



June 2012

Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation:

Summer Nutrition Status Report 2012

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. For information about the Summer Nutrition Programs, go to www.frac.org/federal-foodnutrition-programs/summer-programs/.

Acknowledgements

This report was prepared by Rachel Cooper, Signe Anderson and Crystal FitzSimons.

The Food Research and Action Center gratefully acknowledges the following funders whose major support in 2011-2012 has helped to make possible our work on expanding and improving nutrition programs:

AARP
Anonymous Donors
Annie E. Casey Foundation
California Endowment
Claneil Foundation
ConAgra Foods Foundation
CREDO/Working Assets
Eos Foundation
General Mills Foundation
Kresge Foundation
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
Kaiser Permanente
Kraft Foods Foundation
Land O'Lakes Foundation
Leaves of Grass Fund
MAZON:e John8.2()N

Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation:

The number of low-income children who are receiving free or reduced-price lunch during the regular school year is one excellent indicator of the need for the Summer Nutrition Programs. Because of this, FRAC uses it as a benchmark against which to measure summer participation nationally and in each state. In July 2011, only 14.6 children received Summer Nutrition for every 100 low-income students who received lunch in the 2010-2011 school year. Only one in seven children who needed summer food, according to this measure, was getting it.

The 2011 ratio of 14.6:100 was a significant decrease when compared to the ratio of 15.1:100 children in July 2010. The magnitude of the drop was due to the fact that the number of children being fed during the summer fell slightly, while the number of low-income children receiving help from the school lunch program grew significantly (by 472,000 low-income children) during the 2010-2011 school year, reflecting the growing need in the aftermath of the recession. Since July 2008 the share of children in need being served by the Summer Nutrition Programs has fallen from a ratio 17.3:100 to only 14.6:100.

The story behind the overall numbers shows the impact of the recession on this program. At the same time that more children had to use the regular school year food programs, in many states budget cuts caused school districts to eliminate or reduce their summer programs, resulting in 70,000 fewer students being served by the National School Lunch Program in July 2011 than in the previous year. The losses in the NSLP outstripped the gain of 46,000 children achieved by the Summer Food Service Program.

State Findings for 2011

While participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs fell nationally, the performance of the programs varied dramatically throughout the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

Despite state budget challenges nationwide, four top performing states managed to reach at least one in four of their low-income children in July 2011: District of Columbia (73.5:100), New Mexico (31.2:100), New York (28.5:100) and Connecticut (25.5:100).

Unfortunately, 13 states fed less than one-tenth of their low-income children through their Summer Nutrition Programs in 2011. Oklahoma (3.7:100) and Kansas (6.5:100) fed less than 1 in 15.

a state failed to feed a low-income child a lunch during the summer of 2011, the state lost \$3.2375 in federal SFSP funding (and even more for rural or "self-preparation" sites).

If every state in July 2011 had reached the goal of feeding 40 children Summer Nutrition for every 100 receiving free and reduced-price lunches during the 2010-2011 school year, an additional 4.9 million children would have been fed each day, and the states would have collected

meals can replace unhealthy high-calorie processed foods that children might otherwise consume, steering them away from foods that contribute to weight gain.

Several states have taken steps to improve nutrition quality in the summer meals served to children. Many states have directed summer meal programs to implement higher nutrition standards, and others are offering incentives for programs that exceed basic nutrition guidelines.

Delaware has set aggressive nutrition guidelines designed to reduce fried foods, fat, sugar and sodium from their summer meal programs.

In Washington D.C., the Healthy Schools Act of 2010 requires programs to serve summer meals that meet or exceed federal nutrition standards. An additional reimbursement was provided for schools that meet the requirements under the D.C. Healthy Schools Act and for summer meal programs that include local unprocessed foods as a part of the meal.

In Kentucky, summer sites are encouraged to use the federal reimbursement to purchase fresh, healthy and nutritious products such as fresh fruits and vegetables, lean meats, and unprocessed cheese to improve summer meals.

Massachusetts is working with the Farm to School initiative to improve the summer nutrition programs by offering local and fresh produce. As a result there has been an emphasis on serving more fruits and vegetables.

FRAC's Summer Food Standards of Excellence can help states and advocates raise awareness about what a high quality Summer Food site looks like and encourage sponsors to improve their programs. The Standards give a framework to rank Summer Food sites gold, silver, or bronze based upon the nutrition quality and appeal of the food provided at the site, the environment, and outreach efforts. The standards are available online at <http://frac.org/federal-foodnutrition-programs/summer-programs/standards-of-excellence-summer-programs/>.

Looking Ahead

Children cannot continue to bear the burden of budget cuts. It is in everyone's best interest to ensure that children have adequate nutrition during the summer so they stay healthy and are ready to learn, and everyone has a role to play in making that happen:

Schools must recommit to meeting the nutritional needs of their students during the summer, even if they scale back summer school.

Anti-hunger and child advocates who have worked on Summer Nutrition expansion for years must continue to ratchet up their efforts and find strategies that help and prod states to make these programs a priority.

Private funders are taking a proactive role in supporting the success of the Summer Nutrition Programs by providing funding to cover the costs that cannot be covered by the federal reimbursement, including outreach, equipment, programming at the site and meals for parents. Additional funders can follow their lead, especially in states that have very low participation or that have experienced significant declines.

At the national level, USDA continues to promote summer food through various means, including a Summer Food Service Program Awareness Week, which involves a wide range of events and activities to raise the visibility of summer meals. States should build on this national awareness campaign, and look to raise the visibility of the program.

Decisive action is needed to ensure that far more children from low-income households have access to meals during the summer.

TABLE 1: Summer Nutrition Participation in July 2010 and July 2011 by State (Lunches in Summer Food Service Program - SFSP - and National School Lunch Program - NSLP -* Combined)

State	July 2010 Summer Nutrition				July 2011 Summer Nutrition				Percent Change in Children in Summer Nutrition 2010 to 2011
	Children in Summer Nutrition	Children in 09-10 Regular School Year NSLP**	Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 09-10 School Year NSLP**	Rank	Children in Summer Nutrition	Children in 10-11 Regular School Year NSLP**	Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 10-11 School Year NSLP**	Rank	
Alabama	27,508	352,638	7.8	46	26,488	355,833	7.4	47	-3.7%
Alaska	3,289	34,585	9.5	40	3,532	35,511	9.9	39	7.4%
Arizona	53,850	449,683	12.0	32	49,158	448,087	11.0	36	-8.7%
Arkansas	32,758	229,936	14.2	27	31,651	232,502	13.6	27	-3.4%
California	444,372	2,363,426	18.8	14	411,191	2,418,841	17.0	17	-7.5%
Colorado	14,521	220,579	6.6	47	16,501	227,629	7.2	48	13.6%
Connecticut	32,357	141,142	22.9	8	36,639	143,633	25.5	4	13.2%
Delaware	12,692	48,112	26.4	5	11,560	51,463	22.5	5	-8.9%
District of Columbia	28,008	34,918	80.2	1	25,763	35,043	73.5	1	-8.0%
Florida	158,893	1,113,756	14.3	26	160,379	1,172,507	13.7	26	0.9%
Georgia	108,511	800,602	13.6	29	114,653	821,713	14.0	23	5.7%
Hawaii	4,564	53,685	8.5	44	7,810	62,332	12.5	30	71.1%
Idaho	21,211	95,535	22.2	9	21,771	99,666	21.8	7	2.6%
Illinois	105,653	721,116	14.7	24	109,626	725,108	15.1	22	3.8%
Indiana	48,273	404,592	11.9	33	48,169	412,219	11.7	34	-0.2%
Iowa	13,758	153,461	9.0	42	14,889	159,345	9.3	42	8.2%
Kansas	10,438	174,767	6.0	49	11,858	181,538	6.5	50	13.6%
Kentucky	27,038	315,517	8.6	43	25,193	320,928	7.9	46	-6.8%
Louisiana	24,728	376,579	6.6	47	35,067	380,050	9.2	43	41.8%
Maine	9,009	58,370	15.4	23	9,780	59,287	16.5	19	8.6%
Maryland	51,480	243,181	21.2	10	50,419	255,706	19.7	11	-2.1%
Massachusetts	49,812	254,236	19.6	12	51,776	261,125	19.8	10	3.9%
Michigan	73,773	545,281	13.5	30	68,561	548,080	12.5	30	-7.1%
Minnesota	35,485	245,960	14.4	25	35,532	253,475	14.0	23	0.1%
Mississippi	16,045	294,410	5.4	50	19,788	294,695	6.7	49	23.3%
Missouri	40,509	345,872	11.7	34	43,264	344,847	12.5	30	6.8%
Montana	7,489	44,342	16.9	20	7,288	45,833	15.9	20	-2.7%
Nebraska	10,258	105,477	9.7	38	11,672	109,854	10.6	37	13.8%
Nevada	31,291	128,117	24.4	6	12,266	151,800	8.1	45	-60.8%
New Hampshire	4,209	37,522	11.2	36	4,665	38,777	12.0	33	10.8%
New Jersey	68,533	378,029	18.1	15	75,064	393,306	19.1	13	9.5%
New Mexico	49,047	160,293	30.6	2	50,176	160,843	31.2	2	2.3%
New York	314,986	1,099,893	28.6	3	319,787	1,123,041	28.5	3	1.5%
North Carolina	78,088	599,271	13.0	31	78,413	611,453	12.8	29	0.4%
North Dakota	2,353	27,747	8.5	44	2,560	28,120	9.1	44	8.8%
Ohio	70,853	607,744	11.7	34	66,038	622,078	10.6	37	-6.8%
Oklahoma	11,097	283,905	3.9	51	10,949	292,891	3.7	51	-1.3%
Oregon	35,630	200,113	17.8	17	36,693	204,218	18.0	16	3.0%
Pennsylvania	128,946	544,621	23.7	7	119,195	553,339	21.5	8	-7.6%
Rhode Island	6,791	48,430	14.0	28	6,619	49,127	13.5	28	-2.5%
South Carolina	87,995	324,939	27.1	4	68,077	329,017	20.7	9	-22.6%
South Dakota	8,954	45,570	19.6	12	8,740	46,560	18.8	15	-2.4%
Tennessee	48,494	434,868	11.2	36	51,008	444,956	11.5	35	5.2%
Texas	208,980	2,276,283	9.2	41	221,188	2,342,390	9.4	41	5.8%
Utah	24,633	154,202	16.0	21	24,849	161,965	15.3	21	0.9%
Vermont	5,126	24,584	20.9	11	5,570	25,303	22.0	6	8.7%
Virginia	64,645	364,679	17.7	18	72,873	376,882	19.3	12	12.7%
Washington	30,975	322,532	9.6	39	31,964	334,161	9.6	40	3.2%
West Virginia	20,738	115,228	18.0	16	20,843	109,577	19.0	14	0.5%
Wisconsin	42,190	264,677	15.9	22	38,999	279,584	13.9	25	-7.6%
Wyoming	4,222	24,233	17.4	19	4,267	25,259	16.9	18	1.1%
United States	2,815,058	18,689,237	15.1		2,790,776	19,161,494	14.6		-0.9%

* National School Lunch Program July numbers reflect free and reduced-price lunch attendance and include participation in the "Seamless Summer Option."

** School Year NSLP numbers reflect free and reduced-price lunch participation during the regular school year.

TABLE 2: Change in Summer Food Service Program and in National School Lunch Program Participation from July 2010 to July 2011 by State

State	Children in Summer Food Service Program			Children in National School Lunch Program		
	July 2010	July 2011	Change 2010 to 2011	July 2010	July 2011	Change 2010 to 2011
Alabama	19,602	19,080	-2.7%	7,906	7,407	-6.3%
Alaska	2,554	2,855	11.8%	735	677	-7.9%
Arizona	13,978	19,086	36.5%	39,873	30,073	-24.6%
Arkansas	17,949	22,353	24.5%	14,809	9,298	-37.2%
California	117,770	111,430	-5.4%	326,603	299,761	-8.2%
Colorado	10,584	14,246	34.6%	3,937	2,255	-42.7%
Connecticut	10,830	12,817	18.3%	21,527	23,821	10.7%
Delaware	11,395	9,526	-16.4%	1,296	2,034	56.9%
District of Columbia	26,076	24,027	-7.9%	1,931	1,736	-10.1%
Florida	137,693	139,900	1.6%	21,200	20,479	-3.4%
Georgia	44,495	48,925	10.0%	64,016	65,728	2.7%
Hawaii	3,186	1,286	-59.6%	1,379	6,524	373.2%
Idaho	20,422	20,949	2.6%	790	822	4.1%
Illinois	64,366	62,862	-2.3%	41,287	46,764	13.3%
Indiana	41,364	42,303	2.3%	6,909	5,866	-15.1%
Iowa	9,628	10,608	10.2%	4,130	4,281	3.6%
Kansas	8,445	10,786	27.7%	1,994	1,073	-46.2%
Kentucky	24,909	23,429	-5.9%	2,129	1,764	-17.1%
Louisiana	21,817	30,491	39.8%	2,911	4,577	57.2%
Maine	8,646	9,331	7.9%	363	450	23.8%
Maryland	48,939	47,649	-2.6%	2,541	2,770	9.0%
Massachusetts	43,447	45,131	3.9%	6,365	6,642	4.4%
Michigan	43,775	43,063	-1.6%	29,997	25,498	-15.0%
Minnesota	27,835	28,947	4.0%	7,650	6,586	-13.9%
Mississippi	15,280	17,642	15.5%	765	2,146	180.6%
Missouri	22,304	24,669	10.6%	18,205	18,594	2.1%
Montana	6,801	6,661	-2.1%	688	627	-8.9%
Nebraska	8,376	9,579	14.4%	1,882	2,093	11.2%
Nevada	5,165	5,856	13.4%	26,126	6,410	-75.5%
New Hampshire	3,505	3,843	9.7%	705	822	16.7%
New Jersey	48,289	54,913	13.7%	20,244	20,151	-0.5%
New Mexico	30,259	30,165	-0.3%	18,788	20,011	6.5%
New York	255,361	259,098	1.5%	59,625	60,689	1.8%
North Carolina	36,035	39,089	8.5%	42,053	39,324	-6.5%
North Dakota	2,004	2,183	8.9%	349	377	8.1%
Ohio	58,813	52,536	-10.7%	12,040	13,503	12.1%
Oklahoma	8,866	8,652	-2.4%	2,231	2,297	3.0%
Oregon	32,100	33,577	4.6%	3,529	3,117	-11.7%
Pennsylvania	78,541	78,651	0.1%	50,405	40,543	-19.6%
Rhode Island	5,616	5,082	-9.5%	1,176	1,538	30.8%
South Carolina	39,572	29,941	-24.3%	48,423	38,136	-21.2%
South Dakota	4,071	4,358	7.1%	4,882	4,381	-10.3%
Tennessee	30,635	29,813	-2.7%	17,859	21,195	18.7%
Texas	149,866	161,648	7.9%	59,114	59,540	0.7%
Utah	10,585	11,506	8.7%	14,047	13,343	-5.0%
Vermont	2,804	3,920	39.8%	2,322	1,650	-28.9%
Virginia	54,688	61,520	12.5%	9,957	11,353	14.0%
Washington	25,823	27,246	5.5%	5,152	4,717	-8.4%
West Virginia	14,503	14,673	1.2%	6,235	6,169	-1.1%
Wisconsin	37,943	35,586	-6.2%	4,247	3,413	-19.6%
Wyoming	3,107	2,994	-3.6%	1,115	1,273	14.1%
United States	1,770,617	1,816,479	2.6%	1,044,441	974,297	-6.7%

State	Children in SFSP, July 2011	Children in 10-11 School Year NSLP*	Children in 2011 SFSP per 100 in 10-11 School Year NSLP*	Rank	Percent SFSP Contributes to State's Overall Summer Nutrition Partici_pation
Alabama	19,080	355,833	5.4	46	72.0%
Alaska	2,855	35,511	8.0	31	80.8%
Arizona	19,086	448,087	4.3	48	38.8%
Arkansas	22,353	232,502	9.6	23	70.6%
California	111,430	2,418,841	4.6	47	27.1%
Colorado	14,246	227,629	6.3	42	86.3%
Connecticut	12,817	143,633	8.9	26	35.0%
Delaware	9,526	51,463	18.5	6	82.4%



State	Children in Summer Nutrition (School Lunch* & Summer Food Combined), July 2011	Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 10-11 Regular School Year NSLP**	Total Children Who Would Be in July Summer Nutrition if State Reached a Ratio of 40 Children per 100 in Regular School Year NSLP**	Additional Children Reached in July if State Reached a Ratio of 40 Children per 100 in Regular School Year NSLP**	Additional Federal Reimbursement if State Reached in July a Ratio of 40 Children per 100 in Regular School Year NSLP***
Alabama	26,488	7.4	142,333	115,846	\$7,501,004
Alaska	3,532	9.9	14,205	10,673	\$691,081
Arizona	49,158	11.0	179,235	130,076	\$8,422,439
Arkansas	31,651	13.6	93,001	61,350	\$3,972,411
California	411,191	17.0	967,536	556,346	\$36,023,380
Colorado	16,501	7.2	91,051	74,551	\$4,827,158
Connecticut	36,639	25.5	57,453	20,815	\$1,347,741
Delaware	11,560	22.5	20,585	9,025	\$584,371
District of Columbia	25,763	73.5	--	--	--
Florida	160,379	13.7	469,003	308,624	\$19,983,409
Georgia	114,653	14.0	328,685	214,033	\$13,858,605
Hawaii	7,810	12.5	24,933	17,123	\$1,108,691
Idaho	21,771	21.8	39,866	18,096	\$1,171,688
Illinois	109,626	15.1	290,043	180,417	\$11,682,011
Indiana	48,169	11.7	164,887	116,719	\$7,557,534
Iowa	14,889	9.3	63,738	48,849	\$3,162,997
Kansas	11,858	6.5	72,615	60,757	\$3,934,025
Kentucky	25,193	7.9	128,371	103,178	\$6,680,785
Louisiana	35,067	9.2	152,020	116,953	\$7,572,676
Maine	9,780	16.5	23,715	13,934	\$902,245
Maryland	50,419	19.7	102,282	51,864	\$3,419,605

8.Maine 9,780