP per 100 NSLP	Additional Annual Funding if 70 SBP per 100 NSLP F&RP Students
Alabama	229,960	60.2	267,183	37,223	\$10,811,958
Alaska	22,196	55.4	28,071	5,875	\$1,706,391
Arizona	265,387	55.8	332,735	67,348	\$19,562,054
Arkansas	159,276	66.5	167,739	8,463	\$2,458,172
California	1,488,463	57.0	1,826,413	337,950	\$98,162,576
Colorado	129,448	57.5	157,532	28,084	\$8,157,258
Connecticut	101,576	51.4	138,208	36,632	\$10,640,292
Delaware	40,942	62.6	45,798	4,856	\$1,410,554
District of Columbia	29,575	68.9	30,036	461	\$133,788
Florida	762,038	51.5	1,035,280	273,242	\$79,366,984
Georgia	548,478	61.3	626,131	77,653	\$22,555,464
Hawaii	25,476	39.3	45,367	19,891	\$5,777,628
Idaho	50,813	55.0	64,683	13,870	\$4,028,683
Illinois	409,682	51.4	558,238	148,556	\$43,150,260
Indiana	231,077	51.0	317,466	86,389	\$25,092,962
Iowa	82,205	42.7	134,655	52,450	\$15,234,801
Kansas	99,046	52.1	133,001	33,955	\$9,862,835
Kentucky	292,773	67.4	303,989	11,216	\$3,257,849
Louisiana	271,145	59.4	319,334	48,189	\$13,997,305
Maine	37,173	64.2	40,530	3,357	\$975,089
Maryland	188,504	61.8	213,528	25,024	\$7,268,582
Massachusetts	187,236	54.7	239,629	52,393	\$15,218,274
Michigan	349,149	59.0	414,096	64,947	\$18,864,648
Minnesota	155,679	55.1	197,620	41,941	\$12,182,311
Mississippi	180,493	60.5	208,857	28,364	\$8,238,704
Missouri	224,681	62.7	250,883	26,202	\$7,610,691
Montana	29,793	61.3	34,024	4,231	\$1,229,013
Nebraska	57,946	44.7	90,754	32,808	\$9,529,441
Nevada	111,943	60.4	129,739	17,796	\$5,169,221
New Hampshire	15,393	44.8	24,070	8,677	\$2,520,215
New Jersey	262,957	59.5	309,413	46,456	\$13,493,902
New Mexico	121,777	69.4	122,821	1,044	\$303,129
New York	728,780	52.4	972,814	244,034	\$70,883,136
North Carolina	383,888	58.1	462,819	78,931	\$22,926,646
North Dakota	17,497	51.9	23,615	6,118	\$1,776,916
Ohio	365,425	57.4	445,857	80,432	\$23,362,720
Oklahoma	185,781	58.2	223,322	37,541	\$10,904,237
Oregon	111,462	55.2	141,355	29,893	\$8,682,708
Pennsylvania	362,368	52.6	482,276	119,908	\$34,828,864
Rhode Island	27,927	53.9	36,302	8,375	\$2,432,640
South Carolina	227,651	62.5	254,834	27,183	\$7,895,782
South Dakota	22,403	46.0	34,104	11,701	\$3,398,724
Tennessee	316,379	64.9	341,056	24,677	\$7,167,819
Texas	1,706,449	63.3	1,886,064	179,615	\$52,171,740
Utah	63,497	39.9	111,507	48,010	\$13,945,052
Vermont	17,796	69.6	17,897	101	\$29,308
Virginia	282,822	61.9	319,901	37,079	\$10,770,043
Washington	166,310	47.1	247,174	80,864	\$23,487,972
West Virginia	120,683	83.0	101,794	Met goal	Met goal
Wisconsin	153,752	52.1	206,408	52,656	\$15,294,579
Wyoming	11,825	49.2	16,820	4,995	\$1,450,957
TOTAL	12,434,975	57.5	15,133,737	2,698,762	\$783,894,336



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

202.986.2200
www.frac.org

Copyright © 2020 Food Research & Action Center



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



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



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



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