



D.C. Hunger Solutions

Ending hunger in the nation's capital

# The District of Columbia's **School Meals** **Report** for School Year 2018–2019



# Acknowledgments

D.C. Hunger Solutions is deeply grateful to the following donors and their commitment to improving and expanding participation in child nutrition programs in 2018–2019:

- Bainum Family Foundation;
- Blue Meridian Partners;
- Morris and Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation;
- A. James and Alice B. Clark Foundation;
- Naomi and Nehemiah Cohen Foundation;
- Consumer Health Foundation;
- John Edward Fowler Memorial Foundation;
- *Nourishing Neighbors*, a program of the Albertsons Companies Foundation;
- Kaiser Permanente of the Mid-Atlantic States;
- Morningstar Foundation;
- Prince Charitable Trusts;
- Share Our Strength; and
- U.S. Department of Agriculture.

*Thank you for your generosity.*

This report was written by Paige Pokorney, anti-hunger program and policy analyst for child nutrition programs at D.C. Hunger Solutions.

## About D.C. Hunger Solutions

D.C. Hunger Solutions, founded in 2002 as an initiative of the Food Research & Action Center, seeks to create a hunger-free community and improve the nutrition, health, economic security, and well-being of low-income residents in the District of Columbia. To learn more about D.C. Hunger Solutions, visit [www.dchunger.org](http://www.dchunger.org).

## Executive Summary

On an average day during the 2018–2019 school year, 28,645 (41.3 percent) low-income students in the nation's capital ate free or reduced-price school breakfast, and 41,478 (59.9 percent) ate free or reduced-price school lunch.

Nationally, the District of Columbia has historically ranked high for participation in the federal School Breakfast Program and National School Lunch Program. However, D.C. has been losing ground in the last few

years with declining participation rates in both programs. In the 2010–2011 school year, D.C. ranked first in the nation for school breakfast, but has since fallen in both state rankings and average daily participation.<sup>1</sup> When compared to similarly sized jurisdictions, D.C. now lags behind. Many large metropolitan school districts have high participation in school meals programs, punctuating the District's opportunity for improvement.<sup>2</sup>

### School Breakfast Legislation

Passage of the D.C. Healthy Schools Act in 2010 and subsequent adoption of policies, like universal free breakfast, breakfast after the bell service models, elimination of the reduced-price lunch copay, and the Community Eligibility Provision (which provides free meals to all students regardless of income status), led to D.C.'s early success, and set the stage for further improvements to participation in school breakfast and lunch programs. Some of the decline over the past several years can be attributed to many schools reverting back to traditional breakfast service models of offering the meal in the cafeteria before the school day begins. In response to the decrease in the number of schools implementing breakfast after the bell models, the D.C. Council passed and funded the D.C. Healthy Students Amendment Act in 2019. This legislation strengthens the D.C. Healthy Schools Act by

- creating an annual subsidy from local funds for schools implementing breakfast in the classroom to offset costs and incentivize its use across the District;
- maintaining the mandate for breakfast after the bell in all schools with at least 40 percent of the student body eligible for free or reduced-price school meals;
- enhancing nutrition guidelines through additional sodium limits, restrictions on flavored milk, and whole-grain requirements not in the federal rules; and
- increasing meal reimbursements for meals that meet the higher nutrition standards.

These policies have and will continue to guide and improve meal programs across the District if implemented with strategic- and evidence-based practice.

1 Food Research & Action Center. (2020). *School Breakfast Scorecard: 2018–2019 School Year*. Available at: <https://frac.org/research/resource-library/school-breakfast-scorecard-2018-2019-school-year-february-2020>. Accessed on September 29, 2020.

2 Food Research & Action Center. (2020). *School Breakfast: Making it Work in Large School Districts*. Available at: <https://frac.org/research/resource-library/school-breakfast-making-it-work-in-large-districts-2018-2019-school-year-february-2020>. Accessed on September 29, 2020.

To understand this trend and the possible solutions for reversing it, D.C. Hunger Solutions takes a deeper look at participation in school meals programs in the District. This report analyzes 60 of D.C.'s 68 local education agencies (LEA) and divides them into four groups based on participation levels in school breakfast and school lunch using a benchmark of meeting 60 percent or more of low-income students with a school meal. D.C. Hunger Solutions defines "strong" participation as reaching 60 percent or more of low-income students with either meal. By this metric, more than half of the analyzed LEAs have low participation in school breakfast and lunch programs.

Participation rates in both programs vary each year and between LEAs, which partially

can be explained by the differences in the number of students who are eligible to receive free and reduced-price school meals. However, many LEAs had steep increases and decreases in participation unrelated to fluctuations in enrollment, e.g., changing the breakfast service model.

Nearly 14,000 low-income students would benefit from a nutritious school breakfast, and more than 2,200 from a school lunch, if all 60 LEAs attained the 60 percent benchmark. On the LEA level, almost \$5.8 million more in federal reimbursements would be realized. The benchmark, while challenging, is achievable as is evidenced by the 11 LEAs that have strong participation in both school meals programs.

## Benefits of School Meals

Research shows that access to school meals can improve students' dietary intake and give them the nutrition they need to spend their school day focused and ready to learn. The academic and health benefits of school meals are undeniable.<sup>3</sup> Participation in school meals programs is linked to better test performance; fewer cases of tardiness, absenteeism, and disciplinary problems; fewer visits to the school nurse; improved overall dietary quality; and a lower probability of overweight and obesity.<sup>4,5,6</sup> Low-income students in particular benefit from participating in school meals programs; in D.C., where 1 in 4 households with children struggle against hunger, increasing participation in school meals programs is vital. (For more information on the benefits of school meals, see the following briefs from FRAC: **[Research Shows that the School Nutrition Standards Improve the School Nutrition Environment and Student Outcomes](#)**, **[Breakfast for Learning](#)**, **[Breakfast for Health](#)**, and **[The Connections Between Food Insecurity, the Federal Nutrition Programs, and Student Behavior](#)**. These resources and more can be found on FRAC's Benefits of **[School Breakfast](#)** webpage.)

3 Food Research & Action Center. (2019). State of the States: Profiles of Hunger, Poverty, and Federal Nutrition Programs. Available at: [https://frac.org/research/resource-library/state-of-the-states-profiles?post\\_type=resource&p=4483&state=District%20of%20Columbia](https://frac.org/research/resource-library/state-of-the-states-profiles?post_type=resource&p=4483&state=District%20of%20Columbia). Accessed on September 29, 2020.

4 Food Research & Action Center. (2016). *Breakfast for Learning Fact Sheet*. Available at: <https://frac.org/research/resource-library/breakfast-for-learning>. Accessed on September 29, 2020.

5 Food Research & Action Center. (2016). *Breakfast for Health Fact Sheet*. Available at: <https://frac.org/research/resource-library/breakfast-for-health>. Accessed on September 29, 2020.

6 Food Research & Action Center. (2016). *Research Shows that the School Nutrition Standards Improve the School Nutrition Environment and Student Outcomes*. Available at: <https://frac.org/wp-content/uploads/school-nutrition-brief.pdf>. Accessed on September 29, 2020.

More LEAs struggle with low participation in school breakfast than lunch. Strong school breakfast legislation — such as the D.C. Healthy Schools Act of 2010, and the D.C. Healthy Students Amendment Act of 2019 — helps LEAs strengthen school breakfast programs. When combined with best practices, such as offering universal free breakfast to all children and serving breakfast after the bell (in the classroom, for example), LEAs have the tools and resources to adopt strong school breakfast — and other school meals — programs.

To help drive up participation, D.C. Hunger Solutions recommends increasing accountability for schools that are required to offer breakfast via “breakfast after the bell service models,” which make the meal more convenient, accessible, and free of stigma for all students. Another best practice is providing consistent funding to support the ongoing implementation of strong school meals programs, particularly breakfast. It also is important to review and revise policies and practices associated with school

meals, including meal times, meal locations, and adjacent policies that could have the unintended consequence of decreasing participation. Finally, engaging the school’s community can have dramatic and positive impacts on growing school breakfast and lunch programs.

More than ever before, D.C. must strengthen school meals programs, particularly school breakfast. The COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent economic crisis have led to an unforeseen increase in need, especially among households with children where rates of food insecurity have tripled.<sup>7</sup> With the last decade’s gains in school breakfast participation as a roadmap, D.C. has the opportunity to overcome the participation plateau that it has been experiencing for the past several years. By increasing access to school meals for all D.C. students, which can be achieved by adopting the policies and implementation practices that are recommended in this report, D.C. can once again lead the nation.

## What are Local Education Agencies?

According to the U.S. Department of Education, a local education agency,<sup>8</sup> or LEA, is a public board of education or a combination of school districts or counties that is recognized in a state as an administrative agency for its public elementary schools and secondary schools.

Currently, there are 239 schools that are part of 68 LEAs in the District. Of those schools, 116 of them are in the D.C. Public School District, 122 are public or private charter schools operated by 66 organizations, each of which is an LEA,<sup>9,10</sup> and one is the residential program for the Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services. Some charter schools operate independently as an LEA of one school, while other LEAs operate multiple campuses of up to 16 schools.

7 Northwestern Institute for Policy Research. (2020). *Estimates of Food Insecurity During the COVID-19 Crisis: Results from the COVID Impact Survey, Week 1 (April 20–26, 2020)*. Available at: <https://www.ipr.northwestern.edu/documents/reports/food-insecurity-covid-week1-report-13-may-2020.pdf>. Accessed on September 29, 2020.

8 U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). Definitions (from Race to the Top District competition draft). Available at: <https://www.ed.gov/race-top/district-competition/definitions>. Accessed on September 29, 2020.

9 DC Public Charter School Board. (n.d.). DC Public Charter School Board homepage. Available at: <https://www.dcpscb.org/>. Accessed on September 29, 2020.

10 DC Public Schools. (n.d.). Our Schools. Available at: <https://dcps.dc.gov/page/our-schools>. Accessed on September 29, 2020.



## About This Report

D.C. Hunger Solutions produced this report to help local education agencies (LEA), school administrators, principals, and teachers identify opportunities to connect more low-income students to school breakfast and school lunch. The report also provides recommendations for local officials to support schools in these efforts.

This report analyzes the School Breakfast Program (SBP) and the National School Lunch Program's (NSLP) reach during the 2018–2019 school year among 60 of D.C.'s 68 LEAs — or school districts — that operate in the nation's capital. It does not include private or residential care LEAs. The report compares low-income students' participation in SBP and NSLP to the number of students certified for free and reduced-price school meals.

To access school meals programs, D.C. Hunger Solutions groups LEAs into four categories that are based on participation in SBP and NSLP for this analysis:

1. Group 1: Strong Participation in Both SBP and NSLP;
2. Group 2: Strong Participation in SBP But Weak Participation in NSLP;
3. Group 3: Weak Participation in SBP But Strong Participation in NSLP;
4. Group 4: Weak Participation in Both SBP and NSLP.

"Strong" participation is defined as reaching 60 percent or more students who were eligible for free and reduced-price meals (FARM) through SBP or NSLP. "Weak" participation is defined as reaching less than 60 percent of FARM-eligible students through SBP or NSLP.

## Measuring School Meals Participation

In this report, D.C. Hunger Solutions uses a new methodology to assess school meals participation than in **past years' reports**. In years prior, school breakfast participation was measured by comparing the average daily participation among low-income students for school breakfast to the average daily participation among low-income students for school lunch. This created a ratio that measured the number of low-income students who participated in school breakfast for every 100 low-income students participating in school lunch.

While analyzing this year's data, D.C. Hunger Solutions noticed many local education agencies (LEA) had very low school lunch participation in addition to school breakfast participation. When using the previously reported ratio, some LEAs had artificially high school breakfast participation because of low average daily participation in school lunch. To account for these findings, D.C. Hunger Solutions decided to measure participation by using average daily participation among low-income students in the school breakfast and school lunch programs divided by the number of low-income students enrolled in the LEA. This would allow D.C. Hunger Solutions to assess more accurately the degree to which LEAs reach low-income students with school breakfast and lunch.

## Key Findings Among LEAs for the 2018–2019 School Year

### Group 1: Strong Participation in Both SBP and NSLP

Eleven local education agencies (LEA) had strong participation in the School Breakfast Program (SBP) and National School Lunch

Program (NSLP) during the 2018–2019 school year. For these top-performing LEAs, at least 60 percent of students who were eligible for free and reduced-price meals (FARM) participated in school breakfast and lunch.

GROUP 1: Local Education Agencies (LEA) With Strong Participation in the School Breakfast Program (SBP) and Strong Participation in the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) Among Free and Reduced-Price Meal (FARM) Eligible Students, School Year 2018–2019 (sorted alphabetically)						
LEA	Enrollment	Number of Certified FARM Students	FARM Average Daily Participation for SBP	FARM Average Daily Participation for NSLP	Percent FARM Students Participating in SBP	Percent FARM Students Participating in NSLP
Bridges PCS	417	214	176	154	82.5%	72.0%
DC Scholars PCS	544	544	324	370	59.6%	68.1%
Digital Pioneers Academy PCS	120	120	75	110	62.6%	91.5%
Eagle Academy PCS	838	838	767	692	91.6%	82.6%
Early Childhood Academy PCS	254	254	183	197	72.0%	77.5%
Ingenuity Prep PCS	560	560	351	413	62.6%	73.8%
Mary McLeod Bethune PCS	415	415	341	346	82.1%	83.5%
Perry Street Prep PCS	375	370	239	231	64.5%	62.5%
Rocketship Rise Academy PCS	1,085	1,085	746	832	68.8%	76.7%
Roots PCS	109	96	76	92	79.6%	96.0%
The Children's Guild Public Charter School	383	383	289	277	75.4%	72.4%

## Group 2: Strong Participation in SBP But Weak Participation in NSLP

No LEA fit into this group.

## Group 3: Weak Participation in SBP But Strong Participation in NSLP

Fourteen LEAs had weak participation in school breakfast while showing strong participation in school lunch. For this group, LEAs failed to reach 60 percent of FARM-eligible students with school breakfast, but did reach 60 percent or more with lunch.

<b>GROUP 3:</b> <b>Local Education Agencies (LEA) With Weak Participation in the School Breakfast Program (SBP) but Strong Participation in the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) Among Free and Reduced-Price Meal (FARM) Eligible Students, School Year 2018–2019 (sorted alphabetically)</b>						
LEA	Enrollment	Number of Certified FARM Students	FARM Average Daily Participation for SBP	FARM Average Daily Participation for NSLP	Percent FARM Students Participating in SBP	Percent FARM Students Participating in NSLP
Achievement Preparatory Academy PCS	833	831	409	560	49.2%	67.4%
Capital City Public Charter School	998	693	215	460	31.0%	66.4%
Cedar Tree Academy PCS	359	359	197	260	55.0%	72.3%
DC Bilingual Public Charter School	447	281	100	224	35.6%	79.6%
Democracy Prep PCS	769	769	429	508	55.8%	66.1%
Elsie Whitlow Stokes PCS	485	216	58	136	27.1%	63.1%
Friendship PCS	4,011	4,011	2,031	2,635	50.6%	65.7%
Kipp/DC	6,283	6,283	3,287	4,380	52.3%	69.7%
Latin American Montessori Bilingual PCS	476	99	20	82	19.9%	82.9%
Monument Academy Public Charter School	137	137	78	91	56.7%	66.1%
Mundo Verde PCS	595	148	65	104	44.1%	70.5%
Statesmen College Preparatory Academy for Boys	56	56	31	34	54.8%	60.9%
Two Rivers PCS	875	263	125	222	47.6%	84.4%
Washington Global Public Charter School	218	218	34	151	15.5%	69.1%



### Group 4: Weak Participation in Both SBP and NSLP

This was the largest group: Thirty-five LEAs had weak participation in school breakfast and lunch. These low-performing LEAs

failed to reach 60 percent of FARM-eligible students in either school meal program. It is worth noting that D.C.'s overall SBP and NSLP participation rates are categorized into this grouping.

<b>GROUP 4:</b> <b>Local Education Agencies (LEA) With Weak Participation in the School Breakfast Program (SBP) and Weak Participation in the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) Among Free and Reduced-Price Meal (FARM) Eligible Students, School Year 2018–2019 (sorted alphabetically)</b>						
LEA	Enrollment	Number of Certified FARM Students	FARM Average Daily Participation for SBP	FARM Average Daily Participation for NSLP	Percent FARM Students Participating in SBP	Percent FARM Students Participating in NSLP
Apple Tree Early Learning Public Charter School	644	487	213	291	43.7%	59.8%
Basis DC PCS	638	117	12	38	10.4%	32.3%
Breakthrough Montessori PCS	183	44	6	23	13.6%	53.3%
Briya PCS	721	635	19	32	2.9%	5.0%
Center City PCS	1,464	1,457	611	865	41.9%	59.4%
Cesar Chavez PCS	971	963	125	422	12.9%	43.9%
City Arts & Prep	433	432	176	219	40.8%	50.7%
Creative Minds International PCS	504	183	46	101	25.2%	55.3%
DC International School	1,066	549	52	183	9.5%	33.3%
DC Preparatory Academy PCS	1,964	1,662	732	816	44.0%	49.1%
DC Public Schools (DCPS)	49,489	36,518	14,212	21,599	38.9%	59.1%
EL Haynes Public Charter School	1,146	785	218	420	27.7%	53.5%
Harmony DC PCS	112	112	50	50	44.4%	44.9%
Hope Community PCS	748	600	223	356	37.2%	59.3%
Howard Univ. Middle School	283	283	39	126	13.7%	44.6%
Idea PCS	339	333	43	172	13.0%	51.7%

## GROUP 4 (CONTINUED):

**Local Education Agencies (LEA) With Weak Participation in the School Breakfast Program (SBP) and Weak Participation in the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) Among Free and Reduced-Price Meal (FARM) Eligible Students, School Year 2018–2019 (sorted alphabetically)**

LEA	Enrollment	Number of Certified FARM Students	FARM Average Daily Participation for SBP	FARM Average Daily Participation for NSLP	Percent FARM Students Participating in SBP	Percent FARM Students Participating in NSLP
Ideal Academy PCS	251	251	135	128	53.9%	51.2%
Inspired Teaching Demonstration PCS	472	87	24	50	27.4%	57.6%
Kingsman Academy Public Charter School	291	291	33	63	11.4%	21.6%
LAYC Career Academy PCS	129	129	7	21	5.7%	16.5%
Lee Montessori Public Charter School	212	52	15	30	29.6%	57.9%
Maya Angelou PCS	378	378	34	66	9.0%	17.4%
Meridian PCS	645	644	186	363	28.8%	56.4%
National Collegiate Prep PCS	257	257	14	78	5.6%	30.3%
Next Step PCS	379	156	33	41	20.9%	26.0%
Paul Public Charter School	730	611	93	314	15.3%	51.4%
Richard Wright PCS	300	300	83	134	27.5%	44.8%
Seed Public Charter School	293	288	142	170	49.5%	59.1%
SELA PCS	229	88	40	48	45.4%	54.8%
Shining Stars Montessori Academy	285	76	35	39	46.5%	51.9%
Somerset Preparatory Academy DC	428	425	84	232	19.8%	54.5%
Thurgood Marshall Academy PCHS	398	398	27	91	6.8%	22.8%
Washington Latin PCS	700	111	14	43	12.3%	38.3%
Washington Leadership Academy PCS	309	234	42	107	17.9%	45.9%
Washington Yu Ying PCS	569	63	24	33	38.5%	52.1%
D.C. Overall	89,635	69,275	28,645	41,478	41.3%	59.9%

## **The Majority of LEAs Have Weak School Meals Programs**

Thirty-five out of the 60 LEAs (or 58 percent) analyzed for this report fell into Group 4 for failing to reach 60 percent or more low-income students with school breakfast and lunch. Fourteen LEAs were placed into Group 3 for having weak school breakfast programs while strong school lunch programs. Only 11 LEAs made it into Group 1 for having strong breakfast and lunch programs.

For this report, D.C. Hunger Solutions defined “strong” participation as reaching 60 percent or more of low-income students with a school breakfast or lunch. While this may be a challenging goal, it is achievable with the right policies and sufficient resources to support them. D.C.’s policies

and dedicated local funding for school meals lay a foundation for successful school meals programs. Bridges PCS, Eagle Academy PCS, and the Children’s Guild PCS, all reached more than 70 percent of FARM-eligible students with breakfast and lunch, and even achieved higher participation in school breakfast than in lunch. Successful breakfast and lunch programs are attainable for D.C. schools as illustrated by Group 1 LEAs. See Table A in the Appendix for a full list of LEAs and their average daily participation in school breakfast and lunch.

## **More LEAs Struggle With Low Breakfast Participation Than Lunch Participation**

Based on D.C. Hunger Solutions’ analysis, 49 out of 60 LEAs fail to provide 60 percent

### **10 Local Education Agencies (LEA) With the Largest Increases in School Breakfast Program (SBP) Average Daily Participation (ADP) Among Free and Reduced-Price Meal (FARM) Eligible Students, School Year (SY) 2017–2018 to SY 2018–2019**

LEA	FARM SBP ADP SY 2017-2018	FARM SBP ADP SY 2018-2019	Change in FARM SBP ADP
Rocketship Rise Academy PCS	360	746	386
Kipp/DC	3,147	3,287	140
DC Preparatory Academy PCS	610	732	122
Ingenuity Prep PCS	243	351	107
Perry Street Prep PCS	199	239	40
Somerset Preparatory Academy DC	54	84	31
Paul Public Charter School	71	93	23
Meridian PCS	166	186	19
Ideal Academy PCS	117	135	18
Hope Community PCS	207	223	16



or more of their low-income students with school breakfast, while 35 fail to provide 60 percent or more with school lunch. Additionally, there was no LEA that had a strong breakfast program and weak lunch program (Group 2).

LEA size was not a predictor of school breakfast participation. Small and large LEAs succeeded in reaching low-income students with school breakfast and lunch, and small and large LEAs also failed. See Table A in the Appendix for a full list of LEAs and their average daily participation.

### **Participation Varied Year to Year**

For many LEAs, participation also varied significantly from school year 2017–2018 to school year 2018–2019. Overall, 18 LEAs had a greater than 10 percent increase in school breakfast average daily participation. Unfortunately, 15 LEAs had a greater than 10 percent decrease. Participation also varied for school lunch participation: 15 LEAs had a greater than 10 percent increase in school lunch average daily participation, and the same amount had a greater than 10 percent decrease.

### **10 Local Education Agencies (LEA) With the Largest Declines in School Breakfast Program (SBP) Average Daily Participation (ADP) Among Free and Reduced-Price Meal (FARM) Eligible Students, School Year (SY) 2017–2018 to SY 2018–2019**

LEA	FARM SBP ADP SY 2017-2018	FARM SBP ADP SY 2018-2019	Change in FARM SBP ADP
DC Public Schools (DCPS)	15,692	14,212	-1,480
Eagle Academy PCS	886	767	-118
Democracy Prep PCS	525	429	-96
Cesar Chavez PCS	215	125	-90
Seed Public Charter School	224	142	-81
City Arts & Prep	249	176	-73
Friendship PCS	2,100	2,031	-69
Achievement Preparatory Academy PCS	455	409	-46
Idea PCS	88	43	-45
DC Bilingual Public Charter School	130	100	-30

When interpreting changes in participation, it is important to note FARM-eligible enrollment for each LEA. For example, Cedar Tree Academy PCS — with 359 FARM-eligible students enrolled in school year 2018–2019 — saw a 9 percent decrease in school breakfast average daily participation resulting in 19 fewer students receiving a school breakfast. Similarly, D.C. Public Schools (DCPS) — the District's largest LEA

with 36,518 FARM-eligible students — also saw a 9 percent decrease in school breakfast average daily participation. However, due to the size of DCPS, 1,480 fewer low-income students received a school breakfast when comparing school year 2017–2018 to 2018–2019. See Tables B and C in the Appendix for a year-to-year comparison of all LEAs analyzed in this report.

### 10 Local Education Agencies (LEA) With the Largest Increases in National School Lunch Program (NSLP) Average Daily Participation (ADP) Among Free and Reduced-Price Meal (FARM) Eligible Students, School Year (SY) 2017–2018 to SY 2018–2019

LEA	FARM NSLP ADP SY 2017-2018	FARM NSLP ADP SY 2018-2019	Change in FARM NSLP ADP
Washington Leadership Academy PCS	75	107	32
Meridian PCS	320	363	43
DC International School	134	183	49
Center City PCS	814	865	51
Ingenuity Prep PCS	355	413	58
Paul Public Charter School	246	314	68
Hope Community PCS	281	356	75
DC Preparatory Academy PCS	728	816	88
Kipp/DC	4,181	4,380	200
Rocketship Rise Academy PCS	399	832	433

### Too Many D.C. Students are Missing Out on the Benefits of School Meals

If all LEAs reached just 60 percent of low-income students with school meals, an additional 13,697 would experience the benefits linked to school breakfast participation and an additional 2,234 would experience the benefits linked to

school lunch. Furthermore, this would bring an additional \$5,751,930 in federal reimbursement funding to the District over the course of the year. Several LEAs stand to make significant gains in student reach and funding if they were to meet the 60 percent benchmark. DCPS would reach an additional 7,699 low-income students with



breakfast and 312 with lunch, and Cesar Chavez PCS would be able to offer breakfast to an additional 453 low-income students and lunch to 155 more. DCPS would receive \$2,667,446 in federal funding, and Cesar Chavez PCS would receive \$239,172. See

Tables D and E in the Appendix for a list of LEAs that did not meet the benchmark of 60 percent participation among low-income students and the resulting impact on average daily participation and additional federal funding.

### 10 Local Education Agencies (LEA) With the Largest Declines in National School Lunch Program (NSLP) Average Daily Participation (ADP) Among Free and Reduced-Price Meal (FARM) Eligible Students, School Year (SY) 2017–2018 to SY 2018–2019

LEA	FARM NSLP ADP SY 2017–2018	FARM NSLP ADP SY 2018–2019	Change in FARM NSLP ADP
DC Public Schools (DCPS)	23,295	21,599	-1,696
Cesar Chavez PCS	677	422	-255
Friendship PCS	2,827	2,635	-192
Eagle Academy PCS	827	692	-135
Ideal Academy PCS	243	128	-114
Seed Public Charter School	256	170	-86
City Arts & Prep	304	219	-85
Richard Wright PCS	202	134	-67
Somerset Preparatory Academy DC	272	232	-41
National Collegiate Prep PCS	116	78	-38

*“If all LEAs reached just 60 percent of low-income students with school meals, an additional 13,697 would experience the benefits linked to school breakfast participation and an additional 2,234 would experience the benefits linked to school lunch. Furthermore, this would bring an additional \$5,751,930 in federal reimbursement funding to the District over the course of the year.”*

## Access to School Meals During Emergencies

Now more than ever, attention must be given and improvements made to D.C. school meals programs so that no child is without access to much-needed nutrition that could help them learn and thrive. The COVID-19 pandemic has revealed vulnerabilities in our social safety net and food system. Families are not only dealing with a public health emergency but also an economic crisis resulting in unforeseen rates of unemployment and food insecurity.

Racial disparities in access to healthy food and healthcare have led to higher COVID-19-related death rates, especially among the District's Black and Latinx communities. School meals must be prioritized in order to mitigate the destruction of the pandemic on all vulnerable populations, and to ensure that D.C.'s students have access to essential nutrition. Children need access to healthy food to ward off diet-related conditions that have made the District's Black and Latinx population more vulnerable to complications, including death, from COVID-19. Students of color, especially Black and Latinx students, already disproportionately rely on school meals as their primary source of nutrition, and this will be exacerbated during the COVID-19 crisis and recovery as the economic crisis has hit residents of color the hardest too.

Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, 77 percent of children in D.C. relied on free or reduced-price school meals. This number is expected to have increased as rates of unemployment have escalated. From March 1, 2020 to July 4, 2020, more than 539,000 new unemployment insurance claims were filed in the D.C. metro region, resulting in 16 percent of working-age persons filing for unemployment.<sup>11</sup> Based on data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Feeding America estimates a long-term increase of 48 percent to 60 percent in food insecurity for the region. From this, it is no surprise that food insecurity among households with children has tripled since the start of the pandemic. FRAC's report ***Not Enough to Eat: COVID-19 Deepens America's Hunger Crisis*** finds that more than 1 in 10 adults with children in D.C. do not have enough to eat.<sup>12</sup> When schools made the heavy decision to close down campuses and begin virtual learning in the spring, the thousands of students who relied on school meals were cut off from critical nutritional support, and families had to find a way to make up for this loss in their food budgets.

In response to this urgent need, D.C. LEAs and community-based organizations acted swiftly to open "grab and go" meal sites for families by using federal child nutrition program waivers. These waivers, issued by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, allow schools the flexibility needed to provide school meals during remote and hybrid learning. However, even with these efforts, schools have been unable to reach the same number of students as during in-person learning. D.C. school and state officials must double efforts to reach students during the school year through innovative meal delivery systems. Additionally, D.C. agency officials must ensure full implementation of the Pandemic Electronic Benefit Transfer (P-EBT) program, which was created by Congress through the Families First Coronavirus Response Act. P-EBT provides families previously receiving free school meals with an EBT card — similar to a debit card — with the value of the free school breakfast and lunch reimbursement rates for the days schools are closed or in remote learning during COVID-19. In D.C., more than 68,000 students are eligible for P-EBT.

The lasting financial impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic are inevitable, and we will surely see an increased reliance on school meals programs. Efforts must be taken now to strengthen school meals programs so that LEAs are ready to serve their communities, especially vulnerable ones.

11 Capital Area Food Bank. (2020). *Hunger Report 2020: The State of Food Insecurity in Greater Washington*. Available at: <https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/e764da62715f4931985ee493e15e0dfc>. Accessed on September 25, 2020.

12 Food Research & Action Center. (2020). *Not Enough to Eat: COVID-19 Deepens America's Hunger Crisis*. Available at: [https://frac.org/wp-content/uploads/Not-Enough-to-Eat\\_Hunger-and-COVID.pdf](https://frac.org/wp-content/uploads/Not-Enough-to-Eat_Hunger-and-COVID.pdf). Accessed on September 25, 2020.

## SPOTLIGHT: D.C. Public Schools

Fifty-five percent of D.C. students attend the 114 D.C. Public Schools (DCPS) across the District. Given that DCPS is by far the largest local education agency in D.C., it has the opportunity to make the most impact in connecting students with school breakfast across the District. It would take an additional 7,699 students eating breakfast and 312 eating lunch for DCPS to reach just 60 percent of low-income students with school meals. This increase in participation would also bring an additional \$2,667,446 in federal funding annually.

While many DCPS schools succeed in reaching students with meals, there is significant room for improvement. Eighty-one (or 72 percent) DCPS schools did not reach the 60 percent benchmark for school breakfast participation and 28 (or 25 percent) failed to meet the 60 percent lunch benchmark in the 2018–2019 school year. The vast majority of DCPS schools are eligible for the Community Eligibility Provision, meaning that all students can receive free breakfast and lunch. The accessibility of school meals, along with the centralized nature of the DCPS Food and Nutrition Services team, means that DCPS has the tools and opportunity to greatly increase the number of students participating in school breakfast and lunch.

## Recommendations to Increase School Meal Participation

### ***Increase Accountability for Schools Required to Offer Breakfast After the Bell***

D.C. local education agencies (LEA) struggle more with breakfast participation than with lunch. Breakfast after the bell service models dramatically increase participation by making breakfast convenient, accessible, and stigma-free for all students because they are offered after the official start to the school day. That is why a key provision of the D.C. Healthy Schools Act requires schools with 40 percent or more students who are eligible for free and reduced-price meals to implement one of these models. This provision was strengthened by the D.C. Healthy Students Amendment Act, which created additional oversight to ensure effective implementation. For those schools unable to implement a breakfast after the bell model, the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) may grant waivers to

schools that have submitted an action plan to ensure a breakfast participation rate of 75 percent or higher, and these schools will have one year to demonstrate incremental progress toward this goal before they are required to serve breakfast in the classroom once again.

OSSE must hold schools accountable through this model of oversight. To make it effective, an enforcement method should be made transparent so that schools are aware of the ramifications of non-compliance. One-on-one technical assistance for all schools should be made available and required for every low-performing LEA. Through oversight, enforcement, and technical assistance, OSSE has the ability to ensure that breakfast after the bell is implemented and optimized in all D.C. schools so that every child has access to a healthy school breakfast.

## How Can Breakfast After the Bell Increase Participation?

Implementing a breakfast after the bell service model that moves breakfast out of the school cafeteria served before school starts — making 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 overcomes 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 generally use one or more of three options when offering breakfast after the bell.

### Alternative Breakfast Models for Breakfast After the Bell

#### **Breakfast in the Classroom**

Students eat breakfast in their classrooms, either at the beginning of the school day or early during the day. Often, breakfast is brought to classrooms from the cafeteria in containers or served from carts in the hallways by food service staff.

#### **“Grab and Go”**

All components of school breakfast are conveniently packaged so that students can easily grab a reimbursable meal quickly from the cafeteria line or from carts elsewhere on school grounds. Depending on the school's rules, students can eat in the classroom, or somewhere else on campus.

#### **Second Chance**

Usually implemented in middle and high schools, this method allows students time after first period to obtain breakfast from the cafeteria or carts in the hallway, or to eat in the classroom, cafeteria, or other common areas. Computerized systems ensure that children receive only one breakfast each day.

### ***Ensure Stable Funding for the Revised Breakfast After the Bell Subsidy***

The recently passed D.C. Healthy Students Amendment Act provides additional funding to high-poverty schools using an approved breakfast after the bell service model with an annual subsidy of \$2 per student. In addition, the Act increases the locally funded reimbursements for meals that meet higher nutrition standards. Meals that meet the heightened D.C. Healthy Schools Act nutrition standards receive an additional \$0.20 for every breakfast and \$0.10 for every lunch, on top of \$0.40 for every reduced-price meal (i.e., elimination of the reduced-price copay). This funding supports ongoing

implementation of strong breakfast and lunch programs as schools often need to purchase equipment and supplies to continue successful breakfast after the bell programs. The Mayor, D.C. Council, and OSSE must ensure adequate funding of these programs in the annual budget. Without funding, schools will lack the resources to improve their school meals programs.

### ***Review and Revise School Meal and Adjacent Implementation Practices and Policies***

A closer look must be given to every school's meal implementation policies and practices. First, all LEAs must ensure they are following requirements of the D.C. Healthy Schools Act.

However, many schools struggling with low meal participation may be operating within the policies, but certain operationalized practices act as barriers to participation. Three areas within school meal plans should be reviewed annually by LEAs and OSSE.

## 1. Meal times

In order to have enough time to consume their school meal, students should have at least 20 minutes of *seat time*, which excludes any time spent walking to the cafeteria, waiting in line for meals, bathroom usage, handwashing, and other activities.<sup>13, 14</sup> Long lines at breakfast and lunch are also a deterrent to students who might prioritize socializing with friends, completing a homework assignment, or meeting with a teacher over waiting in line for breakfast or lunch. Schools must maximize seat time by increasing scheduled meal time and improving service speed through additional service lines and “grab and go” locations. The scheduling of meal periods also should be examined in order to optimize the volume of students eating at one time. Schools should schedule small, staggered groups of students with multiple points of service to ensure that every child has enough time to consume their meal. The order of the day’s schedule also impacts school meals. For example, recess before lunch is shown to increase meal consumption, create a calmer atmosphere, and improve classroom behavior after lunch.<sup>15</sup>

## 2. Location

The location of meal service is critical to increasing participation. Alternative breakfast service models, like breakfast in the classroom, “grab and go,” and second chance, all greatly improve access to meals. However, nuanced implementation of these programs is critical to their success. Specifically, the point of service location is imperative to ensuring that every child has the opportunity to participate in breakfast. Breakfast in the classroom is the ideal model in this regard as it brings meals directly to students. “Grab and go” and second chance must be considered in a similar fashion. Carts or kiosks should be placed in the most convenient places for students. This may mean multiple locations throughout campus. For example, the front lobby, where students enter the building, and the courtyard, where students gather to socialize before the start of the school day, are possible options for being high-traffic areas. LEAs should consider similar innovations that are being used for breakfast to being used for lunch as well. Carts and kiosks which facilitate students’ desire to eat lunch in other allowable common areas (like courtyards and empty classrooms) could make it easier for students to participate in school lunch.

## 3. Meal service adjacent policies

Policies not traditionally considered as school meal policies may very well have

---

13 Center for Disease Control and Prevention. (2019). *Making Time for School Lunch*. Available at: [https://www.cdc.gov/healthy-schools/nutrition/school\\_lunch.htm](https://www.cdc.gov/healthy-schools/nutrition/school_lunch.htm). Accessed on September 23, 2020.

14 Hildebrand, D., Millburgh, E. C., Betts, N. M., & Gates, G. E. (2018). *Time to Eat School Lunch Affects Elementary Students' Nutrient Consumption*. Available at: [https://schoolnutrition.org/uploadedFiles/5\\_News\\_and\\_Publications/4\\_The\\_Journal\\_of\\_Child\\_Nutrition\\_and\\_Management/Fall\\_2018/Fall2018-Time-To-Eat-Lunch.pdf](https://schoolnutrition.org/uploadedFiles/5_News_and_Publications/4_The_Journal_of_Child_Nutrition_and_Management/Fall_2018/Fall2018-Time-To-Eat-Lunch.pdf). Accessed on September 23, 2020.

15 Food Research & Action Center. (2019). *Reducing Barriers to Consuming School Meals*. Available at: <https://frac.org/wp-content/uploads/reducing-barriers-to-consuming-school-meals.pdf>. Accessed on October 5, 2020.



a significant impact on participation. For example, a “no saving seats” rule seems like it doesn’t relate to school meal participation. However, if students cannot save seats and sit next to their friends, they may be reluctant to give up their seat to stand in line for school breakfast or lunch. Additionally, the look and feel of the cafeteria can have an impact on participation in meals. A dark, unwelcoming cafeteria pushes students elsewhere — like the courtyard or other common spaces to eat and socialize — where meal service may or may not be available. Renovating meal spaces or allowing for “grab and go” style meals gives students an inviting, pleasant, and happy place to enjoy their school meal.

### ***Engage the School Community***

No school meals program is successful without buy-in and support from all school community members. This includes students, teachers, principals, food and nutrition services, and custodial staff. Especially for school breakfast, increasing participation and successful implementation of best practices (such as breakfast after the bell serving models) hinges on engaging all stakeholders. Open lines of communication facilitate implementation and allow issues to be addressed early and often. Training and support also should be given so that every member of the school community understands the importance of strong school meals programs for students to be healthy and successful.

## **Conclusion**

The School Breakfast Program and National School Lunch Program support students’ health and academic success by providing the nutrition that students need to succeed. As the nation’s capital and the entire country face unprecedented rates of food insecurity due to the COVID-19 pandemic, D.C. schools, government officials, and other stakeholders must double their efforts to ensure that every child has access to healthy school meals whether they are in the classroom or in remote learning. Before the pandemic, too many low-income children were missing out on school meals and the benefits provided to health, well-being, and academic achievement. Looking ahead, even more D.C. students will be relying on school meals, which is why more must be done to improve programs and to ensure equitable access to healthy school meals.

Strong policies are the first step in implementing successful school meals programs. Through promising legislation, such as the D.C. Healthy Students Act and D.C. Healthy Students Amendment Act, D.C.’s school-aged children can and should benefit from nutritious school meals, especially school breakfast. Providing universal free breakfast, incorporating breakfast into the school day through breakfast after the bell serving models, and making breakfast and lunch free to all students, are proven strategies for increasing school breakfast and lunch participation. Coupled with a critical review of implementation practices and support from the entire school community, local education agencies and agency officials have the opportunity to greatly improve access to school meals for students across D.C.

## Technical Notes

Data for this report were provided by the D.C. Office of the State Superintendent of Education. The report only includes data for participation in the federal School Breakfast Program and National School Lunch Program in public schools and public charter schools in D.C. It does not include data for private schools, religious schools, or alternative residential programs. Sixty out of the 68 local education agencies (LEA) in the District of Columbia met these criteria and were analyzed in this report. The average daily participation data for the 2017–2018 and 2018–2019 school years were calculated by dividing the number of breakfasts and lunches served by the average number of school days (180 days). This report compares the average daily participation in free and reduced-price meals (FARM), i.e., school breakfast and lunch participation, to the number of certified FARM students at each LEA.

D.C. Hunger Solutions set a difficult but achievable goal of reaching 60 percent of low-income students with school breakfast and lunch. D.C. Hunger Solutions then calculated the number of additional children by LEA and districtwide that would have been reached if the 60 percent benchmark had been reached. Because D.C. Hunger Solutions does not include private schools or Residential Child Care Institutions in the calculations, the reported citywide breakfast participation rates may differ slightly from calculated rates published in the Food Research & Action Center's annual *School Breakfast Scorecard*.

The amount of federal funding left uncaptured by LEAs was calculated by first determining the average daily participation of FARM-eligible children that would have been met if an LEA would have served

60 percent of FARM-eligible students a school breakfast and lunch. The LEA's actual free and reduced-price average daily participation was subtracted from this number of unreached children. The number of children not reached was then multiplied by the average reimbursement rate for a school breakfast or lunch. This figure was then multiplied by the average number of serving days (180 days) to calculate the average annual amount unrealized in federal reimbursement funding. D.C. Hunger Solutions assumed that each LEA's proportion of students qualifying for free and reduced-price meals would remain the same. The average reimbursement rate for school year 2018–2019 was \$1.79 for school breakfast and \$3.33 for school lunch.

LEAs were categorized into four groups based on school breakfast and school lunch participation. A "strong" breakfast or lunch program was defined as reaching at least 60 percent of free and reduced-price eligible students with a meal. Using this definition, LEAs were grouped into strong/strong, strong/weak, weak/strong, and weak/weak for breakfast/lunch program participation.

# Appendix



**TABLE A:**

**Ratio of Students Eligible for Free and Reduced-Price Meals (FARM) Participating in the School Breakfast Program (SBP) and in the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) per Number of Certified FARM Students for all Reported D.C. LEAs, School Year 2018–2019 (sorted alphabetically)**

LEA	Student Enrollment	Number of Certified FARM Students	FARM Rate	Did Some or All Schools Participate in CEP?	FARM Average Daily Participation for SBP	FARM Average Daily Participation for NSLP	FARM SBP Participation Rate	FARM NSLP Participation Rate
Achievement Preparatory Academy PCS	833	831	99.8%	Y	409	560	49.2%	67.4%
Apple Tree Early Learning Public Charter School	644	487	75.6%	N	213	291	43.7%	59.8%
Basis DC PCS	638	117	18.3%	N	12	38	10.4%	32.3%
Breakthrough Montessori PCS	183	44	24.0%	N	6	23	13.6%	53.3%
Bridges PCS	417	214	51.3%	N	176	154	82.5%	72.0%
Briya PCS	721	635	88.1%	N	19	32	2.9%	5.0%
Capital City Public Charter School	998	693	69.4%	N	215	460	31.0%	66.4%
Cedar Tree Academy PCS	359	359	100.0%	Y	197	260	55.0%	72.3%
Center City PCS	1,464	1,457	99.5%	Y	611	865	41.9%	59.4%
Cesar Chavez PCS	971	963	99.2%	Y	125	422	12.9%	43.9%
City Arts & Prep	433	432	99.8%	Y	176	219	40.8%	50.7%
Creative Minds International PCS	504	183	36.3%	N	46	101	25.2%	55.3%
DC Bilingual Public Charter School	447	281	62.9%	N	100	224	35.6%	79.6%
DC International School	1,066	549	51.5%	N	52	183	9.5%	33.3%
DC Preparatory Academy PCS	1,964	1,662	84.6%	Y	732	816	44.0%	49.1%
DC Public Schools (DCPS)	49,489	36,518	73.8%	Y	14,212	21,599	38.9%	59.1%
DC Scholars PCS	544	544	100.0%	Y	324	370	59.6%	68.1%
Democracy Prep PCS	769	769	100.0%	Y	429	508	55.8%	66.1%
Digital Pioneers Academy PCS	120	120	100.0%	Y	75	110	62.6%	91.5%
Eagle Academy PCS	838	838	100.0%	Y	767	692	91.6%	82.6%
Early Childhood Academy PCS	254	254	100.0%	Y	183	197	72.0%	77.5%
EL Haynes Public Charter School	1,146	785	68.5%	N	218	420	27.7%	53.5%
Elsie Whitlow Stokes PCS	485	216	44.5%	N	58	136	27.1%	63.1%
Friendship PCS	4,011	4,011	100.0%	Y	2,031	2,635	50.6%	65.7%
Harmony DC PCS	112	112	100.0%	Y	50	50	44.4%	44.9%
Hope Community PCS	748	600	80.2%	N	223	356	37.2%	59.3%
Howard Univ. Middle School	283	283	100.0%	Y	39	126	13.7%	44.6%
Idea PCS	339	333	98.2%	Y	43	172	13.0%	51.7%
Ideal Academy PCS	251	251	100.0%	Y	135	128	53.9%	51.2%
Ingenuity Prep PCS	560	560	100.0%	Y	351	413	62.6%	73.8%

LEA	Student Enrollment	Number of Certified FARM Students	FARM Rate	Did Some or All Schools Participate in CEP?	FARM Average Daily Participation for SBP	FARM Average Daily Participation for NSLP	FARM SBP Participation Rate	FARM NSLP Participation Rate
Inspired Teaching Demonstration PCS	472	87	18.4%	N	24	50	27.4%	57.6%
Kingsman Academy Public Charter School	291	291	100.0%	Y	33	63	11.4%	21.6%
Kipp/DC	6,283	6,283	100.0%	Y	3,287	4,380	52.3%	69.7%
Latin American Montessori Bilingual PCS	476	99	20.8%	N	20	82	19.9%	82.9%
LAYC Career Academy PCS	129	129	100.0%		7	21	5.7%	16.5%
Lee Montessori Public Charter School	212	52	24.5%	N	15	30	29.6%	57.9%
Mary McLeod Bethune PCS	415	415	100.0%	Y	341	346	82.1%	83.5%
Maya Angelou PCS	378	378	100.0%	Y	34	66	9.0%	17.4%
Meridian PCS	645	644	99.8%	Y	186	363	28.8%	56.4%
Monument Academy Public Charter School	137	137	100.0%	Y	78	91	56.7%	66.1%
Mundo Verde PCS	595	148	24.9%	N	65	104	44.1%	70.5%
National Collegiate Prep PCS	257	257	100.0%	Y	14	78	5.6%	30.3%
Next Step PCS	379	156	41.2%	N	33	41	20.9%	26.0%
Paul Public Charter School	730	611	83.7%	N	93	314	15.3%	51.4%
Perry Street Prep PCS	375	370	98.7%	Y	239	231	64.5%	62.5%
Richard Wright PCS	300	300	100.0%	Y	83	134	27.5%	44.8%
Rocketship Rise Academy PCS	1,085	1,085	100.0%	Y	746	832	68.8%	76.7%
Roots PCS	109	96	88.1%	N	76	92	79.6%	96.0%
Seed Public Charter School	293	288	98.3%	Y	142	170	49.5%	59.1%
SELA PCS	229	88	38.4%	N	40	48	45.4%	54.8%
Shining Stars Montessori Academy	285	76	26.7%	N	35	39	46.5%	51.9%
Somerset Preparatory Academy DC	428	425	99.3%	Y	84	232	19.8%	54.5%
Statesmen College Preparatory Academy for Boys	56	56	100.0%	Y	31	34	54.8%	60.9%
The Children's Guild Public Charter School	383	383	100.0%	Y	289	277	75.4%	72.4%
Thurgood Marshall Academy PCHS	398	398	100.0%	Y	27	91	6.8%	22.8%
Two Rivers PCS	875	263	30.1%	N	125	222	47.6%	84.4%
Washington Global Public Charter School	218	218	100.0%	Y	34	151	15.5%	69.1%
Washington Latin PCS	700	111	15.9%	N	14	43	12.3%	38.3%
Washington Leadership Academy PCS	309	234	75.7%	N	42	107	17.9%	45.9%
Washington Yu Ying PCS	569	63	11.1%	N	24	33	38.5%	52.1%
D.C. Overall	89,635	69,275	77.3%	n/a	28,645	41,478	41.3%	59.9%



**TABLE B:**

**Percent Change in School Breakfast Program (SBP) Average Daily Participation Among Students Eligible for Free and Reduced-Price Meals (FARM) for all Reported D.C. LEAs, School Year (SY) 2017–2018 to 2018–2019**

LEA	SY 2018–2019 Student Enrollment	SY 2018–2019 Number of Certified FARM Students	SY 2018–2019 FARM Rate	SY 2017–2018 FARM SBP Daily Participation	SY 2018–2019 FARM SBP Daily Participation	Change in FARM Average SBP Daily Participation	Percent Change in FARM SBP Average Daily Participation SY 2017–2018 to SY 2018–2019
Achievement Preparatory Academy PCS	833	831	99.8%	455	409	-46	-11.3%
Apple Tree Early Learning Public Charter School	644	487	75.6%	215	213	-2	-1.0%
Basis DC PCS	638	117	18.3%	9	12	3	22.3%
Breakthrough Montessori PCS	183	44	24.0%	20	6	-14	-235.8%
Bridges PCS	417	214	51.3%	185	176	-8	-4.8%
Briya PCS	721	635	88.1%	21	19	-2	-11.8%
Capital City Public Charter School	998	693	69.4%	209	215	6	2.6%
Cedar Tree Academy PCS	359	359	100.0%	217	197	-19	-9.9%
Center City PCS	1,464	1,457	99.5%	602	611	9	1.5%
Cesar Chavez PCS	971	963	99.2%	215	125	-90	-72.6%
City Arts & Prep	433	432	99.8%	249	176	-73	-41.3%
Creative Minds International PCS	504	183	36.3%	38	46	8	18.4%
DC Bilingual Public Charter School	447	281	62.9%	130	100	-30	-30.0%
DC International School	1,066	549	51.5%	41	52	11	20.6%
DC Preparatory Academy PCS	1,964	1,662	84.6%	610	732	122	16.6%
DC Public Schools (DCPS)	49,489	36,518	73.8%	15,692	14,212	-1480	-10.4%
DC Scholars PCS	544	544	100.0%	332	324	-8	-2.6%
Democracy Prep PCS	769	769	100.0%	525	429	-96	-22.4%
Digital Pioneers Academy PCS	120	120	100.0%	n/a	75	n/a	n/a
Eagle Academy PCS	838	838	100.0%	886	767	-118	-15.4%
Early Childhood Academy PCS	254	254	100.0%	201	183	-18	-9.9%
EL Haynes Public Charter School	1,146	785	68.5%	223	218	-5	-2.2%
Elsie Whitlow Stokes PCS	485	216	44.5%	44	58	15	24.8%
Friendship PCS	4,011	4,011	100.0%	2,100	2,031	-69	-3.4%
Harmony DC PCS	112	112	100.0%	53	50	-3	-6.2%
Hope Community PCS	748	600	80.2%	207	223	16	7.4%
Howard Univ. Middle School	283	283	100.0%	26	39	13	34.3%
Idea PCS	339	333	98.2%	88	43	-45	-102.6%
Ideal Academy PCS	251	251	100.0%	117	135	18	13.5%
Ingenuity Prep PCS	560	560	100.0%	243	351	107	30.6%
Inspired Teaching Demonstration PCS	472	87	18.4%	16	24	7	31.1%

LEA	SY 2018- 2019 Student Enroll- ment	SY 2018- 2019 Number of Certified FARM Students	SY 2018- 2019 FARM Rate	SY 2017-2018 FARM SBP Daily Participation	SY 2018-2019 FARM SBP Daily Participation	Change in FARM Average SBP Daily Participation	Percent Change in FARM SBP Average Daily Participation SY 2017-2018 to SY 2018-2019
Kingsman Academy Public Charter School	291	291	100.0%	58	33	-25	-74.6%
Kipp/DC	6,283	6,283	100.0%	3,147	3,287	140	4.2%
Latin American Montessori Bilingual PCS	476	99	20.8%	22	20	-2	-9.7%
LAYC Career Academy PCS	129	129	100.0%	7	7	1	8.4%
Lee Montessori Public Charter School	212	52	24.5%	7	15	9	56.9%
Mary McLeod Bethune PCS	415	415	100.0%	367	341	-26	-7.5%
Maya Angelou PCS	378	378	100.0%	36	34	-2	-5.6%
Meridian PCS	645	644	99.8%	166	186	19	10.4%
Monument Academy Public Charter School	137	137	100.0%	81	78	-3	-3.7%
Mundo Verde PCS	595	148	24.9%	65	65	0	0.0%
National Collegiate Prep PCS	257	257	100.0%	19	14	-4	-31.0%
Next Step PCS	379	156	41.2%	31	33	1	3.8%
Paul Public Charter School	730	611	83.7%	71	93	23	24.4%
Perry Street Prep PCS	375	370	98.7%	199	239	40	16.7%
Richard Wright PCS	300	300	100.0%	98	83	-16	-19.3%
Rocketship Rise Academy PCS	1,085	1,085	100.0%	360	746	386	51.7%
Roots PCS	109	96	88.1%	61	76	16	20.6%
Seed Public Charter School	293	288	98.3%	224	142	-81	-57.0%
SELA PCS	229	88	38.4%	40	40	0	0.6%
Shining Stars Montessori Academy	285	76	26.7%	39	35	-3	-9.3%
Somerset Preparatory Academy DC	428	425	99.3%	54	84	31	36.4%
Statesmen College Preparatory Academy for Boys	56	56	100.0%	n/a	31	n/a	n/a
The Children's Guild Public Charter School	383	383	100.0%	294	289	-5	-1.8%
Thurgood Marshall Academy PCHS	398	398	100.0%	26	27	1	3.5%
Two Rivers PCS	875	263	30.1%	111	125	14	11.5%
Washington Global Public Charter School	218	218	100.0%	42	34	-8	-24.3%
Washington Latin PCS	700	111	15.9%	17	14	-3	-22.9%
Washington Leadership Academy PCS	309	234	75.7%	32	42	10	23.1%
Washington Yu Ying PCS	569	63	11.1%	17	24	7	30.5%
D.C. Overall	89,635	69,275	77.3%	30,101	28,645	-1,456	-5.1%

**TABLE C:**

**Percent Change in National School Lunch Program (NSLP) Average Daily Participation Among Students Eligible for Free and Reduced-Price Meals (FARM) for all Reported D.C. LEAs, School Year (SY) 2017–2018 to 2018–2019**

LEA	SY 2018–2019 Student Enrollment	SY 2018–2019 Number of Certified FARM Students	SY 2018–2019 FARM Rate	SY 2017–2018 FARM NSLP Daily Participation	SY 2018–2019 FARM NSLP Daily Participation	Change in FARM Average NSLP Daily Participation	Percent Change in FARM NSLP Average Daily Participation SY 2017–2018 to SY 2018–2019
Achievement Preparatory Academy PCS	833	831	99.8%	542	560	18	3.2%
Apple Tree Early Learning Public Charter School	644	487	75.6%	324	291	-32	-11.1%
Basis DC PCS	638	117	18.3%	29	38	8	22.3%
Breakthrough Montessori PCS	183	44	24.0%	21	23	2	10.6%
Bridges PCS	417	214	51.3%	161	154	-6	-4.1%
Briya PCS	721	635	88.1%	34	32	-3	-8.7%
Capital City Public Charter School	998	693	69.4%	444	460	16	3.5%
Cedar Tree Academy PCS	359	359	100.0%	268	260	-8	-3.0%
Center City PCS	1,464	1,457	99.5%	814	865	51	5.9%
Cesar Chavez PCS	971	963	99.2%	677	422	-255	-60.4%
City Arts & Prep	433	432	99.8%	304	219	-85	-39.1%
Creative Minds International PCS	504	183	36.3%	98	101	3	2.7%
DC Bilingual Public Charter School	447	281	62.9%	229	224	-5	-2.4%
DC International School	1,066	549	51.5%	134	183	49	26.5%
DC Preparatory Academy PCS	1,964	1,662	84.6%	728	816	88	10.7%
DC Public Schools (DCPS)	49,489	36,518	73.8%	23,295	21,599	-1,696	-7.9%
DC Scholars PCS	544	544	100.0%	382	370	-12	-3.1%
Democracy Prep PCS	769	769	100.0%	542	508	-34	-6.6%
Digital Pioneers Academy PCS	120	120	100.0%	n/a	110	n/a	n/a
Eagle Academy PCS	838	838	100.0%	827	692	-135	-19.5%
Early Childhood Academy PCS	254	254	100.0%	221	197	-25	-12.5%
EL Haynes Public Charter School	1,146	785	68.5%	408	420	12	2.9%
Elsie Whitlow Stokes PCS	485	216	44.5%	131	136	6	4.1%
Friendship PCS	4,011	4,011	100.0%	2,827	2,635	-192	-7.3%
Harmony DC PCS	112	112	100.0%	60	50	-9	-18.4%
Hope Community PCS	748	600	80.2%	281	356	75	21.0%
Howard Univ. Middle School	283	283	100.0%	95	126	31	24.9%
Idea PCS	339	333	98.2%	194	172	-22	-12.8%
Ideal Academy PCS	251	251	100.0%	243	128	-114	-88.9%
Ingenuity Prep PCS	560	560	100.0%	355	413	58	14.0%
Inspired Teaching Demonstration PCS	472	87	18.4%	38	50	12	24.1%

LEA	SY 2018- 2019 Student Enroll- ment	SY 2018- 2019 Number of Certified FARM Students	SY 2018- 2019 FARM Rate	SY 2017-2018 FARM NSLP Daily Participation	SY 2018-2019 FARM NSLP Daily Participation	Change in FARM Average NSLP Daily Participation	Percent Change in FARM NSLP Average Daily Participation SY 2017-2018 to SY 2018-2019
Kingsman Academy Public Charter School	291	291	100.0%	80	63	-17	-26.6%
Kipp/DC	6,283	6,283	100.0%	4,181	4,380	200	4.6%
Latin American Montessori Bilingual PCS	476	99	20.8%	80	82	2	2.5%
LAYC Career Academy PCS	129	129	100.0%	18	21	3	13.9%
Lee Montessori Public Charter School	212	52	24.5%	28	30	2	6.9%
Mary McLeod Bethune PCS	415	415	100.0%	370	346	-23	-6.7%
Maya Angelou PCS	378	378	100.0%	66	66	0	-0.7%
Meridian PCS	645	644	99.8%	320	363	43	12.0%
Monument Academy Public Charter School	137	137	100.0%	88	91	3	3.3%
Mundo Verde PCS	595	148	24.9%	113	104	-9	-8.5%
National Collegiate Prep PCS	257	257	100.0%	116	78	-38	-49.1%
Next Step PCS	379	156	41.2%	39	41	1	3.1%
Paul Public Charter School	730	611	83.7%	246	314	68	21.6%
Perry Street Prep PCS	375	370	98.7%	204	231	27	11.9%
Richard Wright PCS	300	300	100.0%	202	134	-67	-50.1%
Rocketship Rise Academy PCS	1,085	1,085	100.0%	399	832	433	52.0%
Roots PCS	109	96	88.1%	67	92	26	27.8%
Seed Public Charter School	293	288	98.3%	256	170	-86	-50.3%
SELA PCS	229	88	38.4%	44	48	5	9.3%
Shining Stars Montessori Academy	285	76	26.7%	44	39	-4	-11.2%
Somerset Preparatory Academy DC	428	425	99.3%	272	232	-41	-17.6%
Statesmen College Preparatory Academy for Boys	56	56	100.0%	n/a	34	n/a	n/a
The Children's Guild Public Charter School	383	383	100.0%	296	277	-18	-6.6%
Thurgood Marshall Academy PCHS	398	398	100.0%	98	91	-7	-7.9%
Two Rivers PCS	875	263	30.1%	228	222	-6	-2.9%
Washington Global Public Charter School	218	218	100.0%	139	151	11	7.5%
Washington Latin PCS	700	111	15.9%	49	43	-7	-15.7%
Washington Leadership Academy PCS	309	234	75.7%	75	107	32	30.0%
Washington Yu Ying PCS	569	63	11.1%	32	33	1	2.0%
D.C. Overall	89,635	69,275	77.3%	43,540	41,478	-2,062	-5.0%

**TABLE D:**

**Additional Participation and Funding if 60 Percent of Students Eligible for Free and Reduced Price Meals (FARM) Were Served Through the School Breakfast Program (SBP) for all Reported D.C. Local Education Agencies (LEA) That Did Not Meet This Goal, School Year 2018–2019**

<b>LEA That Did Not Meet 60 Percent Benchmark</b>	<b>Number of Certified FARM Students</b>	<b>Actual SBP Average Daily Participation</b>	<b>FARM SBP Participation Rate</b>	<b>FARM SBP ADP if 60 Percent Goal Met</b>	<b>Additional FARM Students That Would be Served if 60 Percent Goal Met</b>	<b>Additional Federal Funding if 60 Percent Goal Met</b>
Achievement Preparatory Academy PCS	831	409	49.2%	499	90	\$28,944.30
Apple Tree Early Learning Public Charter School	487	213	43.7%	292	79	\$25,580.89
Basis DC PCS	117	12	10.4%	70	58	\$18,680.44
Breakthrough Montessori PCS	44	6	13.6%	26	20	\$6,576.46
Briya PCS	635	19	2.9%	381	362	\$116,738.43
Capital City Public Charter School	693	215	31.0%	416	201	\$64,697.76
Cedar Tree Academy PCS	359	197	55.0%	215	18	\$5,831.82
Center City PCS	1,457	611	41.9%	874	263	\$84,815.57
Cesar Chavez PCS	963	125	12.9%	578	453	\$146,038.94
City Arts & Prep	432	176	40.8%	259	83	\$26,789.14
Creative Minds International PCS	183	46	25.2%	110	64	\$20,542.04
DC Bilingual Public Charter School	281	100	35.6%	169	69	\$22,117.24
DC International School	549	52	9.5%	329	277	\$89,338.90
DC Preparatory Academy PCS	1,662	732	44.0%	997	265	\$85,429.54
DC Public Schools (DCPS)	36,518	14,212	38.9%	21,911	7,699	\$2,480,519.35
Democracy Prep PCS	769	429	55.8%	461	32	\$10,441.07
EL Haynes Public Charter School	785	218	27.7%	471	253	\$81,572.09
Elsie Whitlow Stokes PCS	216	58	27.1%	130	71	\$22,920.95
Friendship PCS	4,011	2,031	50.6%	2,407	376	\$121,174.05
Harmony DC PCS	112	50	44.4%	67	17	\$5,620.60
Hope Community PCS	600	223	37.2%	360	137	\$44,114.55
Howard Univ. Middle School	283	39	13.7%	170	131	\$42,193.88
Idea PCS	333	43	13.0%	200	156	\$50,395.66
Ideal Academy PCS	251	135	53.9%	151	15	\$4,922.50
Inspired Teaching Demonstration PCS	87	24	27.4%	52	28	\$9,139.74
Kingsman Academy Public Charter School	291	33	11.4%	175	142	\$45,596.67
Kipp/DC	6,283	3,287	52.3%	3,770	483	\$155,620.81
Latin American Montessori Bilingual PCS	99	20	19.9%	59	40	\$12,798.50
LAYC Career Academy PCS	129	7	5.7%	77	70	\$22,582.64
Lee Montessori Public Charter School	52	15	29.6%	31	16	\$5,085.39
Maya Angelou PCS	378	34	9.0%	227	193	\$62,075.41



LEA That Did Not Meet 60 Percent Benchmark	Number of Certified FARM Students	Actual SBP Average Daily Participation	FARM SBP Participation Rate	FARM SBP ADP if 60 Percent Goal Met	Additional FARM Students That Would be Served if 60 Percent Goal Met	Additional Federal Funding if 60 Percent Goal Met
Meridian PCS	644	186	28.8%	386	201	\$64,695.97
Monument Academy Public Charter School	137	78	56.7%	82	5	\$1,466.01
Mundo Verde PCS	148	65	44.1%	89	23	\$7,569.91
National Collegiate Prep PCS	257	14	5.6%	154	140	\$45,075.78
Next Step PCS	156	33	20.9%	94	61	\$19,639.88
Paul Public Charter School	611	93	15.3%	367	273	\$88,057.26
Richard Wright PCS	300	83	27.5%	180	97	\$31,412.71
Seed Public Charter School	288	142	49.5%	173	30	\$9,773.40
SELA PCS	88	40	45.4%	53	13	\$4,136.69
Shining Stars Montessori Academy	76	35	46.5%	46	10	\$3,302.55
Somerset Preparatory Academy DC	425	84	19.8%	255	171	\$54,994.17
Statesmen College Preparatory Academy for Boys	56	31	54.8%	34	3	\$939.75
Thurgood Marshall Academy PCHS	398	27	6.8%	239	212	\$68,252.70
Two Rivers PCS	263	125	47.6%	158	33	\$10,518.04
Washington Global Public Charter School	218	34	15.5%	131	97	\$31,258.77
Washington Latin PCS	111	14	12.3%	67	53	\$17,064.07
Washington Leadership Academy PCS	234	42	17.9%	140	98	\$31,727.75
Washington Yu Ying PCS	63	24	38.5%	38	14	\$4,362.23
D.C. Overall					13,697	\$4,413,142.97

**TABLE E:**

**Additional Participation and Funding if 60 Percent of Students Eligible for Free and Reduced Price Meals (FARM) Were Served Through the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) for all Reported D.C. Local Education Agencies (LEA) That Did Not Meet This Goal, School Year 2018–2019**

LEA That Did Not Meet 60 Percent Benchmark	Number of Certified FARM Students	Actual NSLP Average Daily Participation	FARM NSLP Participation Rate	FARM NSLP ADP if 60 Percent Goal Met	Additional FARM Students That Would be Served if 60 Percent Goal Met	Additional Federal Funding if 60 Percent Goal Met
Basis DC PCS	117	38	32.3%	70	32	\$19,453.86
Breakthrough Montessori PCS	44	23	53.3%	26	3	\$1,764.90
Briya PCS	635	32	5.0%	381	349	\$209,470.32
Center City PCS	1,457	865	59.4%	874	9	\$5,274.72
Cesar Chavez PCS	963	422	43.9%	578	155	\$93,133.44
City Arts & Prep	432	219	50.7%	259	40	\$24,159.15
Creative Minds International PCS	183	101	55.3%	110	9	\$5,144.85
DC International School	549	183	33.3%	329	147	\$87,828.75
DC Preparatory Academy PCS	1,662	816	49.1%	997	182	\$108,894.33
DC Public Schools (DCPS)	36,518	21,599	59.1%	21,911	312	\$186,926.22
EL Haynes Public Charter School	785	420	53.5%	471	51	\$30,695.94
Harmony DC PCS	112	50	44.9%	67	17	\$10,123.20
Hope Community PCS	600	356	59.3%	360	4	\$2,557.44
Howard Univ. Middle School	283	126	44.6%	170	44	\$26,160.48
Idea PCS	333	172	51.7%	200	28	\$16,590.06
Ideal Academy PCS	251	128	51.2%	151	22	\$13,306.68
Inspired Teaching Demonstration PCS	87	50	57.6%	52	2	\$1,252.08
Kingsman Academy Public Charter School	291	63	21.6%	175	112	\$66,986.28
LAYC Career Academy PCS	129	21	16.5%	77	56	\$33,613.02
Lee Montessori Public Charter School	52	30	57.9%	31	1	\$669.33
Maya Angelou PCS	378	66	17.4%	227	161	\$96,629.94
Meridian PCS	644	363	56.4%	386	23	\$13,896.09
National Collegiate Prep PCS	257	78	30.3%	154	76	\$45,784.17
Next Step PCS	156	41	26.0%	94	53	\$31,774.86
Paul Public Charter School	611	314	51.4%	367	52	\$31,395.24
Richard Wright PCS	300	134	44.8%	180	46	\$27,399.24
Seed Public Charter School	288	170	59.1%	173	3	\$1,578.42
SELA PCS	88	48	54.8%	53	5	\$2,730.60
Shining Stars Montessori Academy	76	39	51.9%	46	6	\$3,672.99
Somerset Preparatory Academy DC	425	232	54.5%	255	23	\$14,079.24
Thurgood Marshall Academy PCHS	398	91	22.8%	239	148	\$88,697.88

LEA That Did Not Meet 60 Percent Benchmark	Number of Certified FARM Students	Actual SBP Average Daily Participation	FARM SBP Participation Rate	FARM SBP ADP if 60 Percent Goal Met	Additional FARM Students That Would be Served if 60 Percent Goal Met	Additional Federal Funding if 60 Percent Goal Met
Washington Latin PCS	111	43	38.3%	67	24	\$14,405.58
Washington Leadership Academy PCS	234	107	45.9%	140	33	\$19,763.55
Washington Yu Ying PCS	63	33	52.1%	38	5	\$2,973.69
D.C. Overall					2,234	\$1,338,786.54



## **D.C. Hunger Solutions**

Ending hunger in the nation's capital

D.C. Hunger Solutions  
1200 18th Street NW  
Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20036

Phone: 202-640-1088  
Fax: 202-640-1085

**[www.dchunger.org](http://www.dchunger.org)**  
[info@dchunger.org](mailto:info@dchunger.org)



@dchunger



@dchungersolutions



@dchungersolutions