



**JUNE**  
**20**  
**14**

**HUNGER DOESN'T TAKE A VACATION**  
SUMMER NUTRITION STATUS REPORT 2014

# About FRAC

---

The Food Research and Action Center (FRAC) is the leading national organization working for more effective public and private policies to eradicate domestic hunger and undernutrition.

For more information about FRAC, or to sign up for FRAC's Weekly News Digest, visit [www.frac.org](http://www.frac.org). For information about the Summer Nutrition Programs, go to [www.frac.org/federal-foodnutrition-programs/summer-programs/](http://www.frac.org/federal-foodnutrition-programs/summer-programs/).

## Acknowledgements

---

This report was prepared by Kate Sims, Signe Anderson, Crystal FitzSimons, Michael Burke, and Hannah Kapp-Klote.

The Food Research and Action Center gratefully acknowledges support of its work to expand and improve the Summer Nutrition Programs in 2013-2014 from:

The California Endowment

ConAgra Foods Foundation

Hillshire Brands

David and Lucile Packard Foundation

Walmart Foundation

YMCA of the USA

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

AARP

AARP Foundation

Anonymous Donors

Bank of America Charitable Foundation

Cargill Foundation

Annie E. Casey Foundation

Commonweal Foundation

Eos Foundation

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

General Mills Foundation

Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

Kaiser Permanente

Kellogg's Corporate Citizenship Fund

Kraft Foods Foundation

Kresge Foundation

Leaves of Grass Fund

MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger

The Moriah Fund

National Dairy Council/Dairy Management, Inc.

New Directions Foundation

Newman's Own Foundation

Sand Dollar Fund

Share Our Strength

Taste of the NFL

# Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation:

## Summer Nutrition Status Report 2014

The summer of 2013 marked the first major increase in the number of low-income children eating summer meals in 10 years. In July 2013, the Summer Nutrition Programs grew to serve nearly three million children, an increase of 161,000 children or 5.7 percent from 2012, and the largest percentage increase since 2003.

This increase in participation is good news not just for the children, but for states, for communities, and for struggling families. When the school bell rings to mark the beginning of the long summer recess, millions of low-income children lose access to the school breakfasts and lunches they rely on during the school year. The federal Summer Nutrition Programs—the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) and the National School Lunch Program (NSLP)—are designed to replace the school breakfasts and lunches on which low-income children and their families rely during the school year. They provide children the nutritious meals they need to keep hunger at bay and remain healthy throughout the summer. The meals provided through the Summer Nutrition Programs also support summer programs and help draw children into educational, enrichment, and recreational activities that keep them learning, engaged, active, and safe during school vacation.

Growing participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs means that more low-income children are experiencing these benefits. 2013 saw overall growth in the number of children eating summer meals, but it also saw progress in the reach of these programs. The programs grew to serve 15.1 children for every 100 low-income children who participated in school lunch during the 2012-2013 school year, a modest increase from the 14.3:100 served in the 2011-2012 school year. This growth is due to a combination of more children (161,000) eating summer meals, and fewer low-income children (27,000) eating school lunch during the regular school year.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) was the key driving force behind the participation growth in July 2013. In May 2013, Secretary Tom Vilsack announced that USDA was making higher participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs a top priority. He set an ambitious goal of increasing the number of meals served during the summer by five million. Working in partnership with FRAC, Feeding America, Share Our Strength, and other national, state, and local stakeholders to increase Summer Nutrition participation, USDA surpassed its goal and served seven million more meals in the summer of 2013 than it did in 2012.

While more children are receiving summer food, more work is needed to rebuild the Summer Nutrition Programs so they can adequately respond to meet the need. Participation in most other nutrition programs (the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program – SNAP – and school meals, for example) grew during and after the Great Recession to help families who had lost jobs or had wages reduced. But participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs began to drop in July 2009, as states and communities cut back their child care and other funding for summer programs and summer school, which provide the platforms for Summer Nutrition Programs. Participation continued to fall each subsequent year, and by the summer of 2012, 99,000 fewer children were participating in the Summer Nutrition Programs than in 2008. This happened despite the growing

need for summer meals. While participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs was falling, participation in the National School Lunch Program was growing dramatically during the same time period. From school year 2007-2008 to school year 2011-2012, participation in school lunch grew by 3.6 million low-income children.

As last summer's results demonstrate, growing participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs is entirely possible when USDA leads the charge to promote the programs and address barriers to participation, when state child nutrition agencies focus on expanding participation, and when national, state, and local stakeholders support those efforts. Last summer's gains provide important momentum to further the reach of the Summer Nutrition Programs so they can serve more of the low-income children who lose access to nutritious meals when the school year ends. For summer 2014, USDA is once again leading the charge by providing technical assistance to states, developing and collecting national resources to share, and compiling program models in an effort to continue expansion efforts nationwide. And the 2015 Child Nutrition Reauthorization provides the opportunity for Congress to invest in the Summer Nutrition Programs and make crucial improvements so that more low-income children have access to nutritious meals throughout the summer.

# National Findings for 2013

The Summer Nutrition Programs experienced considerable growth in 2013, more than matching the numerical decrease in participation that occurred during the Great Recession. While this increase moves the program forward, there remains substantial room for further growth. The Great Recession increased the number of children eligible for free and reduced-price lunch during the school year; however, only 15.1 out of every 100 of those children participated in Summer Nutrition.

- In July 2013, the Summer Nutrition Programs (i.e., SFSP and NSLP combined) served lunch to nearly three million children on an average day. The total number of children participating in Summer Nutrition increased by more than 161,000, or 5.7 percent, from July 2012 to July 2013. Since 2008 when the Great Recession began, this was the largest increase in the total number of children participating and was the largest percent-increase in participation since 2003.
- Still, in July 2013, only 15.1 children received Summer Nutrition for every 100 low-income students who received lunch in the 2012-2013 school year. That is, only one child in seven who needed summer food was getting it.
- The ratio of 15.1:100 in July 2013 was an increase compared to the ratio of 14.3:100 in July 2012. The higher ratio was due to more than 161,000 additional children participating in summer nutrition in July 2012 compared to July 2013, along with more than 27,000 fewer low-income students participating in NSLP during the 2012-2013 school year than in 2011-2012.
- Both the number of SFSP sponsors and sites increased in July 2013 compared to July 2012. Forty-four sponsors (a one percent increase) and 2,370 sites (a six percent increase) were added nationally.
- The Summer Nutrition Programs continued to struggle to feed children throughout the entire summer vacation, because many sponsors and sites do not operate the whole summer. The number of SFSP lunches served in June actually decreased by one percent from 2012 to 2013 (a decline of more than 279,000 lunches), and only increased by one percent in August (an increase of 117,000-plus lunches).

---

<sup>1</sup> In calculating the Summer Nutrition participation numbers described in this report, FRAC focuses on data from the month of July because it is the peak month for summer nutrition participation for most states. School schedules vary widely across the country, with many regular school years going into June or starting in August. July is when the vast majority of schools are closed for summer vacation.

<sup>2</sup> Because the rate of school lunch participation by eligible low-income children is quite high, the number of low-income children who are receiving free or reduced-price lunch during the regular school year is a useful way to estimate the need for Summer Nutrition Programs.

# State Findings for 2013

Summer Nutrition participation rates and state agency performance varied greatly throughout the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

- Five top-performing states reached at least one in four of their low-income children in July 2013, when comparing Summer Nutrition participation to regular school-year free and reduced price lunch numbers: the District of Columbia (ratio of 57.9:100), New Mexico (32.4:100), New York (28.2:100), Connecticut (26.4), and Vermont (25.9). Three additional states reached at least one in five children with summer meals: Arkansas (22.2:100), Idaho (22.1:100), and Delaware (21.4).
- Eleven states fed summer meals to fewer than one in ten of their low-income children in July 2013. Oklahoma (4.5:100), Mississippi (5.8:100), and Nevada (6.4:100) were the three lowest-performing states, and each had a 2013 ratio even worse than in the previous year.
- Thirty-two states experienced increases in Summer Nutrition participation, with 12 states growing the number of participants by more than 10 percent. Arkansas had the largest increase, growing participation by 39 percent, followed by Hawaii with 33.9 percent, and Louisiana with 32.2 percent.
- Nineteen states experienced decreases in Summer Nutrition participation, with three states shrinking by more than 10 percent. Nevada decreased by 21.5 percent, followed by North Dakota (13.3 percent), and Mississippi (13.1 percent).
- While not used in calculations for this report, it is important to note that 21 states had their highest SFSP participation during the month of June. Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma all served at least twice as many SFSP lunches in June compared to July, with Kansas, North Dakota, and Tennessee serving between 43 and 73 percent more.

# Missed Opportunities

The child poverty rate is still much higher than before the recession, and it was far too high even before the recession. As the economy slowly recovers, it remains urgent that states continue and build 2013's progress in feeding children summer food. It is important to embrace policies such as Summer Nutrition not only to improve child nutrition and health but to boost state economies. Summer Nutrition Programs provide healthy meals to low-income children, and funnel millions of dollars to the states. For every lunch that an eligible child does not receive, the state and community miss out on \$3.4125<sup>3</sup> in federal SFSP funding. When added together, it can mean millions of dollars are left on the table.

- If every state had reached the goal of 40 children participating in Summer Nutrition in July 2013 for every 100 receiving free or reduced-price lunch during the 2012-2013 school year, an additional 4.8 million children would have been fed each day, and states would have collected an additional \$365 million in child nutrition funding in July alone (assuming the programs operated 22 days).
- The five states that missed out on the most federal funding and failed to feed the most children were Texas (\$49.4 million; 658,000 children), California (\$39.7 million; 529,000 children), Florida (\$23.4 million; 312,000 children), Georgia (\$16.7 million; 223,000 children), and Illinois (\$15.2 million; 203,000 children).

# Strategies to Increase Participation

In 2013, the Summer Nutrition Programs benefited from numerous promotional, outreach, and technical assistance strategies undertaken by USDA, state child nutrition agencies, and national, state, and local stakeholders. In addition, the Summer Nutrition Programs fit well into the increased focus of First Lady Michelle Obama's Let's Move! campaign, with many summer meal sites also providing recreational and physical activities. Many sites also supported the Administration's focus on improving student achievement by providing educational and enrichment activities that helped temper summer learning loss. Below some of the most promising efforts are described.

---

<sup>3</sup> Reimbursement rates are slightly higher than this number for rural or "self-preparation" sites.

# USDA Summer Nutrition Program Initiative

In 2013, USDA Secretary Vilsack made increasing access to the Summer Nutrition Programs a top priority for the agency and set the goal of providing five million more meals than in the summer of 2012. USDA surpassed its goal, reimbursing seven million more meals in 2013.

To achieve its goal, USDA partnered closely with FRAC, Share Our Strength, Feeding America, and numerous other national and state organizations to increase the number of sponsors and sites providing summer meals and to increase the number of children who participated. It used a variety of strategies, including: offering technical assistance through webinars; providing promotion and outreach through traditional and social media; engaging partners; and taking important steps to alleviate administrative barriers to participation at the state and local level.<sup>4</sup>

Another key component of the USDA campaign was the targeting of five states—Arkansas, California, Colorado, Rhode Island, and Virginia—for intensive technical assistance. Leading up to summer 2013, USDA and the five state child nutrition agencies, with help from national and state partners, convened meetings of key stakeholders in each of the five states to develop action plans to increase participation. Following the first year of USDA’s targeted technical assistance project, all of the states except Virginia increased participation, and California experienced double-digit increases.

Increasing access to the Summer Nutrition Programs remains a top priority for USDA in 2014. This summer, it is targeting six additional states—Alabama, Illinois, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, and Texas—because of their persistent poverty, high levels of food insecurity, and low summer meal participation, while continuing to work closely with the 2013 target states. USDA is conducting an aggressive outreach and promotion campaign and will hold its fourth annual Summer Food Week during the first week of June. FRAC, Share Our Strength and Feeding America, as well as numerous other national, state, and local organizations, continue to support USDA’s expansion efforts in the target states, as well as its efforts to promote the Summer Nutrition Programs nationwide.

---

<sup>4</sup><http://www.fns.usda.gov/pressrelease/2014/004814>.



# Nutrition Quality

Summer is a difficult nutritional time for many children. Not only does food insecurity increase among families with children during the summer months, but children also are at greater risk for obesity as they lose access to school meals, with some gaining weight two to three times faster than during the school year.<sup>5</sup> The Institute of Medicine (IOM) and the White House Task Force on Childhood Obesity both have recommended increasing access to the child nutrition programs, including the Summer Nutrition Programs, as an effective tool for reducing obesity among low-income children.<sup>6 7</sup>

All meals served through the Summer Nutrition Programs must meet federal nutrition standards. NSLP meals must meet the newest federal nutrition standards; SFSP meals must include milk, two different servings of fruit or vegetables (which can include 100 percent juice), a grain, and a protein. While SFSP nutrition standards have not been updated recently, they establish the basic components of a healthy meal and sponsors can improve upon them by serving lean meats, low-fat milk, whole grains, and fruits and vegetables instead of juice. FRAC's Summer Food Standards of Excellence, modeled after the Healthy Schools Challenge, can be used as a basis to improve the meals served at Summer Nutrition sites. The FRAC standards provide a framework to rank summer meal sites as gold, silver, or bronze, based upon: the nutrition quality and appeal of the food provided at the site; the environment of the meal site; and outreach efforts. Serving higher quality, nutritious food leads to healthier children and has the added benefit of drawing more children to the site. The standards are available on the FRAC website: <http://frac.org/federal-foodnutrition-programs/summer-programs/standards-of-excellence-summer-programs/>.

Growing numbers of state child nutrition agencies are working with sponsors to improve the nutritional quality and appeal of summer meals. The following examples show how states are making positive strides to improve the diets of children in their summer nutrition programs:

- The **California** Department of Education encourages school districts, food banks, and other community-based summer food sponsors to collaborate with local farmers to serve locally-sourced fresh fruits and vegetables at summer meal sites.
- The **Florida** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services works with its sponsors to offer a variety of meals, both hot and cold. It also encourages sponsors to take into consideration the cultural preferences of the children in the community.

---

<sup>5</sup> von Hippel, P. T., Powell, B., Downey, D. B., & Rowland, N. J. (2007). The Effect of School on Overweight in Childhood: Gain in Body Mass Index During the School Year and During Summer Vacation. *American Journal of Public Health*, 97(4), 696-702.

<sup>6</sup> Institute of Medicine. (2009). *Local Government Actions to Prevent Childhood Obesity*. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press.

<sup>7</sup> White House Task Force on Childhood Obesity. (2010). *Solving the Problem of Childhood Obesity Within a Generation*. Available at: [http://www.letsmove.gov/sites/letsmove.gov/files/TaskForce\\_on\\_Childhood\\_Obesity\\_May2010\\_FullReport.pdf](http://www.letsmove.gov/sites/letsmove.gov/files/TaskForce_on_Childhood_Obesity_May2010_FullReport.pdf). Accessed on May 7, 2014.

- The **New York** State Education Department incorporates information on improving nutrition quality into its annual sponsor training. Many school sponsors are increasing whole grains and offering more varieties of vegetables in their summer menus.
- The **Wyoming** Department of Education has partnered with the Wyoming Food Bank of the Rockies to get greater variety and more nutritious foods to its summer meal sites. It also develops menus for sponsors to use that eliminate most processed foods and include lean meats, plus a variety of fruits and vegetables. Wyoming has held competitions for the best menus, and the winner receives large activity toolkits for its summer meal site.

To learn more, check out FRAC's sample menus, [http://frac.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/model\\_menus\\_summer\\_food\\_standards\\_of\\_excellence.pdf](http://frac.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/model_menus_summer_food_standards_of_excellence.pdf), and Fresh from the Farm: Using Local Foods in the Afterschool and Summer Nutrition Programs, <http://frac.org/newsite/wp-content/uploads/2009/09/produceguide.pdf>.

## Sponsor Retention

Many state agencies are reporting an increased focus on sponsor retention from summer to summer. By keeping existing sponsors in the program and providing support to strengthen their programs, new sponsors mean program growth which is much needed, and retained, knowledgeable sponsors present the state with an opportunity to encourage those existing sponsors to serve more sites. State agencies are evaluating the support that they provide sponsors, incorporating sponsors' recommendations to improve trainings and outreach materials, and relying on experienced and well-established sponsors to mentor new sponsors. Surveying sponsors, after trainings, before starting outreach efforts and at the end of the summer allows state agency staff to make adjustments to internal processes based on the feedback received. By retaining strong sponsors and involving them in the recruitment and support provided to new sponsors, states can build a cohort of successful sponsors who can continue to improve their summer meal programs year after year.

- The **Florida** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services connected sponsors who are operating similar type programs with one another so they can share best practices.
- The **Idaho** Department of Education surveyed its sponsors at the end of the summer to identify those that planned to return the following summer and those that needed additional technical assistance. It also used this survey as an opportunity to increase participation, asking sponsors to recommend and provide contact information for organizations that might be interested in becoming sponsors.
- The **New York** State Education Department surveyed its sponsors after trainings in order to improve future workshops, to get recommendations on website improvements, and to identify additional outreach materials that would be helpful to sponsors.

To learn more about other successful strategies, read FRAC's State Agency Summer Nutrition Sponsor Retention Strategies. [[http://frac.org/pdf/sfsp\\_state\\_agency\\_sponsor\\_retention\\_plans.pdf](http://frac.org/pdf/sfsp_state_agency_sponsor_retention_plans.pdf)]

# Outreach Strategies

Conducting outreach to families about the Summer Nutrition Programs remains an essential strategy to increase participation. States continue to use customary methods—e.g., fliers, banners, and post-cards—but also increasingly are using traditional mass media outlets, such as radio and television advertisements, along with social media, to promote summer meal programs. The National Hunger Hotline (1-866-3-HUNGRY), local 211 call centers, and texting services are important methods to inform families of site locations so their children can participate in summer meals.

Some state agencies, such as the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services and the Hawaii Department of Education, report greater collaboration with SNAP (Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program) offices to advertise summer meal sites to households receiving SNAP benefits. In addition, some states are encouraging greater collaboration among summer food sponsors. For example, the Kentucky Department of Education reports collaborative partner meetings happening on the local level in which private nonprofit organizations and school districts share plans for their site locations and discuss working together to promote the Summer Nutrition sites.

An important and relatively new opportunity for outreach is a requirement in the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 that schools which participate in the regular school year federal lunch program distribute summer meal site information to students before the end of the school year. While not all states reported tracking schools' outreach efforts, many are finding that schools are sending fliers with nearby site locations home to parents – sometimes including that site information on the last menu of the school year – or posting interactive maps of site locations on their websites or linking to maps on state agency websites. State agencies can play a role in encouraging robust implementation of this outreach requirement. For example, the Michigan Department of Education works with school districts to link back to the state agency website's interactive map of site locations. It also encourages school districts to promote state 211 call centers for site information provided by the state agency.

# Congressional Child Nutrition Reauthorization

The child nutrition programs are scheduled to be reauthorized by Congress in 2015. Reauthorization provides an excellent opportunity to invest in the Summer Nutrition Programs to increase their reach. The last reauthorization made it easier for nonprofit organizations to serve more children and required schools to help with Summer Nutrition outreach. These modest changes have contributed to the gains in participation. The reach of the Summer Nutrition Programs could be expanded dramatically by making more significant investments in the upcoming reauthorization, including:

- Improving the area eligibility test by lowering it from 50 to 40 percent so more low-income communities can participate;
- Streamlining the administrative requirements so nonprofit organizations and local government agencies can provide meals year-round, an expansion of the California Year-Round Summer Food Pilot to all states;
- Allowing sites to serve three meals per day instead of two; and
- Offering grants for transportation to assist sponsors in getting children and meals to sites.

## CHAMPS

(Cities Combating Hunger through Afterschool and Summer Meal Programs)

The National League of Cities' CHAMPS project, developed in partnership with FRAC and funded by the Walmart Foundation, engages City officials in efforts to increase participation in the Summer and Afterschool Nutrition Programs. CHAMPS provides city officials with funding, technical assistance, and training opportunities to increase participation in year-round out-of-school programs that serve healthy meals, and provides support to state anti-hunger organizations to assist CHAMPS expansion efforts. In 2013, CHAMPS grants were provided to 15 cities that added 170 new summer meal sites, served 15,700 more children, and provided 713,000 more meals than in the previous summer. The current CHAMPS cities are Baltimore, MD; Columbus, OH; Gary, IN; Hagerstown, MD; Houston, TX; Kansas City, KS; Louisville, KY; Missoula, MT; Providence, RI; Rochester, NY; Seattle, WA; Takoma, WA; Tallahassee, FL; Trotwood, OH; and Waco, TX. The current anti-hunger groups are: Maryland Hunger Solutions, Children's Hunger Alliance, Florida Impact, Texas Hunger Initiative, United Way of King County, and Hunger Solutions New York.

# Conclusion

The summer of 2013 marked an important potential turning point for the Summer Nutrition Programs. The substantive increase in the number of children served demonstrates what is possible when USDA leads the charge, state child nutrition agencies rally in support of the programs, and national, state, and local organizations work together to expand the programs' reach.

USDA's expansion campaign has created strong momentum to continue growing participation. A steady and strong focus on program expansion—including aggressive outreach and promotion of the programs; policy solutions to the administrative barriers that limit participation; and improvements to the nutrition quality and appeal of the meals served—is necessary to continue to increase access to the Summer Nutrition Programs. The programs need to reach more of the low-income children who rely on school lunch during the school year. Serving just one hungry child in seven is not enough.

The 2015 Child Nutrition Reauthorization also provides an important opportunity to invest in the Summer Nutrition Programs so they are better able to serve low-income children and support summer programming and activities, ensuring that children return to school in the fall well-nourished and ready to learn.

# Technical Notes

The data in this report are collected from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and from an annual survey of state child nutrition officials conducted by FRAC. This report does not include Summer Nutrition Programs in Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, or Department of Defense schools.

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

## Summer Food Service Program (SFSP)

USDA provided FRAC with the number of SFSP lunches served in each state. FRAC calculated each state's July average daily lunch attendance in the SFSP by dividing the total number of SFSP lunches served in July by the total number of weekdays in July (excluding the Independence Day holiday). The average daily lunch attendance numbers for July reported in FRAC's analysis are slightly different from USDA's average daily participation numbers. FRAC's revised measure allows consistent comparisons from state to state and year to year. This measure is also more in line with the average daily lunch attendance numbers in the school-year NSLP, as described below.

FRAC uses July data because it is problematic to use the months of June or August for analysis. It is impossible to determine for those months how many days were regular school days, and how many were summer vacation days. Because of the limits of the available USDA data, it also is not possible in those months to separate NSLP data to determine if meals were served as part of the summer program or as part of the regular school year.

USDA obtains the July numbers of sponsors and sites from the states and reports them as the states provide them. USDA does not report the number of sponsors or sites for June or August.

For this report, FRAC gave states the opportunity to update the July data on sponsors and sites, and the total number of lunches for June, July, and August that FRAC obtained from USDA. The state changes are included.

## National School Lunch Program (NSLP)

Using data provided by USDA, FRAC calculated the regular school-year NSLP average daily low-income attendance for each state, based on the number of free and reduced-price meals served from September through May. The NSLP summer meal numbers include all the free and reduced-price lunches served through NSLP during July. This includes lunches served at summer school, through NSLP Seamless Summer Option, and on regular school days (during July). FRAC used the July average daily attendance figures provided by USDA for the summertime NSLP participation data in the report.

Note that USDA calculates average daily participation in the regular-year NSLP by dividing the average daily lunch figures by an attendance factor (0.944) to account for children who were absent from school on a particular day. FRAC's School Breakfast Scorecard reports these NSLP average daily participation numbers—that is, including the attendance factor. To make the NSLP numbers consistent with the SFSP numbers, for which there is no analogous attendance factor, *Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation 2014* does not include the attendance factor. As a result, the regular school-year NSLP numbers in this report do not match the NSLP numbers in FRAC's School Breakfast Scorecard School Year 2012-2013.

## The Cost of Low Participation

For each state, FRAC calculated the average daily number of children receiving Summer Nutrition in July for every 100 children receiving free or reduced-price lunches during the regular school year. FRAC then calculated the number of additional children who would be reached if that state achieved a 40 to 100 ratio of summer nutrition to regular school-year lunches. FRAC then multiplied this unserved population by the summer lunch reimbursement rate for 22 days (the number of weekdays in July 2013, not counting the Fourth of July holiday) of SFSP lunches. FRAC assumed each meal is reimbursed at the lowest standard rate available.

Table 1. Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Summer Nutrition<sup>1</sup> in July 2012 and July 2013; and National School Lunch Program (NSLP)<sup>2</sup> ADP for School Years 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, by State

State	July 2012 Summer Nutrition and NSLP SY 2011-12				July 2013 Summer Nutrition and NSLP SY 2012-13				Percent Change in Summer Nutrition ADP '12 to '13
	Summer Nutrition ADP	NSLP ADP	Ratio of Summer Nutrition to NSLP <sup>3</sup>	Rank	Summer Nutrition ADP	NSLP ADP	Ratio of Summer Nutrition to NSLP <sup>3</sup>	Rank	
Alabama	26,721	361,547	7.4	47	30,456	358,221	8.5	43	14.0
Alaska	3,866	35,997	10.7	36	3,664	35,893	10.2	38	-5.2
Arizona	60,303	462,634	13.0	28	68,743	461,802	14.9	24	14.0
Arkansas	36,810	235,152	15.7	18	51,166	230,127	22.2	6	39.0
California	399,833	2,500,022	16.0	17	447,411	2,442,773	18.3	15	11.9
Colorado	19,220	231,139	8.3	42	19,457	229,933	8.5	43	1.2
Connecticut	35,485	147,587	24.0	5	38,107	144,107	26.4	4	7.4
Delaware	11,112	54,062	20.6	7	11,763	54,884	21.4	8	5.9
District of Columbia	21,514	35,987	59.8	1	23,868	41,225	57.9	1	10.9
Florida	160,963	1,211,954	13.3	27	174,517	1,218,251	14.3	25	8.4
Georgia	117,827	840,073	14.0	21	114,842	845,282	13.6	29	-2.5
Hawaii	4,448	65,659	6.8	48	5,954	66,138	9.0	42	33.9
Idaho	20,667	101,894	20.3	8	21,685	98,332	22.1	7	4.9
Illinois	94,915	741,192	12.8	29	106,818	774,814	13.8	27	12.5
Indiana	61,756	409,642	15.1	20	75,781	424,239	17.9	18	22.7
Iowa	14,224	163,631	8.7	41	16,585	165,000	10.1	39	16.6
Kansas	11,742	187,458	6.3	50	12,361	185,784	6.7	48	5.3
Kentucky	25,820	329,955	7.8	45	26,587	338,904	7.8	46	3.0
Louisiana	36,448	387,155	9.4	40	48,189	379,264	12.7	30	32.2
Maine	10,503	59,976	17.5	15	11,535	58,781	19.6	9	9.8
Maryland	47,409	265,705	17.8	13	50,902	268,006	19.0	12	7.4
Massachusetts	52,544	270,220	19.4	11	52,938	272,171	19.5	10	0.8
Michigan	62,447	574,128	10.9	35	67,528	571,501	11.8	35	8.1
Minnesota	36,472	260,143	14.0	21	39,088	260,682	15.0	23	7.2
Mississippi	19,906	297,760	6.7	49	17,296	297,184	5.8	50	-13.1
Missouri	28,425	359,130	7.9	44	28,090	355,296	7.9	45	-1.2
Montana	6,422	45,966	14.0	21	7,245	45,308	16.0	21	12.8
Nebraska	10,998	115,415	9.5	39	10,683	114,581	9.3	41	-2.9
Nevada	13,292	159,792	8.3	42	10,418	162,661	6.4	49	-21.6
New Hampshire	4,960	39,275	12.6	31	4,725	38,850	12.2	33	-4.7
New Jersey	81,888	413,820	19.8	10	76,117	416,304	18.3	15	-7.0
New Mexico	49,411	163,509	30.2	2	51,943	160,533	32.4	2	5.1
New York	313,175	1,135,374	27.6	3	328,350	1,165,524	28.2	3	4.8
North Carolina	80,243	631,366	12.7	30	85,664	626,126	13.7	28	6.8
North Dakota	2,305	29,412	7.8	45	1,998	28,931	6.9	47	-13.3
Ohio	64,074	630,466	10.2	37	66,015	633,022	10.4	37	3.0
Oklahoma	13,802	292,196	4.7	51	12,957	290,852	4.5	51	-6.1
Oregon	36,343	207,629	17.5	15	34,560	199,350	17.3	19	-4.9
Pennsylvania	113,847	561,713	20.3	8	105,607	563,854	18.7	14	-7.2
Rhode Island	6,963	51,122	13.6	25	7,182	50,480	14.2	26	3.1
South Carolina	72,807	337,151	21.6	6	64,788	334,052	19.4	11	-11
South Dakota	8,955	47,010	19.1	12	8,558	47,297	18.1	17	-4.4
Tennessee	56,862	449,547	12.6	31	56,606	444,121	12.7	30	-0.4
Texas	258,900	2,360,708	11.0	34	280,018	2,347,225	11.9	34	8.2
Utah	19,811	166,256	11.9	33	18,558	163,740	11.3	36	-6.3
Vermont	6,888	26,542	26.0	4	6,673	25,757	25.9	5	-3.1
Virginia	68,772	390,771	17.6	14	66,402	393,814	16.9	20	-3.4
Washington	33,491	342,531	9.8	38	33,943	336,313	10.1	39	1.3
West Virginia	15,488	110,359	14.0	21	14,802	117,504	12.6	32	-4.4
Wisconsin	38,589	283,157	13.6	25	40,817	268,874	15.2	22	5.8
Wyoming	3,901	25,117	15.5	19	4,749	24,955	19.0	12	21.7
United States	2,803,567	19,606,007	14.3		2,964,709	19,578,622	15.1		5.7

<sup>1</sup> Summer Nutrition includes the Summer Food Service Program and free and reduced-price National School Lunch Program, including the Seamless Summer Option.

<sup>2</sup> School Year NSLP numbers reflect free and reduced-price lunch participation during the regular school year.

<sup>3</sup> Ratio of Summer Nutrition to NSLP is the number of children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in NSLP.

Table 2. Change in Summer Food Service Program Average Daily Participation (ADP); and in National School Lunch Program ADP from July 2012 to July 2013, by State

State	ADP Summer Food Service Program			ADP National School Lunch Program		
	July 2012	July 2013	Percent Change '12 to '13	July 2012	July 2013	Percent Change '12 to '13
Alabama	20,199	24,151	19.6	6,522	6,305	-3.3
Alaska	3,219	3,003	-6.7	647	661	2.2
Arizona	26,193	20,243	-22.7	34,111	48,500	42.2
Arkansas	25,190	41,009	62.8	11,620	10,157	-12.6
California	101,910	106,186	4.2	297,923	341,225	14.5
Colorado	15,846	16,381	3.4	3,374	3,076	-8.8
Connecticut	11,681	11,731	0.4	23,804	26,376	10.8
Delaware	9,075	10,388	14.5	2,037	1,375	-32.5
District of Columbia	20,312	21,906	7.8	1,202	1,962	63.2
Florida	140,572	154,992	10.3	20,392	19,525	-4.3
Georgia	47,371	46,224	-2.4	70,457	68,618	-2.6
Hawaii	1,410	1,488	5.5	3,038	4,466	47.1
Idaho	19,904	21,004	5.5	762	681	-10.7
Illinois	62,670	62,786	0.2	32,245	44,032	36.6
Indiana	38,213	38,644	1.1	23,543	37,137	57.7
Iowa	10,510	12,688	20.7	3,714	3,897	5.0
Kansas	10,845	11,574	6.7	897	787	-12.3
Kentucky	19,185	22,758	18.6	6,635	3,829	-42.3
Louisiana	32,815	43,311	32.0	3,634	4,878	34.2
Maine	10,144	11,093	9.4	359	442	23.1
Maryland	45,317	49,073	8.3	2,093	1,829	-12.6
Massachusetts	46,753	45,936	-1.7	5,791	7,002	20.9
Michigan	49,331	51,984	5.4	13,116	15,544	18.5
Minnesota	27,863	30,397	9.1	8,609	8,691	1.0
Mississippi	18,484	16,184	-12.4	1,422	1,112	-21.8
Missouri	19,982	19,114	-4.3	8,443	8,976	6.3
Montana	5,870	6,650	13.3	552	595	7.8
Nebraska	8,411	8,472	0.7	2,587	2,211	-14.5
Nevada	6,244	6,445	3.2	7,048	3,973	-43.6
New Hampshire	4,239	4,058	-4.3	721	667	-7.5
New Jersey	61,048	51,813	-15.1	20,840	24,304	16.6
New Mexico	30,176	32,236	6.8	19,235	19,707	2.5
New York	247,063	261,923	6.0	66,112	66,427	0.5
North Carolina	45,094	48,031	6.5	35,149	37,633	7.1
North Dakota	1,907	1,628	-14.6	398	370	-7.0
Ohio	55,556	54,995	-1.0	8,518	11,020	29.4
Oklahoma	10,008	9,684	-3.2	3,794	3,273	-13.7
Oregon	33,482	31,269	-6.6	2,860	3,291	15.1
Pennsylvania	80,413	76,541	-4.8	33,434	29,066	-13.1
Rhode Island	5,940	6,140	3.4	1,023	1,042	1.8
South Carolina	35,653	33,488	-6.1	37,153	31,300	-15.8
South Dakota	4,984	5,128	2.9	3,971	3,430	-13.6
Tennessee	32,811	40,063	22.1	24,050	16,543	-31.2
Texas	176,401	180,292	2.2	82,499	99,726	20.9
Utah	10,829	9,968	-8.0	8,983	8,590	-4.4
Vermont	5,980	6,048	1.1	908	625	-31.2
Virginia	58,645	56,502	-3.7	10,127	9,900	-2.2
Washington	28,183	28,748	2.0	5,308	5,195	-2.1
West Virginia	9,377	10,148	8.2	6,110	4,654	-23.8
Wisconsin	35,342	37,393	5.8	3,247	3,424	5.5
Wyoming	2,557	3,140	22.8	1,344	1,609	19.8
United States	1,831,209	1,905,051	4.0	972,359	1,059,658	9.0



Table 3. Change in Number of Summer Food Service Program Sponsors and Sites from July 2012 to July 2013, by State

State	Number of Sponsors			Number of Sites		
	July 2012	July 2013	Percent Change	July 2012	July 2013	Percent Change
Alabama	43	63	46.5	522	593	13.6
Alaska	25	24	-4.0	135	151	11.9
Arizona	74	43	-41.9	418	402	-3.8
Arkansas	160	180	12.5	422	661	56.6
California	214	231	7.9	1,645	1,898	15.4
Colorado	65	76	16.9	332	496	49.4
Connecticut	24	23	-4.2	217	236	8.8
Delaware	20	25	25.0	251	213	-15.1
District of Columbia	32	36	12.5	338	343	1.5
Florida	119	133	11.8	3,025	3,466	14.6
Georgia	91	87	-4.4	1,116	1,085	-2.8
Hawaii	23	19	-17.4	91	90	-1.1
Idaho	66	70	6.1	284	284	0.0
Illinois	150	147	-2.0	1,538	1,624	5.6
Indiana	240	216	-10.0	1,220	1,321	8.3
Iowa	93	96	3.2	237	265	11.8
Kansas	75	86	14.7	258	280	8.5
Kentucky	129	111	-14.0	1,335	968	-27.5
Louisiana	75	89	18.7	641	584	-8.9
Maine	80	95	18.8	243	306	25.9
Maryland	41	43	4.9	1,264	1,328	5.1
Massachusetts	87	95	9.2	832	922	10.8
Michigan	249	255	2.4	1,101	1,242	12.8
Minnesota	129	142	10.1	555	576	3.8
Mississippi	91	89	-2.2	360	396	10.0
Missouri <sup>1</sup>	266	265	-0.4	953	927	-2.7
Montana	81	82	1.2	194	157	-19.1
Nebraska	64	54	-15.6	225	160	-28.9
Nevada	30	36	20.0	123	175	42.3
New Hampshire	20	25	25.0	136	140	2.9
New Jersey	98	96	-2.0	1,076	1,038	-3.5
New Mexico	47	60	27.7	631	651	3.2
New York	289	300	3.8	2,519	2,693	6.9
North Carolina	121	126	4.1	1,223	1,292	5.6
North Dakota	37	38	2.7	60	63	5.0
Ohio	179	166	-7.3	1,554	1,471	-5.3
Oklahoma	166	58	-65.1	400	392	-2.0
Oregon	127	133	4.7	733	749	2.2
Pennsylvania	235	244	3.8	2,004	2,157	7.6
Rhode Island	16	21	31.3	181	184	1.7
South Carolina	53	56	5.7	984	1,003	1.9
South Dakota	35	39	11.4	73	72	-1.4
Tennessee	61	87	42.6	1,194	1,690	41.5
Texas	264	271	2.7	3,304	3,601	9.0
Utah	17	17	0.0	110	126	14.5
Vermont	67	59	-11.9	206	226	9.7
Virginia	128	131	2.3	1,579	1,537	-2.7
Washington	130	133	2.3	712	706	-0.8
West Virginia	95	88	-7.4	367	321	-12.5
Wisconsin	131	138	5.3	625	655	4.8
Wyoming	26	25	-3.8	57	57	0.0
United States	5,178	5,222	0.8	39,603	41,973	6.0

<sup>1</sup> Missouri's 2012 sponsor and site numbers were revised from FRAC's 2013 "Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation" report.

Table 4. Number of Summer Food Service Program Lunches Served in June, July, and August 2012 and 2013, by State

State	June Lunches			July Lunches			August Lunches		
	SFSP '12	SFSP '13	Percent Change	SFSP '12	SFSP '13	Percent Change	SFSP '12	SFSP '13	Percent Change
Alabama	560,807	659,181	17.5	424,170	531,325	25.3	35,834	65,721	83.4
Alaska	77,821	73,301	-5.8	67,601	66,060	-2.3	29,848	24,076	-19.3
Arizona	829,966	610,251	-26.5	550,043	445,340	-19.0	19,144	30,131	57.4
Arkansas	510,230	691,298	35.5	528,998	902,190	70.5	181,691	344,633	89.7
California	1,061,871	1,399,741	31.8	2,140,110	2,336,096	9.2	658,678	641,784	-2.6
Colorado	526,455	500,541	-4.9	332,761	360,392	8.3	37,999	58,753	54.6
Connecticut	14,748	10,552	-28.5	245,308	258,087	5.2	73,851	85,786	16.2
Delaware	89,362	92,406	3.4	190,567	228,527	19.9	93,197	99,535	6.8
District of Columbia	81,822	3,360	-95.9	426,556	481,928	13.0	93,594	130,130	39.0
Florida	2,179,286	2,432,889	11.6	2,952,002	3,409,831	15.5	506,897	487,730	-3.8
Georgia	1,073,909	1,074,968	0.1	994,788	1,016,927	2.2	127,566	78,207	-38.7
Hawaii	36,068	37,127	2.9	29,620	32,746	10.6	0!	0!	-
Idaho	544,370	486,556	-10.6	417,992	462,081	10.5	161,082	127,421	-20.9
Illinois	707,457	483,876	-31.6	1,316,075	1,381,292	5.0	412,108	506,578	22.9
Indiana	972,085	956,696	-1.6	802,472	850,162	5.9	94,383	65,195	-30.9
Iowa	305,082	300,498	-1.5	220,709	279,139	26.5	28,893	31,937	10.5
Kansas	415,512	439,221	5.7	227,740	254,622	11.8	10,329	20,975	103.1
Kentucky	547,521	592,318	8.2	402,891	500,682	24.3	44,649	52,758	18.2
Louisiana	1,309,703	1,340,022	2.3	689,110	952,842	38.3	45,203	58,831	30.1
Maine	17,536	60,175	243.2	213,025	244,051	14.6	69,256	81,140	17.2
Maryland	145,125	209,833	44.6	951,649	1,079,605	13.4	148,396	182,122	22.7
Massachusetts	117,522	45,502	-61.3	981,821	1,010,598	2.9	465,675	477,839	2.6
Michigan	531,136	577,349	8.7	1,035,955	1,143,647	10.4	445,008	459,176	3.2
Minnesota	450,769	440,741	-2.2	585,128	668,738	14.3	190,548	222,943	17.0
Mississippi	903,804	804,790	-11.0	388,165	356,050	-8.3	9,583	7,655	-20.1
Missouri	1,411,293	1,462,793	3.6	419,623	420,503	0.2	85,605	69,659	-18.6
Montana	114,016	127,314	11.7	123,272	146,309	18.7	40,921	48,398	18.3
Nebraska	395,695	393,150	-0.6	176,638	186,381	5.5	25,956	22,133	-14.7
Nevada	90,127	107,623	19.4	131,126	141,783	8.1	65,074	62,092	-4.6
New Hampshire	15,159	11,856	-21.8	89,015	89,283	0.3	33,820	33,711	-0.3
New Jersey	0!	1,232	-	1,282,001	1,139,894	-11.1	400,474	438,111	9.4
New Mexico	743,283	747,999	0.6	633,698	709,191	11.9	6,462	2,355	-63.6
New York	165,683	396,634	139.4	5,188,317	5,762,312	11.1	3,603,197	3,430,508	-4.8
North Carolina	505,402	508,248	0.6	946,973	1,056,684	11.6	340,812	424,179	24.5
North Dakota	62,268	61,934	-0.5	40,038	35,815	-10.5	8,897	8,815	-0.9
Ohio	947,820	909,450	-4.0	1,166,677	1,209,900	3.7	325,450	265,618	-18.4
Oklahoma	478,462	451,235	-5.7	210,173	213,050	1.4	22,327	19,516	-12.6
Oregon	303,849	249,030	-18.0	703,132	687,924	-2.2	382,636	359,718	-6.0
Pennsylvania	379,198	334,357	-11.8	1,688,666	1,683,905	-0.3	848,448	857,429	1.1
Rhode Island	13,656	4,734	-65.3	124,736	135,089	8.3	58,708	62,198	5.9
South Carolina	699,601	567,134	-18.9	748,722	736,736	-1.6	217,520	214,777	-1.3
South Dakota	126,280	132,667	5.1	104,667	112,825	7.8	32,311	35,783	10.7
Tennessee	1,008,278	1,265,774	25.5	689,041	881,387	27.9	26,259	34,595	31.7
Texas	4,739,863	3,929,398	-17.1	3,704,422	3,966,415	7.1	1,804,796	1,822,083	1.0
Utah	249,244	252,083	1.1	227,400	219,297	-3.6	81,327	62,560	-23.1
Vermont	28,144	23,147	-17.8	125,584	133,052	5.9	39,917	39,773	-0.4
Virginia	413,050	401,648	-2.8	1,231,543	1,243,036	0.9	583,297	479,620	-17.8
Washington	190,084	208,128	9.5	591,844	632,452	6.9	330,465	318,676	-3.6
West Virginia	125,716	100,149	-20.3	196,922	223,256	13.4	23,494	17,982	-23.5
Wisconsin	491,953	463,161	-5.9	742,188	822,642	10.8	226,436	244,111	7.8
Wyoming	63,058	57,851	-8.3	53,705	69,069	28.6	15,609	15,482	-0.8
United States	27,771,149	27,491,921	-1.0	38,455,379	41,911,148	9.0	13,613,630	13,730,938	0.9

Note: States may serve lunches for a few days in June or August, but not have data in those months. This is because sponsors are allowed, if they do not serve for more than 10 days in those months, to claim those lunches in July to reduce paperwork.

Table 5. Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Summer Nutrition<sup>1</sup> and Additional ADP and Additional Federal Reimbursement if States Reached FRAC's Goal of 40 Summer Nutrition Participants per 100 National School Lunch Program (NSLP)<sup>2</sup> Participants

State	Summer Nutrition ADP, July 2013	Ratio of Summer Nutrition to NSLP <sup>3</sup>	Total Summer Nutrition ADP if Summer Nutrition to NSLP Ratio Reached 40:100	Additional Summer Nutrition ADP if Summer Nutrition to NSLP Ratio Reached 40:100	Additional Federal Reimbursement Dollars if Summer Nutrition to NSLP Ratio Reached 40:100 <sup>4</sup>
Alabama	30,456	8.5	143,288	112,832	8,470,862
Alaska	3,664	10.2	14,357	10,693	802,777
Arizona	68,743	14.9	184,721	115,978	8,707,048
Arkansas	51,166	22.2	92,051	40,885	3,069,442
California	447,411	18.3	977,109	529,698	39,767,076
Colorado	19,457	8.5	91,973	72,516	5,444,139
Connecticut	38,107	26.4	57,643	19,536	1,466,665
Delaware	11,763	21.4	21,954	10,191	765,089
District of Columbia	23,868	57.9	-	-	-
Florida	174,517	14.3	487,300	312,783	23,482,184
Georgia	114,842	13.6	338,113	223,271	16,762,070
Hawaii	5,954	9.0	26,455	20,501	1,539,113
Idaho	21,685	22.1	39,333	17,648	1,324,924
Illinois	106,818	13.8	309,926	203,108	15,248,333
Indiana	75,781	17.9	169,696	93,915	7,050,669
Iowa	16,585	10.1	66,000	49,415	3,709,831
Kansas	12,361	6.7	74,314	61,953	4,651,122
Kentucky	26,587	7.8	135,562	108,975	8,181,298
Louisiana	48,189	12.7	151,706	103,517	7,771,539
Maine	11,535	19.6	23,512	11,977	899,173
Maryland	50,902	19.0	107,202	56,300	4,226,723
Massachusetts	52,938	19.5	108,868	55,930	4,198,945
Michigan	67,528	11.8	228,600	161,072	12,092,480
Minnesota	39,088	15.0	104,273	65,185	4,893,764
Mississippi	17,296	5.8	118,874	101,578	7,625,969
Missouri	28,090	7.9	142,118	114,028	8,560,652
Montana	7,245	16.0	18,123	10,878	816,666
Nebraska	10,683	9.3	45,832	35,149	2,638,811
Nevada	10,418	6.4	65,064	54,646	4,102,549
New Hampshire	4,725	12.2	15,540	10,815	811,936
New Jersey	76,117	18.3	166,522	90,405	6,787,156
New Mexico	51,943	32.4	64,213	12,270	921,170
New York	328,350	28.2	466,210	137,860	10,349,840
North Carolina	85,664	13.7	250,450	164,786	12,371,309
North Dakota	1,998	6.9	11,572	9,574	718,768
Ohio	66,015	10.4	253,209	187,194	14,053,590
Oklahoma	12,957	4.5	116,341	103,384	7,761,554
Oregon	34,560	17.3	79,740	45,180	3,391,889
Pennsylvania	105,607	18.7	225,542	119,935	9,004,120
Rhode Island	7,182	14.2	20,192	13,010	976,726
South Carolina	64,788	19.4	133,621	68,833	5,167,638
South Dakota	8,558	18.1	18,919	10,361	777,852
Tennessee	56,606	12.7	177,648	121,042	9,087,228
Texas	280,018	11.9	938,890	658,872	49,464,816
Utah	18,558	11.3	65,496	46,938	3,523,870
Vermont	6,673	25.9	10,303	3,630	272,522
Virginia	66,402	16.9	157,526	91,124	6,841,135
Washington	33,943	10.1	134,525	100,582	7,551,194
West Virginia	14,802	12.6	47,002	32,200	2,417,415
Wisconsin	40,817	15.2	107,550	66,733	5,009,980
Wyoming	4,749	19.0	9,982	5,233	392,867
United States	2,964,709	15.1	7,838,828	4,874,119	365,924,488

<sup>1</sup> Summer Nutrition includes the Summer Food Service Program and free and reduced-price National School Lunch Program during the summer, including the Seamless Summer Option.

<sup>2</sup> School Year NSLP numbers reflect free and reduced-price lunch participation in regular school year 2012-2013.

<sup>3</sup> Ratio of Summer Nutrition to NSLP is the number of children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in NSLP.

<sup>4</sup> Additional federal reimbursement dollars is calculated assuming that the state's sponsors are reimbursed for each child each weekday only for lunch (not also breakfast or a snack) and at the lowest rate for a SFSP lunch (\$3.4125 per lunch) and are served 22 days in July 2013.