



Supplement B: Data Tables

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Contents

Supplement B.1: Use of the Fiscal Action Flexibility for Meal Pattern Violations Waiver.....	1
Table B.1.1. Number and percentage of State agencies that used the Fiscal Action waiver for certain types of meal pattern violations during SY 2022–2023, nationwide and by FNS region.....	3
Table B.1.2. Number and percentage of SFAs for which State agencies waived fiscal action requirements for certain types of meal pattern violations during SY 2022–2023.....	3
Table B.1.3. Total number of State agencies that used each waiver during SY 2021–2022 or summer 2022.....	4
Table B.1.4. Number and percentage of State agencies reporting that the Fiscal Action Flexibility for Meal Pattern Violations waiver was used for all affected SFAs during SY 2021–2022.....	4
Supplement B.2: Household Application Collection	5
Table B.2.1. Number of UFSM State agencies that experienced certain challenges with free and reduced-price school meals application collections during SY 2022–2023.....	7
Table B.2.2. Percentage of SFAs that reported collecting household applications to certify children for free and reduced-price school meals during SY 2022–2023, by SFA characteristic	8
Table B.2.3. Of SFAs that collected household applications to certify children for free and reduced-price school meals, percentage that reported using an application based on the USDA online application during SY 2022–2023	9
Table B.2.4. Of SFAs that collected household applications to certify children for free and reduced-price school meals, percentage that reported using each application format during SY 2022–2023	9
Table B.2.5. Of SFAs that collected household applications to certify children for free and reduced-price school meals, percentage that reported using one or more application formats during SY 2022–2023.....	10
Table B.2.6. Of SFAs that collected household applications to certify children for free and reduced-price school meals, percentage that reported each household application format as most used during SY 2022–2023.....	10
Supplement B.3: USDA Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program.....	11
Table B.3.1. Number and percentage of elementary schools that applied to participate and participated in the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program during SY 2022–2023.....	13
Table B.3.2. Number and percentage of elementary school students that were served under the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program during SY 2022–2023.....	13
Table B.3.3. Number and percentage of State agencies that reported certain reasons for returning Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program funding in SY 2022–2023	14

Supplement B.4: Meal Preparation and Service	15
Table B.4.1. Percentage of SFAs that reported using each source to get standardized recipes during SY 2022–2023, by SFA size	17
Table B.4.2. Percentage of SFAs that reported using each source to get standardized recipes during SY 2022–2023, by SFA poverty level.....	18
Table B.4.3. Percentage of SFAs that reported using each source to get standardized recipes during SY 2022–2023, by SFA urbanicity.....	19
Table B.4.4. Of SFAs that reported using standardized recipes, percentage that reported the USDA Recipe Standardization Guide was helpful during SY 2022–2023.....	20
Table B.4.5. Of SFAs that reported using standardized recipes, percentage that reported certain additional training or resource topics would be helpful during SY 2022–2023.....	20
Table B.4.6. Percentage of SFAs that preferred USDA resources as online, paper copies, or had no preference during SY 2022–2023	21
Table B.4.7. Percentage of SFAs that used scratch, speed-scratch, or both cooking methods to prepare meals at breakfast, lunch, or breakfast and lunch during SY 2022–2023.....	21
Table B.4.8. Percentage of SFAs that used or did not use scratch or speed-scratch cooking methods to prepare meals at breakfast or lunch during SY 2022–2023, by SFA size	22
Table B.4.9. Percentage of SFAs that used or did not use scratch or speed-scratch cooking methods to prepare meals at breakfast or lunch during SY 2022–2023, by SFA poverty level.....	23
Table B.4.10. Percentage of SFAs that used or did not use scratch or speed-scratch cooking methods to prepare meals at breakfast or lunch during SY 2022–2023, by SFA urbanicity.....	24
Table B.4.11. Percentage of all SFAs that reported each frequency of using scratch cooking methods to prepare reimbursable meals during SY 2022–2023.....	25
Table B.4.12. Percentage of all SFAs that reported each frequency of using speed-scratch cooking methods to prepare reimbursable meals during SY 2022–2023	26
Table B.4.13. Of SFAs that reported they did not use scratch cooking methods, percentage that reported each challenge as being a barrier preventing them from scratch cooking more often during SY 2022–2023	27
Table B.4.14. Of SFAs that reported they did not use scratch cooking methods, percentage that reported each challenge as being a barrier preventing them from scratch cooking more often during SY 2022–2023, by SFA size	28
Table B.4.15. Of SFAs that reported they did not use scratch cooking methods, percentage that reported each challenge as being a barrier preventing them from scratch cooking more often during SY 2022–2023, by SFA poverty level.....	32

Table B.4.16. Of SFAs that reported they did not use scratch cooking methods, percentage that reported each challenge as being a barrier preventing them from scratch cooking more often during SY 2022–2023, by SFA urbanicity.....	36
Table B.4.17. Percentage of SFAs that reported certain frequencies of offering a daily breakfast menu without animal-based proteins (meat, poultry, fish, eggs, or dairy) during SY 2022–2023, by school type.....	40
Table B.4.18. Percentage of SFAs that reported certain frequencies of offering a daily breakfast menu without animal-based proteins (meat, poultry, fish, eggs, or dairy) during SY 2022–2023, by SFA size.....	40
Table B.4.19. Percentage of SFAs that reported certain frequencies of offering a daily breakfast menu without animal-based proteins (meat, poultry, fish, eggs, or dairy) during SY 2022–2023, by SFA poverty level.....	41
Table B.4.20. Percentage of SFAs that reported certain frequencies of offering a daily breakfast menu without animal-based proteins (meat, poultry, fish, eggs, or dairy) during SY 2022–2023, by SFA urbanicity.....	41
Table B.4.21. Percentage of SFAs that reported certain frequencies of offering a daily lunch menu without animal-based proteins (meat, poultry, fish, eggs, or dairy) during SY 2022–2023, by school type.....	42
Table B.4.22. Percentage of SFAs that reported certain frequencies of offering a daily lunch menu without animal-based proteins (meat, poultry, fish, eggs, or dairy) during SY 2022–2023, by SFA size.....	42
Table B.4.23. Percentage of SFAs that reported certain frequencies of offering a daily lunch menu without animal-based proteins (meat, poultry, fish, eggs, or dairy) during SY 2022–2023, by SFA poverty level.....	43
Table B.4.24. Percentage of SFAs that reported certain frequencies of offering a daily lunch menu without animal-based proteins (meat, poultry, fish, eggs, or dairy) during SY 2022–2023, by SFA urbanicity.....	43
Table B.4.25. Percentage of SFAs that reported certain challenges in making accommodations for students with disabilities during SY 2022–2023, by SFA characteristic.....	44
Supplement B.5: Additional Funding Sources Available to School Food Authorities.....	45
Table B.5.1. Number and percentage of State agencies that provided SFAs subsidies in addition to Federal reimbursements for breakfasts in SY 2022–2023, nationwide and by FNS region.....	47
Table B.5.2. Number and percentage of State agencies that provided SFAs certain subsidies in addition to Federal reimbursements for breakfasts in SY 2022–2023, nationwide.....	47
Table B.5.3. Number and percentage of State agencies that provided SFAs subsidies in addition to Federal reimbursements for lunches in SY 2022–2023, nationwide and by FNS region.....	48

Table B.5.4. Number and percentage of State agencies that provided certain subsidies in addition to Federal reimbursements for lunches in SY 2022–2023, nationwide.....	49
Table B.5.5. States that provided SFAs subsidies in addition to Federal reimbursements for breakfasts only, lunches only, or both breakfasts and lunches in SY 2022–2023.....	50
Table B.5.6. Number and percentage of States that provided SFAs subsidies in addition to Federal reimbursements for breakfasts only, lunches only, or both breakfasts and lunches in SY 2022–2023	51
Table B.5.7. Percentage of SFAs that reported financial impacts from the additional per-meal reimbursements from the Keep Kids Fed Act during SY 2022–2023, by SFA characteristic	52
Table B.5.8. Percentage of SFAs that reported receiving Supply Chain Assistance funds during SY 2022–2023.....	53
Table B.5.9. Of SFAs that received Supply Chain Assistance funds, percentage that reported purchasing certain food products with funds during SY 2022–2023	53
Table B.5.10. Percentage of SFAs that reported receiving Equipment Assistance Grants during SY 2022–2023.....	54
Table B.5.11. Of SFAs that received Equipment Assistance Grants, percentage that reported using grants for certain purposes during SY 2022–2023.....	54
Table B.5.12. Of SFAs that received Equipment Assistance Grants, percentage that reported using grants to procure certain types of equipment during SY 2022–2023	55
Supplement B.6: Meal Prices.....	57
Table B.6.1. Percentage of SFAs in States without UFSM policies that reported all schools in their SFA served all meals at no charge during SY 2022–2023, by SFA characteristic.....	59
Table B.6.2. Of SFAs with schools that charge for meals, average prices charged by SFAs for reduced-price and paid breakfasts during SY 2022–2023, by school type	60
Table B.6.3. Of SFAs with schools that charge for meals, average price charged by SFAs for paid breakfasts during SY 2022–2023, by school type and SFA characteristic.....	61
Table B.6.4. Of SFAs with schools that charge for meals, average price charged by SFAs for reduced-price breakfasts during SY 2022–2023, by school type and SFA characteristic.....	62
Table B.6.5. Of SFAs with schools that charge for meals, average prices charged by SFAs for reduced-price and paid lunches during SY 2022–2023, by school type	63
Table B.6.6. Of SFAs with schools that charge for meals, average price charged by SFAs for a paid lunch during SY 2022–2023, by school type and SFA characteristic.....	64
Table B.6.7. Of SFAs with schools that charge for meals, average price charged by SFAs for a reduced-price lunch during SY 2022–2023, by school type and SFA characteristic.....	65

Table B.6.8. Percentage of SFAs that reported taking certain actions in response to the Paid Lunch Equity provision during SY 2022–2023, by SFA size.....	66
Table B.6.9. Percentage of SFAs that reported taking certain actions in response to Paid Lunch Equity provision during SY 2022–2023, by poverty level.....	67
Table B.6.10. Percentage of SFAs that reported taking certain actions in response to Paid Lunch Equity provision during SY 2022–2023, by urbanicity.....	68
Table B.6.11. Of SFAs that charged for school meals, percentage that reported lowering prices for paid meals in SY 2022–2023 compared to prices charged prior to the COVID-19 pandemic (in SY 2019–2020), by SFA characteristic	69
Table B.6.12. Of SFAs that charged for school meals, percentage that reported lowering prices for paid meals during SY 2022–2023, by school type.....	70
Supplement B.7: Unpaid Meal Charges.....	71
Table B.7.1. Percentage of SFAs that reported having a local and/or State-level unpaid meal charge policy during SY 2022–2023.....	73
Table B.7.2. Percentage of SFAs that reported having a local and/or State-level unpaid meal charge policy during SY 2022–2023, by SFA characteristic	74
Table B.7.3. Of SFAs with a meal charge policy, percentage that reported including certain components in their meal charge policy during SY 2022–2023.....	75
Table B.7.4. Of SFAs with a meal charge policy, percentage that reported including certain components in their meal charge policy during SY 2022–2023, by SFA size.....	76
Table B.7.5. Of SFAs with a meal charge policy, percentage that reported including certain components in their meal charge policy during SY 2022–2023, by poverty level	77
Table B.7.6. Of SFAs with a meal charge policy, percentage that reported including certain components in their meal charge policy during SY 2022–2023, by urbanicity.....	78
Table B.7.7. Of SFAs with unpaid meal charge policies, percentage that reported tracking unpaid meal charges during SY 2022–2023, by SFA characteristic.....	79
Table B.7.8. Of SFAs that tracked unpaid meal charges, average amount of money SFAs reported being owed at the end of SY 2022–2023, by SFA characteristic.....	80
Table B.7.9. Of SFAs that tracked unpaid meal charges, average amount of money SFAs reported recovering since the end of SY 2022–2023, by SFA characteristic.....	81
Table B.7.10. Of SFAs that tracked unpaid meal charges, average percentage of unpaid meal charge money SFAs reported recovering from certain sources since the end of SY 2022–2023, by SFA characteristic.....	82
Table B.7.11. Of SFAs that tracked unpaid meal charges, percentage that reported using certain strategies to recover money during SY 2022–2023, by SFA size.....	83

Table B.7.12. Of SFAs that tracked unpaid meal charges, percentage that reported using certain strategies to recover money during SY 2022–2023, by poverty level	84
Table B.7.13. Of SFAs that tracked unpaid meal charges, percentage that reported using certain strategies to recover money during SY 2022–2023, by urbanicity	85
Table B.7.14. Of SFAs that used certain strategies to recover unpaid meal charges, percentage that reported certain strategies as successful in recovering unpaid meal charges during SY 2022–2023, by SFA size	86
Table B.7.15. Of SFAs that used certain strategies to recover unpaid meal charges, percentage that reported certain strategies as successful in recovering unpaid meal charges during SY 2022–2023, by poverty level.....	87
Table B.7.16. Of SFAs that used certain strategies to recover unpaid meal charges, percentage that reported certain strategies as successful in recovering unpaid meal charges during SY 2022–2023, by urbanicity.....	88
Supplement B.8: Additional Tables.....	89
Table B.8.1. Number and percentage of State agencies that prefer to use USDA resources online or as paper copies	91
Table B.8.2. Percentage of State agencies reporting additional thoughts for FNS about State and local efforts to provide Child Nutrition Program meals during SY 2022–2023.....	91
Table B.8.3. Percentage of SFAs that used NSLP or SBP to provide meals during SY 2022–2023, by school type	92
Table B.8.4. Percentage of SFAs that used NSLP or SBP to provide meals during SY 2022–2023, by SFA size	92
Table B.8.5. Percentage of SFAs that used NSLP or SBP to provide meals during SY 2022–2023, by poverty level.....	93
Table B.8.6. Percentage of SFAs that used NSLP or SBP to provide meals during SY 2022–2023, by urbanicity.....	93
Table B.8.7. Of SFAs in States with UFSM policies, percentage that reported operating CEP, Provision 2 or 3, or no provisions during SY 2022–2023.....	94
Table B.8.8. Of SFAs in States with UFSM policies that operated CEP, percentage that reported whether new State legislation impacted their decision to elect or continue operating CEP during SY 2022–2023.....	94
Table B.8.9. Of SFAs in States with UFSM policies that did not operate CEP, percentage that reported being eligible to elect CEP during SY 2022–2023.....	95
Table B.8.10. Of SFAs in States with UFSM policies that operated Provision 2 or 3, percentage that reported whether new State legislation impacted their decision to elect or continue operating Provision 2 or 3 during SY 2022–2023.....	95

Supplement B.1:
Use of the Fiscal Action Flexibility for Meal Pattern Violations Waiver

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Table B.1.1. Number and percentage of State agencies that used the Fiscal Action waiver for certain types of meal pattern violations during SY 2022–2023, nationwide and by FNS region

Types of meal pattern violations	Nationwide		MARO		MPRO		MWRO		NERO		SERO		SWRO		WRO	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Missing food components or missing production records	12	21	1	13	2	25	1	14	0	0	5	63	2	22	1	13
Repeated violations involving milk type and vegetable subgroups	15	27	2	25	2	25	2	29	1	13	5	63	2	22	1	13
<i>n</i>	56	56	8	8	8	8	7	7	8	8	8	8	9	9	8	8

Survey question: A1

Source: School Meals Operations Study, State Agency Child Nutrition Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Sixteen State agencies used the Fiscal Action waiver during SY 2022–2023. Fifty-six State agencies administered NSLP, SBP, or SSO in the 50 States, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands during this time period.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of State agencies that reported using the Fiscal Action waiver for each type of meal pattern violation by the total number of State agencies that administered NSLP, SBP, or SSO, nationwide or in the region.

Table B.1.2. Number and percentage of SFAs for which State agencies waived fiscal action requirements for certain types of meal pattern violations during SY 2022–2023

	Nationwide		
	#	%	Don't Know ^a
Missing food components or missing production records	40	0.2	1
Repeated violations involving milk type and vegetable subgroups	61	0.3	2
<i>n</i>	19,570	19,570	56

Survey question: A2 and A3

Source: School Meals Operations Study, State Agency Child Nutrition Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Sixteen State agencies used the Fiscal Action waiver during SY 2022–2023. Fifty-six State agencies administered NSLP, SBP, or SSO in the 50 States, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands during this time period.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs for which State agencies waived fiscal action requirements for certain types of meal pattern violations by the total number of SFAs that served program meals or snacks/supplements at any point during SY 2022–2023, according to State administrative data.

^a The number of State agencies that reported they did not know the number of SFAs for which the State agency waived the fiscal action requirement for each type of meal pattern violation, after reporting that the waiver was used for the listed type of meal pattern violation. These State agencies are excluded from the percentage calculations.

Table B.1.3. Total number of State agencies that used each waiver during SY 2021–2022 or summer 2022

Waiver	Number of State agencies
SSO Operations	52
SFSP Reimbursement for SSO	53
Non-congregate	67
Meal Time Requirements	68
Parent and Guardian Pick-up	68
Meal Pattern Flexibility	63
High School Offer vs. Serve Flexibility	53
Area Eligibility	63
School Meals Onsite Monitoring	54
CACFP Onsite Monitoring for State Agencies	50
CACFP Onsite Monitoring for Sponsors	52
Administrative Reviews for SSO Operators	48
School Wellness Policy Assessments	41
SFSP Half Aggregate Monitoring for State Agencies and Sponsors	46
Fiscal Action Flexibility for Meal Pattern Violations	52
SSO/SFSP Meal Service at School Sites	52
Child Nutrition Program Reporting Requirements	51
SSO/SFSP Area Eligibility for Closed Enrolled Sites	48
SFSP Application Deadlines and Reimbursements	37

Source: School Meals Operations Study, State Agency Child Nutrition Director COVID-19 Waiver Collection School Year 2021–2022.

Note: Sixty-eight State agencies administered at least one of the relevant Child Nutrition Programs in the 50 States, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands during this time period.

Table B.1.4. Number and percentage of State agencies reporting that the Fiscal Action Flexibility for Meal Pattern Violations waiver was used for all affected SFAs during SY 2021–2022

	Nationwide	
	#	%
State agencies that used the waiver for all affect SFAs	46	88
<i>n</i>	52	52

Source: School Meals Operations Study, State Agency Child Nutrition Director COVID-19 Waiver Collection School Year 2021–2022.

Note: Sixty-eight State agencies administered at least one of the relevant Child Nutrition Programs in the 50 States, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands during this time period.

Supplement B.2:
Household Application Collection

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Table B.2.1. Number of UFSM State agencies that experienced certain challenges with free and reduced-price school meals application collections during SY 2022–2023

Challenges	Nationwide #
Families not completing applications	5
SFAs unable to verify applications	3
Incomplete data in applications	2
SFAs not collecting applications	2
Other challenges	
CEP schools collecting applications for non-CN reasons	1
Families not understanding why they needed to complete a meal application	1
No challenges	0
Don't know	0
<i>n</i>	5

Survey question: B1

Source: School Meals Operations Study, State Agency Child Nutrition Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Five States had Universal Free School Meal (UFSM) policies during SY 2022–2023: California, Nevada, Massachusetts, Maine, and Vermont. Respondents could select multiple challenges.

Table B.2.2. Percentage of SFAs that reported collecting household applications to certify children for free and reduced-price school meals during SY 2022–2023, by SFA characteristic

SFA characteristic	Yes %	No %	No response %	n
All SFAs	73.4	26.3	0.3	1,100
SFA size (enrollment)				
SFA size (1–499)	69.3*	29.9*	0.8	389
SFA size (500–2,499)	76.5	23.5	0.0	336
SFA size (2,500–4,999)	71.2	28.8	0.0	166
SFA size (5,000–99,999)	80.5*	19.5*	0.0	182
SFA size (100,000+)	63.0	37.0	0.0	27
SFA poverty level				
SFA poverty level <60% approved for F/RP meals	92.3*	7.3*	0.4	654
SFA poverty level 60%+ approved for F/RP meals	46.1*	53.6*	0.3	419
SFA urbanicity				
Suburban	80.1*	19.9*	0.0	309
Urban	59.8*	39.2*	1.0	240
Rural	75.8	24.0	0.2	551
UFSM status				
UFSM	62.4*	36.6*	1.0	121
Non-UFSM	74.7*	25.0*	0.2	979

Survey question: C1

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA poverty level obtained from the latest available FNS-742 file, with missing values obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey. SFA urbanicity obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey, with missing values imputed according to the SFA’s geographic location. UFSM SFAs are those in States with Universal Free School Meal (UFSM) policies. Five States had UFSM policies during SY 2022–2023: California, Nevada, Massachusetts, Maine, and Vermont. Non-UFSM SFAs are those in all the other States.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that collected household applications by the total number of SFAs within each SFA characteristic.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs that used the program between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.2.3. Of SFAs that collected household applications to certify children for free and reduced-price school meals, percentage that reported using an application based on the USDA online application during SY 2022–2023

Did SFAs use an application based on the USDA online application?	Percentage of SFAs
Yes	82.4
No	5.7
Don't know	11.9
No response	0.0
<i>n</i>	820

Survey question: C2

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that used an application based on the USDA online application by the total number of SFAs that collected household applications.

Table B.2.4. Of SFAs that collected household applications to certify children for free and reduced-price school meals, percentage that reported using each application format during SY 2022–2023

Application format	Yes %	No %	Don't know %	No response %
Manually reviewed and entered paper application	87.0	6.4	6.7	0.0
Electronic or web-based application	53.4	38.6	6.3	1.6
Computer-read of scannable paper application	19.6	68.1	10.3	2.0
Other household application format	3.3	75.1	19.0	2.6

Survey question: C3

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. 820 SFAs collected household applications to certify children for free and reduced-price school meals.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that used each household application format by the number of SFAs that collected household applications. 820 SFAs reported collected household applications. Respondents could indicate they used multiple application formats.

Table B.2.5. Of SFAs that collected household applications to certify children for free and reduced-price school meals, percentage that reported using one or more application formats during SY 2022–2023

Number of application formats used	Percentage of SFAs
One	43.2
Two	38.5
Three	13.0
Four	1.0
Don't know	4.3
No response	0.0
<i>n</i>	820

Survey question: C3

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported each number of application formats by the total number of SFAs that collected household applications.

Table B.2.6. Of SFAs that collected household applications to certify children for free and reduced-price school meals, percentage that reported each household application format as most used during SY 2022–2023

Application format used most often	Percentage of SFAs
Manually reviewed and entered paper application	54.5
Electronic or web-based application	33.0
Computer-read of scannable paper application	1.6
Other household application format	0.3
Don't know	6.9
No response	3.7
<i>n</i>	820

Survey question: C4

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported each application format as their most used format by the total number of SFAs that collected household applications. For SFAs that reported using one application format in C3, we considered the selected format to be their most used during SY 2022–2023.

Supplement B.3:
USDA Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Table B.3.1. Number and percentage of elementary schools that applied to participate and participated in the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program during SY 2022–2023

	Nationwide		
	#	%	Don't Know
Elementary schools that applied to participate	10,081	23	0
Elementary schools that participated	9,265	21	0
<i>n</i>	44,692	44,692	56

Survey question: C2 and C1

Source: School Meals Operations Study, State Agency Child Nutrition Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Fifty-six State agencies administered NSLP, SBP, or SSO in the 50 States, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands during this time period.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of elementary schools that applied to participate or participated in the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program by the total number of elementary schools that operated NSLP at any point during SY 2022–2023, according to State administrative data. School level data was only provided by 49 State agencies so the total number of elementary schools used in this calculation is not comprehensive.

Table B.3.2. Number and percentage of elementary school students that were served under the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program during SY 2022–2023

	Nationwide		
	#	%	Don't Know ^a
Number of elementary school students served	3,004,286	6	7
<i>n</i>	48,327,210	48,327,210	56

Survey question: C3

Source: School Meals Operations Study, State Agency Child Nutrition Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Fifty-six State agencies administered NSLP, SBP, or SSO in the 50 States, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands during this time period.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of students that State agencies reported being served under the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable program by the total number of students enrolled in schools that operated NSLP at any point during SY 2022–2023, according to State administrative data. State agencies reported enrollment data as of October 2022 on the FNS-10.

^a The number of State agencies that reported they did not know the number of elementary school students served under the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program in SY 2022–2023. These State agencies are excluded from the percentage calculations.

Table B.3.3. Number and percentage of State agencies that reported certain reasons for returning Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program funding in SY 2022–2023

Reasons	Nationwide	
	#	%
Schools did not utilize all their awarded funds	48	86
Not enough schools applied to participate in FFVP	16	29
State was unable to operate the program at full capacity	2	4
Other reasons		
Allocation limit prevented spending	2	4
LPOs unable to operate the program due to staff shortages	2	4
Overestimated the number of schools that would participate in FFVP and their expenses because the spending period-Federal fiscal year- did not align with the program year-State fiscal year	1	2
State did not return FFVP funding	2	4
Don't know	1	2
<i>n</i>	56	56

Survey question: C4

Source: School Meals Operations Study, State Agency Child Nutrition Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Fifty-six State agencies administered NSLP, SBP, or SSO in the 50 States, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands during this time period.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of State agencies that reported each reason for returning FFVP funding or not returning FFVP funding by the total number of State agencies that administered NSLP, SBP, or SSO. Respondents could select multiple reasons.

Supplement B.4:
Meal Preparation and Service

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Table B.4.1. Percentage of SFAs that reported using each source to get standardized recipes during SY 2022–2023, by SFA size

Recipe source	All SFAs %	SFA size (enrollment)				
		1-499 %	500- 2,499 %	2,500- 4,999 %	5,000- 99,999 %	100,000+ %
USDA	61.7	55.3*	66.7*	67.1	64.8	40.7*
Created in-house	46.7	41.6*	44.8	47.7	69.4*	100.0*
Institute of Child Nutrition (ICN)	41.2	33.9*	42.7	56.2*	49.3*	44.4
Food Service Management Company	23.4	17.7*	27.6*	31.6*	23.0	11.1*
State agency	22.3	17.7*	27.6*	23.6	21.0	14.8
Other	6.3	6.4	5.4	7.3	7.8	11.1
None – SFA does not use standardized recipes	3.9	6.2*	3.3	1.2*	0.5*	0.0*
None – meals prepared off-site	4.4	8.5*	1.8*	0.6*	1.1*	3.7
Don't know	0.5	1.0	0.3	0.0*	0.0*	0.0*
No response	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>n</i>	1,100	389	336	166	182	27

Survey question: G1

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported using each source to get standardized recipes by the number of SFAs within each SFA size. SFAs could select all sources that applied.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs reporting each source between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.4.2. Percentage of SFAs that reported using each source to get standardized recipes during SY 2022–2023, by SFA poverty level

Recipe source	All SFAs %	SFA poverty level	
		< 60% approved for F/RP meals %	60% + approved for F/RP meals %
USDA	61.7	61.9	61.6
Created in-house	46.7	50.9*	40.3*
Institute of Child Nutrition (ICN)	41.2	44.3*	36.7*
Food Service Management Company	23.4	23.7	23.0
State agency	22.3	24.7*	18.9*
Other	6.3	5.7	7.2
None – SFA does not use standardized recipes	3.9	4.3	3.5
None – meals prepared off-site	4.4	2.3*	7.5*
Don't know	0.5	0.5	0.5
No response	0.3	0.4	0.3
<i>n</i>	1,100	654	419

Survey question: G1

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA poverty level obtained from the latest available FNS-742 file, with missing values obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported using each source to get standardized recipes by the number of SFAs within each SFA characteristic. SFAs could select all sources that applied.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs reporting each source between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs with fewer than 60 percent of students below poverty level, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs with at least 60 percent of students above the poverty level).

Table B.4.3. Percentage of SFAs that reported using each source to get standardized recipes during SY 2022–2023, by SFA urbanicity

Recipe source	All SFAs %	SFA urbanicity		
		Suburban %	Urban %	Rural %
USDA	61.7	53.6*	49.5*	70.1*
Created in-house	46.7	46.6	41.4	48.7
Institute of Child Nutrition (ICN)	41.2	40.9	32.0*	44.9*
Food Service Management Company	23.4	31.3*	22.4	20.3*
State agency	22.3	19.2	10.5*	28.4*
Other	6.3	3.7*	6.2	7.4
None – SFA does not use standardized recipes	3.9	4.3	8.5*	2.0*
None – meals prepared off-site	4.4	4.7	9.4*	2.3*
Don't know	0.5	0.0*	1.0	0.6
No response	0.3	0.5	1.0	0.0
<i>n</i>	1,100	309	240	551

Survey question: G1

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA urbanicity obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey, with missing values imputed according to the SFA’s geographic location.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported using each source to get standardized recipes by the number of SFAs within each SFA characteristic. SFAs could select all sources that applied.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs reporting each source between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.4.4. Of SFAs that reported using standardized recipes, percentage that reported the USDA Recipe Standardization Guide was helpful during SY 2022–2023

Helpfulness of USDA Recipe Standardization Guide	Percentage of SFAs
Not at all helpful	1.2
Slightly helpful	12.1
Somewhat helpful	29.6
Very helpful	26.5
Not applicable – did not use guide	30.5
No response	0.2
<i>n</i>	1,062

Survey question: G2

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs reporting each level of helpfulness by the total number of SFAs that reported using standardized recipes.

Table B.4.5. Of SFAs that reported using standardized recipes, percentage that reported certain additional training or resource topics would be helpful during SY 2022–2023

Training or resource topic	Percentage of SFAs
Determining how recipes credit toward the meal pattern requirements	40.1
Developing seasonal menus and recipes	37.5
Conducting menu or nutrient analysis	32.3
Incorporating scratch cooking	32.2
Determining ingredient costs or price per serving for standardized recipes	26.9
Incorporating more local foods into recipes	21.4
Customizing recipes to reflect cultural foodways	19.8
Incorporating more whole foods into recipes	16.9
Other	1.9
No additional trainings needed for recipe development	13.9
No response	0.4
<i>n</i>	1,062

Survey question: G3

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported using each source to get standardized recipes by the total number of SFAs that reported using standardized recipes. SFAs could select all sources that applied.

Table B.4.6. Percentage of SFAs that preferred USDA resources as online, paper copies, or had no preference during SY 2022–2023

Recipe format	Percentage of SFAs
Online	54.6
Paper copies	14.5
No preference	30.8
No response	0.1
<i>n</i>	1,100

Survey question: G4

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs reporting each resource format by the total number of SFAs.

Table B.4.7. Percentage of SFAs that used scratch, speed-scratch, or both cooking methods to prepare meals at breakfast, lunch, or breakfast and lunch during SY 2022–2023

Meal	Scratch cooking only %	Speed-scratch cooking only %	Scratch and speed-scratch cooking %
Breakfast only	0.1	0.4	1.4
Lunch only	2.7	6.0	10.5
Breakfast and lunch	4.1	10.5	35.5
Don't know	1.7	2.3	12.8
Did not use	13.5	4.9	13.7
No response	2.0	1.0	0.0
<i>n</i>	1,100	1,100	1,100

Survey question: G5

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported using or not using each cooking method by the total number of SFAs. SFAs could select more than one cooking method and meal type.

Scratch-based food preparation: Produces meal components from whole or minimally processed basic ingredients, often using a recipe.

Speed-scratch food preparation: Produces meal components using some processed ingredients in an otherwise scratch-based food preparation, such as premade pizza dough, shredded cheese, canned pizza sauce, and pre-cut vegetables.

Table B.4.8. Percentage of SFAs that used or did not use scratch or speed-scratch cooking methods to prepare meals at breakfast or lunch during SY 2022–2023, by SFA size

Cooking method	All SFAs %	SFA size (enrollment)				
		1-499 %	500-2,499 %	2,500-4,999 %	5,000-99,999 %	100,000+ %
Scratch cooking						
Used to prepare reimbursable breakfasts	35.2	33.7	37.2	30.1	39.4	33.3
Used to prepare reimbursable lunches	54.3	50.9	55.4	56.0	61.8*	63.0
Did not use	27.2	22.4*	29.7	32.1	32.2	29.6
Don't know	14.5	22.9*	10.4*	7.1*	3.7*	3.7*
No response	2.0	1.8	2.4	3.0	1.0	0.0*
Speed-scratch cooking						
Used to prepare reimbursable breakfasts	48.6	37.3*	53.3*	59.3*	64.3*	66.7*
Used to prepare reimbursable lunches	62.6	50.4*	66.6*	76.0*	81.9*	85.2*
Did not use	18.6	19.0	20.9	16.2	11.3*	14.8
Don't know	15.1	26.0*	9.2*	4.8*	3.7*	0.0*
No response	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0
<i>n</i>	1,100	389	336	166	182	27

Survey question: G5

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported using or not using each cooking method by the number of SFAs within each SFA size. SFAs could select more than one cooking method and meal type.

Scratch-based food preparation: Produces meal components from whole or minimally processed basic ingredients, often using a recipe.

Speed-scratch food preparation: Produces meal components using some processed ingredients in an otherwise scratch-based food preparation, such as premade pizza dough, shredded cheese, canned pizza sauce, and pre-cut vegetables.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs reporting using each cooking method between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.4.9. Percentage of SFAs that used or did not use scratch or speed-scratch cooking methods to prepare meals at breakfast or lunch during SY 2022–2023, by SFA poverty level

Cooking method	All SFAs %	SFA poverty level	
		< 60% approved for F/RP meals %	60% + approved for F/RP meals %
Scratch cooking			
Used to prepare reimbursable breakfasts	35.2	35.6	34.8
Used to prepare reimbursable lunches	54.3	55.0	53.4
Did not use	27.2	26.1	28.8
Don't know	14.5	14.9	13.9
No response	2.0	2.4	1.5
Speed-scratch cooking			
Used to prepare reimbursable breakfasts	48.6	48.2	49.0
Used to prepare reimbursable lunches	62.6	63.8	60.7
Did not use	18.6	16.7	21.3
Don't know	15.1	15.6	14.4
No response	0.1	0.1	0.0
<i>n</i>	1,100	654	419

Survey question: G5

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA poverty level obtained from the latest available FNS-742 file, with missing values obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported using or not using each cooking method by the number of SFAs within each SFA poverty level. SFAs could select more than one cooking method and meal type.

Scratch-based food preparation: Produces meal components from whole or minimally processed basic ingredients, often using a recipe.

Speed-scratch food preparation: Produces meal components using some processed ingredients in an otherwise scratch-based food preparation, such as premade pizza dough, shredded cheese, canned pizza sauce, and pre-cut vegetables.

Table B.4.10. Percentage of SFAs that used or did not use scratch or speed-scratch cooking methods to prepare meals at breakfast or lunch during SY 2022–2023, by SFA urbanicity

Cooking method	All SFAs %	SFA urbanicity		
		Suburban %	Urban %	Rural %
Scratch cooking				
Used to prepare reimbursable breakfasts	35.2	27.4*	32.7	39.7*
Used to prepare reimbursable lunches	54.3	47.6*	47.6*	60.0*
Did not use	27.2	33.7*	30.0	23.2*
Don't know	14.5	15.4	17.9	12.7
No response	2.0	1.7	1.0	2.6
Speed-scratch cooking				
Used to prepare reimbursable breakfasts	48.6	45.6	42.6*	52.2*
Used to prepare reimbursable lunches	62.6	63.5	54.1*	65.5*
Did not use	18.6	19.3	22.4	16.7
Don't know	15.1	15.4	19.9*	13.0
No response	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0
<i>n</i>	1,100	309	240	551

Survey question: G5

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA urbanicity obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey, with missing values imputed according to the SFA’s geographic location.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported using or not using each cooking method by the number of SFAs within each SFA urbanicity. SFAs could select more than one cooking method and meal type.

Scratch-based food preparation: Produces meal components from whole or minimally processed basic ingredients, often using a recipe.

Speed-scratch food preparation: Produces meal components using some processed ingredients in an otherwise scratch-based food preparation, such as premade pizza dough, shredded cheese, canned pizza sauce, and pre-cut vegetables.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs reporting using each cooking method between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.4.11. Percentage of all SFAs that reported each frequency of using scratch cooking methods to prepare reimbursable meals during SY 2022–2023

Recipe format	Percentage of all SFAs
Breakfast	
Never	48.9
Less than once per week	6.0
Once per week	10.3
2-4 times per week	13.4
Every day	4.1
Don't know	15.4
No response	2.0
<i>n</i>	1,100
Lunch	
Never	29.2
Less than once per week	5.5
Once per week	12.2
2-4 times per week	29.7
Every day	6.0
Don't know	15.4
No response	2.0
<i>n</i>	1,100

Survey question: G6a

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported each frequency of using scratch cooking methods by the total number of SFAs. "Never" and "Don't know" responses include SFAs who reported "Did not use" or "Don't know" for if they used scratch cooking in question G5.

Scratch-based food preparation: Produces meal components from whole or minimally processed basic ingredients, often using a recipe.

Speed-scratch food preparation: Produces meal components using some processed ingredients in an otherwise scratch-based food preparation, such as premade pizza dough, shredded cheese, canned pizza sauce, and pre-cut vegetables.

Table B.4.12. Percentage of all SFAs that reported each frequency of using speed-scratch cooking methods to prepare reimbursable meals during SY 2022–2023

Recipe format	Percentage of all SFAs
Breakfast	
Never	37.4
Less than once per week	4.3
Once per week	11.1
2-4 times per week	21.5
Every day	9.1
Don't know	16.5
No response	0.1
<i>n</i>	1,100
Lunch	
Never	22.5
Less than once per week	4.3
Once per week	9.6
2-4 times per week	33.1
Every day	13.8
Don't know	16.5
No response	0.1
<i>n</i>	1,100

Survey question: G6b

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported each frequency of using speed-scratch cooking methods by the total number of SFAs. "Never" and "Don't know" include SFAs who reported "Did not use" or "Don't know" for if they used speed-scratch cooking in question G5.

Scratch-based food preparation: Produces meal components from whole or minimally processed basic ingredients, often using a recipe.

Speed-scratch food preparation: Produces meal components using some processed ingredients in an otherwise scratch-based food preparation, such as premade pizza dough, shredded cheese, canned pizza sauce, and pre-cut vegetables.

Table B.4.13. Of SFAs that reported they did not use scratch cooking methods, percentage that reported each challenge as being a barrier preventing them from scratch cooking more often during SY 2022–2023

Challenge	Percentage of SFAs				
	Major barrier	Minor barrier	Not a barrier	Don't know	No response
SFA needs to change oversight/monitoring methods	6.9	22.2	52.0	18.5	0.3
Unsure how to modify or are overwhelmed to modify program operations for scratch cooking	14.5	31.1	43.9	10.1	0.3
Not enough staff to scratch cook	49.0	25.4	20.8	4.5	0.2
Staff do not have enough culinary skills or training	27.8	34.1	32.5	5.4	0.3
Lack of interest or resistance from staff	19.3	31.9	42.8	5.5	0.6
Lack of interest or resistance from school administration	4.0	11.6	76.1	7.9	0.4
Not enough time for scratch cooking	41.1	32.5	20.9	5.1	0.3
Not enough space for scratch cooking	27.2	26.5	41.6	4.7	0.1
Not enough large equipment (e.g. refrigerators, ovens)	24.7	22.4	47.8	5.0	0.1
Not enough small equipment (e.g. food processors, knives)	17.2	24.1	53.4	5.1	0.1
Cost of foods	22.7	41.3	30.0	5.9	0.1
Cost of labor hours	45.5	30.0	18.7	5.7	0.2
Need to change procurement strategies and processes	12.5	30.2	44.1	12.9	0.3
Need to identify new vendors to procure foods for new menus	11.4	28.0	49.6	10.7	0.3
Locked into a contract with a vendor, cooperative purchasing group, or FSMC that doesn't sell what we need	6.1	14.1	69.8	9.8	0.1
Need to solicit or identify new recipes	11.9	36.2	44.9	6.8	0.1
Need to change menu and nutrition analysis methods to ensure menus meet meal pattern requirements	20.6	29.7	43.5	6.2	0.1
It's more challenging to prepare kosher or halal foods or foods for special diets with scratch cooking	16.0	18.4	42.8	22.6	0.1
Concern about more waste	17.1	34.6	42.6	5.5	0.1
Concern about lower participation	18.5	30.8	44.9	5.6	0.1
Concern about student acceptance of new recipes or menus	22.8	40.9	31.6	4.5	0.1
Concern about parent acceptance of new recipes or menus	8.6	31.6	53.1	6.6	0.1

Survey question: G7

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported each response option for each challenge by the number of SFAs that reported using scratch cooking methods. 918 SFAs reported used scratch cooking methods.

Scratch-based food preparation: Produces meal components from whole or minimally processed basic ingredients, often using a recipe.

Speed-scratch food preparation: Produces meal components using some processed ingredients in an otherwise scratch-based food preparation, such as premade pizza dough, shredded cheese, canned pizza sauce, and pre-cut vegetables.

Table B.4.14. Of SFAs that reported they did not use scratch cooking methods, percentage that reported each challenge as being a barrier preventing them from scratch cooking more often during SY 2022–2023, by SFA size

Challenge	All SFAs %	SFA size (enrollment)				
		1-499 %	500-2,499 %	2,500-4,999 %	5,000-99,999 %	100,000+ %
SFA needs to change oversight/monitoring methods						
Major barrier	6.9	6.7	6.5	6.5	9.0	7.7
Minor barrier	22.2	17.3*	21.8	28.0	32.7*	26.9
Not a barrier	52.0	49.5	53.9	54.7	50.6	57.7
Don't know	18.5	26.2*	17.4	10.1*	7.7*	7.7*
No response	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.6	0.0	0.0
Unsure how to modify or are overwhelmed to modify program operations for scratch cooking						
Major barrier	14.5	12.4	15.7	17.6	14.4	19.2
Minor barrier	31.1	25.1*	34.5	35.1	34.3	26.9
Not a barrier	43.9	45.9	41.3	42.0	47.8	50.0
Don't know	10.1	16.3*	8.1	4.7*	3.5*	3.8
No response	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.6	0.0	0.0
Not enough staff to scratch cook						
Major barrier	49.0	35.3*	51.6	64.2*	66.7*	84.6*
Minor barrier	25.4	26.5	24.4	24.4	26.7	15.4
Not a barrier	20.8	30.4*	19.6	11.4*	5.3*	0.0*
Don't know	4.5	7.8*	4.1	0.0*	0.5*	0.0*
No response	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.7	0.0
Staff do not have enough culinary skills or training						
Major barrier	27.8	13.5*	26.3	41.2*	61.7*	73.1*
Minor barrier	34.1	30.7	38.5*	41.0	24.1*	23.1
Not a barrier	32.5	46.6*	30.2	17.0*	12.6*	3.8*
Don't know	5.4	9.2*	4.4	0.7*	1.6*	0.0*
No response	0.3	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lack of interest or resistance from staff						
Major barrier	19.3	10.3*	19.5	28.8*	36.0*	42.3*
Minor barrier	31.9	21.6*	38.1*	40.7*	34.7	30.8
Not a barrier	42.8	59.7*	35.5*	30.5*	27.6*	26.9
Don't know	5.5	8.5*	5.8	0.0*	0.5*	0.0*
No response	0.6	0.0*	1.0	0.0*	1.2	0.0*
Lack of interest or resistance from school administration						
Major barrier	4.0	5.0	2.7	4.6	4.8	0.0*
Minor barrier	11.6	10.6	12.6	11.9	11.1	15.4
Not a barrier	76.1	73.5	76.5	79.5	79.3	76.9
Don't know	7.9	10.9*	7.5	3.3*	4.3*	7.7
No response	0.4	0.0	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.0

Challenge	All SFAs %	SFA size (enrollment)				
		1-499 %	500-2,499 %	2,500-4,999 %	5,000-99,999 %	100,000+ %
Not enough time for scratch cooking						
Major barrier	41.1	32.9*	44.7	49.8*	45.9	65.4*
Minor barrier	32.5	30.7	32.1	33.9	38.1	30.8
Not a barrier	20.9	27.6*	17.8	16.3	15.4	3.8*
Don't know	5.1	8.5*	5.1	0.0*	0.0*	0.0*
No response	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.0	0.5	0.0
Not enough space for scratch cooking						
Major barrier	27.2	23.0*	27.7	30.8	34.3*	34.6
Minor barrier	26.5	21.9*	27.7	30.4	32.4	38.5
Not a barrier	41.6	47.3*	39.9	38.1	33.3*	23.1*
Don't know	4.7	7.8*	4.4	0.7*	0.0*	3.8
No response	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Not enough large equipment (e.g. refrigerators, ovens)						
Major barrier	24.7	23.7	24.4	22.4	30.4	46.2*
Minor barrier	22.4	18.4*	21.1	30.8*	30.1*	30.8
Not a barrier	47.8	49.8	49.7	44.8	39.0*	23.1*
Don't know	5.0	8.1*	4.4	2.1*	0.5*	0.0*
No response	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Not enough small equipment (e.g. food processors, knives)						
Major barrier	17.2	17.3	16.8	14.0	21.4	23.1
Minor barrier	24.1	19.8*	24.3	29.5	30.8	53.8*
Not a barrier	53.4	54.8	53.8	54.5	47.3	23.1*
Don't know	5.1	8.1*	4.7	2.1*	0.5*	0.0*
No response	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cost of foods						
Major barrier	22.7	20.5	24.4	20.7	25.5	30.8
Minor barrier	41.3	37.4	43.2	52.0*	37.6	23.1*
Not a barrier	30.0	31.1	27.6	27.4	35.8	46.2
Don't know	5.9	11.0*	4.5	0.0*	1.0*	0.0*
No response	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cost of labor hours						
Major barrier	45.5	36.4*	43.0	63.3*	63.1*	61.5
Minor barrier	30.0	29.0	34.0*	25.3	24.8	23.1
Not a barrier	18.7	25.1*	17.1	11.4*	11.4*	15.4
Don't know	5.7	9.5*	5.5	0.0*	0.0*	0.0*
No response	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.7	0.0
Need to change procurement strategies and processes						
Major barrier	12.5	10.6	12.5	14.8	15.8	26.9
Minor barrier	30.2	26.1*	28.5	38.5*	40.2*	23.1

Supplement B.4: Meal Preparation and Service

Challenge	All SFAs %	SFA size (enrollment)				
		1-499 %	500-2,499 %	2,500-4,999 %	5,000-99,999 %	100,000+ %
Not a barrier	44.1	42.0	47.7	41.9	41.0	46.2
Don't know	12.9	20.8*	10.9	4.8*	3.0*	3.8*
No response	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Need to identify new vendors to procure foods for new menus						
Major barrier	11.4	13.4	7.9*	14.9	13.3	15.4
Minor barrier	28.0	18.4*	31.7	32.0	40.4*	38.5
Not a barrier	49.6	50.5	50.4	49.6	44.6	42.3
Don't know	10.7	17.3*	9.6	3.5*	1.2*	3.8
No response	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.0	0.5	0.0
Locked into a new contract with a vendor, cooperative purchasing group, or FSMC that doesn't sell what we'd need						
Major barrier	6.1	7.1	4.8	8.9	4.8	15.4
Minor barrier	14.1	7.8*	17.5*	16.0	20.5*	7.7
Not a barrier	69.8	69.3	69.2	71.9	71.9	65.4
Don't know	9.8	15.9*	8.2	3.3*	2.8*	11.5
No response	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Need to solicit or identify new recipes						
Major barrier	11.9	11.0	10.4	18.9*	13.1	19.2
Minor barrier	36.2	28.3*	40.9*	41.4	40.2	42.3
Not a barrier	44.9	48.4	42.9	39.7	45.5	38.5
Don't know	6.8	12.4*	5.5	0.0*	1.2*	0.0*
No response	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Need to change menu and nutrition analysis methods to ensure menus meet meal pattern requirements						
Major barrier	20.6	19.8	19.7	28.7*	18.1	19.2
Minor barrier	29.7	25.1*	33.6	30.2	30.7	19.2
Not a barrier	43.5	43.1	42.3	41.2	49.8	61.5
Don't know	6.2	12.0*	4.1*	0.0*	1.4*	0.0*
No response	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
It's more challenging to prepare kosher or halal foods or foods for special diets with scratch cooking						
Major barrier	16.0	10.6*	15.3	24.3*	26.0*	34.6*
Minor barrier	18.4	15.5	18.7	19.9	24.7	15.4
Not a barrier	42.8	45.6	45.4	35.7	33.0*	42.3
Don't know	22.6	28.3*	20.2	20.1	16.3*	7.7*
No response	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Concern about more waste						
Major barrier	17.1	14.8	17.9	20.2	18.6	7.7
Minor barrier	34.6	31.8	34.2	41.7	38.0	30.8
Not a barrier	42.6	43.5	43.5	38.2	41.1	61.5
Don't know	5.5	9.9*	4.1	0.0*	2.3*	0.0*

Challenge	All SFAs %	SFA size (enrollment)				
		1-499 %	500-2,499 %	2,500-4,999 %	5,000-99,999 %	100,000+ %
No response	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Concern about lower participation						
Major barrier	18.5	16.3	19.9	24.0	16.2	3.8*
Minor barrier	30.8	25.8*	33.2	35.6	33.9	23.1
Not a barrier	44.9	47.7	42.2	40.5	48.9	73.1*
Don't know	5.6	10.2*	4.4	0.0*	1.0*	0.0*
No response	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Concern about student acceptance of new recipes or menus						
Major barrier	22.8	21.9	22.6	27.3	22.4	11.5
Minor barrier	40.9	36.4*	43.4	43.9	43.8	23.1*
Not a barrier	31.6	33.2	30.6	28.9	32.2	65.4*
Don't know	4.5	8.5*	3.1	0.0*	1.6*	0.0*
No response	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Concern about parent acceptance of new recipes or menus						
Major barrier	8.6	9.6	8.6	10.0	4.8*	0.0*
Minor barrier	31.6	23.3*	35.0	38.0	39.6*	26.9
Not a barrier	53.1	56.5	50.7	48.6	54.0	69.2
Don't know	6.6	10.6*	5.5	3.3*	1.6*	3.8
No response	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>n</i>	918	283	293	150	166	26

Survey question: G7

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported each response option for each challenge by the number of SFAs within each SFA size.

Scratch-based food preparation: Produces meal components from whole or minimally processed basic ingredients, often using a recipe.

Speed-scratch food preparation: Produces meal components using some processed ingredients in an otherwise scratch-based food preparation, such as premade pizza dough, shredded cheese, canned pizza sauce, and pre-cut vegetables.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs reporting a challenge as being a barrier between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.4.15. Of SFAs that reported they did not use scratch cooking methods, percentage that reported each challenge as being a barrier preventing them from scratch cooking more often during SY 2022–2023, by SFA poverty level

Challenge	All SFAs %	SFA poverty level	
		< 60% approved for F/RP meals %	60% + approved for F/RP meals %
SFA needs to change oversight/monitoring methods			
Major barrier	6.9	6.0	8.2
Minor barrier	22.2	22.7	21.5
Not a barrier	52.0	53.0	50.4
Don't know	18.5	17.9	19.5
No response	0.3	0.3	0.3
Unsure how to modify or are overwhelmed to modify program operations for scratch cooking			
Major barrier	14.5	12.9	16.9
Minor barrier	31.1	31.9	29.8
Not a barrier	43.9	44.4	43.3
Don't know	10.1	10.4	9.7
No response	0.3	0.3	0.3
Not enough staff to scratch cook			
Major barrier	49.0	48.1	50.2
Minor barrier	25.4	26.7	23.7
Not a barrier	20.8	20.3	21.6
Don't know	4.5	4.8	4.2
No response	0.2	0.2	0.2
Staff do not have enough culinary skills or training			
Major barrier	27.8	25.4	31.1
Minor barrier	34.1	36.3	31.0
Not a barrier	32.5	32.4	32.6
Don't know	5.4	5.4	5.4
No response	0.3	0.4	0.0
Lack of interest or resistance from staff			
Major barrier	19.3	16.9*	22.6*
Minor barrier	31.9	33.4	29.7
Not a barrier	42.8	43.8	41.6
Don't know	5.5	5.4	5.5
No response	0.6	0.6	0.6
Lack of interest or resistance from school administration			
Major barrier	4.0	3.6	4.6
Minor barrier	11.6	11.8	11.3
Not a barrier	76.1	75.8	76.5
Don't know	7.9	8.1	7.6
No response	0.4	0.7	0.0

Challenge	All SFAs %	SFA poverty level	
		< 60% approved for F/RP meals %	60% + approved for F/RP meals %
Not enough time for scratch cooking			
Major barrier	41.1	41.4	40.6
Minor barrier	32.5	33.7	31.0
Not a barrier	20.9	19.5	23.0
Don't know	5.1	5.1	5.2
No response	0.3	0.3	0.3
Not enough space for scratch cooking			
Major barrier	27.2	24.1*	31.5*
Minor barrier	26.5	27.3	25.2
Not a barrier	41.6	43.7	38.6
Don't know	4.7	4.6	4.7
No response	0.1	0.2	0.0
Not enough large equipment (e.g. refrigerators, ovens)			
Major barrier	24.7	22.4	27.9
Minor barrier	22.4	21.8	23.1
Not a barrier	47.8	50.2	44.5
Don't know	5.0	5.3	4.6
No response	0.1	0.2	0.0
Not enough small equipment (e.g. food processors, knives)			
Major barrier	17.2	15.9	19.1
Minor barrier	24.1	22.6	26.1
Not a barrier	53.4	55.9	49.8
Don't know	5.1	5.3	4.9
No response	0.1	0.2	0.0
Cost of foods			
Major barrier	22.7	20.5	25.7
Minor barrier	41.3	45.7*	35.2*
Not a barrier	30.0	28.5	32.0
Don't know	5.9	5.1	7.1
No response	0.1	0.2	0.0
Cost of labor hours			
Major barrier	45.5	44.6	46.7
Minor barrier	30.0	31.8	27.5
Not a barrier	18.7	18.1	19.4
Don't know	5.7	5.3	6.2
No response	0.2	0.2	0.2

Challenge	All SFAs %	SFA poverty level	
		< 60% approved for F/RP meals %	60% + approved for F/RP meals %
Need to change procurement strategies and processes			
Major barrier	12.5	11.2	14.3
Minor barrier	30.2	29.2	31.7
Not a barrier	44.1	45.7	41.8
Don't know	12.9	13.6	11.8
No response	0.3	0.2	0.3
Need to identify new vendors to procure foods for new menus			
Major barrier	11.4	8.7*	15.3*
Minor barrier	28.0	26.9	29.4
Not a barrier	49.6	53.0*	44.8*
Don't know	10.7	10.8	10.5
No response	0.3	0.6	0.0
Locked into a new contract with a vendor, cooperative purchasing group, or FSMC that doesn't sell what we'd need			
Major barrier	6.1	4.1*	9.0*
Minor barrier	14.1	13.6	14.8
Not a barrier	69.8	71.4	67.6
Don't know	9.8	10.7	8.6
No response	0.1	0.2	0.0
Need to solicit or identify new recipes			
Major barrier	11.9	8.6*	16.6*
Minor barrier	36.2	38.3	33.3
Not a barrier	44.9	46.6	42.4
Don't know	6.8	6.3	7.7
No response	0.1	0.2	0.0
Need to change menu and nutrition analysis methods to ensure menus meet meal pattern requirements			
Major barrier	20.6	20.1	21.3
Minor barrier	29.7	29.7	29.7
Not a barrier	43.5	44.1	42.5
Don't know	6.2	6.0	6.5
No response	0.1	0.2	0.0
It's more challenging to prepare kosher or halal foods or foods for special diets with scratch cooking			
Major barrier	16.0	13.2*	19.9*
Minor barrier	18.4	19.5	16.9
Not a barrier	42.8	44.8	40.0
Don't know	22.6	22.2	23.2
No response	0.1	0.2	0.0

Challenge	All SFAs %	SFA poverty level	
		< 60% approved for F/RP meals %	60% + approved for F/RP meals %
Concern about more waste			
Major barrier	17.1	14.5*	20.9*
Minor barrier	34.6	35.8	33.0
Not a barrier	42.6	43.8	40.8
Don't know	5.5	5.6	5.4
No response	0.1	0.2	0.0
Concern about lower participation			
Major barrier	18.5	17.4	20.3
Minor barrier	30.8	31.7	29.5
Not a barrier	44.9	44.9	44.7
Don't know	5.6	5.8	5.5
No response	0.1	0.2	0.0
Concern about student acceptance of new recipes or menus			
Major barrier	22.8	21.5	24.8
Minor barrier	40.9	43.0	37.9
Not a barrier	31.6	31.2	32.1
Don't know	4.5	4.1	5.2
No response	0.1	0.2	0.0
Concern about parent acceptance of new recipes or menus			
Major barrier	8.6	6.8*	11.2*
Minor barrier	31.6	31.0	32.4
Not a barrier	53.1	55.7	49.1
Don't know	6.6	6.2	7.2
No response	0.1	0.2	0.0
<i>n</i>	918	541	351

Survey question: G7

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA poverty level obtained from the latest available FNS-742 file, with missing values obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported each response option for each challenge by the number of SFAs within each SFA poverty level.

Scratch-based food preparation: Produces meal components from whole or minimally processed basic ingredients, often using a recipe.

Speed-scratch food preparation: Produces meal components using some processed ingredients in an otherwise scratch-based food preparation, such as premade pizza dough, shredded cheese, canned pizza sauce, and pre-cut vegetables.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs reporting a challenge as being a barrier between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs with fewer than 60 percent of students below poverty level, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs with at least 60 percent of students above the poverty level).

Table B.4.16. Of SFAs that reported they did not use scratch cooking methods, percentage that reported each challenge as being a barrier preventing them from scratch cooking more often during SY 2022–2023, by SFA urbanicity

Challenge	All SFAs %	SFA urbanicity		
		Suburban %	Urban %	Rural %
SFA needs to change oversight/monitoring methods				
Major barrier	6.9	6.9	7.4	6.7
Minor barrier	22.2	26.4	15.6*	22.9
Not a barrier	52.0	52.9	58.4	49.3
Don't know	18.5	13.5*	18.0	20.8
No response	0.3	0.3	0.7	0.2
Unsure how to modify or are overwhelmed to modify program operations for scratch cooking				
Major barrier	14.5	14.2	14.5	14.7
Minor barrier	31.1	30.8	21.6*	34.5*
Not a barrier	43.9	44.4	50.8*	41.3
Don't know	10.1	10.3	11.8	9.5
No response	0.3	0.3	1.3	0.0
Not enough staff to scratch cook				
Major barrier	49.0	57.6*	47.8	45.9*
Minor barrier	25.4	23.0	19.6*	28.5*
Not a barrier	20.8	14.8*	24.2	22.1
Don't know	4.5	4.7	7.3	3.5
No response	0.2	0.0	1.1	0.0
Staff do not have enough culinary skills or training				
Major barrier	27.8	39.4*	28.5	22.7*
Minor barrier	34.1	32.8	25.7*	37.6*
Not a barrier	32.5	21.7*	36.9	35.4*
Don't know	5.4	6.0	8.3	4.1
No response	0.3	0.0	0.7	0.2
Lack of interest or resistance from staff				
Major barrier	19.3	24.1*	17.2	18.0
Minor barrier	31.9	34.9	21.2*	34.4
Not a barrier	42.8	35.5*	51.1*	43.0
Don't know	5.5	5.2	8.6	4.5
No response	0.6	0.3	1.8	0.2
Lack of interest or resistance from school administration				
Major barrier	4.0	4.2	7.2	2.8*
Minor barrier	11.6	14.9	11.7	10.2
Not a barrier	76.1	71.8	70.1	80.0*
Don't know	7.9	8.6	10.4	6.7
No response	0.4	0.6	0.7	0.2

Challenge	All SFAs %	SFA urbanicity		
		Suburban %	Urban %	Rural %
Not enough time for scratch cooking				
Major barrier	41.1	45.9	41.1	39.1
Minor barrier	32.5	30.7	22.5*	36.9*
Not a barrier	20.9	17.6	26.5	20.3
Don't know	5.1	5.5	9.2*	3.5*
No response	0.3	0.3	0.7	0.2
Not enough space for scratch cooking				
Major barrier	27.2	33.2*	34.8*	21.9*
Minor barrier	26.5	29.2	18.1*	28.3
Not a barrier	41.6	33.2*	39.2	45.9*
Don't know	4.7	4.4	7.3	3.9
No response	0.1	0.0	0.7	0.0
Not enough large equipment (e.g. refrigerators, ovens)				
Major barrier	24.7	31.6*	32.3*	19.1*
Minor barrier	22.4	26.6	17.7	22.2
Not a barrier	47.8	36.6*	41.4	54.8*
Don't know	5.0	5.2	7.9	3.9
No response	0.1	0.0	0.7	0.0
Not enough small equipment (e.g. food processors, knives)				
Major barrier	17.2	20.0	24.1*	13.6*
Minor barrier	24.1	24.9	22.7	24.3
Not a barrier	53.4	49.9	44.6*	57.9*
Don't know	5.1	5.2	7.9	4.1
No response	0.1	0.0	0.7	0.0
Cost of foods				
Major barrier	22.7	24.8	22.9	21.7
Minor barrier	41.3	43.3	32.7*	43.5
Not a barrier	30.0	26.9	33.2	30.1
Don't know	5.9	5.0	10.5*	4.7
No response	0.1	0.0	0.7	0.0
Cost of labor hours				
Major barrier	45.5	54.1*	45.8	41.7*
Minor barrier	30.0	28.3	22.9*	33.2*
Not a barrier	18.7	12.6*	21.4	20.3
Don't know	5.7	5.0	9.3	4.7
No response	0.2	0.0	0.7	0.2

Challenge	All SFAs %	SFA urbanicity		
		Suburban %	Urban %	Rural %
Need to change procurement strategies and processes				
Major barrier	12.5	17.6*	13.6	10.0*
Minor barrier	30.2	31.0	33.2	28.9
Not a barrier	44.1	42.7	40.5	46.0
Don't know	12.9	8.7*	11.4	15.1*
No response	0.3	0.0	1.3	0.0
Need to identify new vendors to procure foods for new menus				
Major barrier	11.4	11.5	15.4	10.0
Minor barrier	28.0	32.5	23.6	27.6
Not a barrier	49.6	48.1	48.5	50.6
Don't know	10.7	7.9	11.5	11.5
No response	0.3	0.0	1.0	0.2
Locked into a new contract with a vendor, cooperative purchasing group, or FSMC that doesn't sell what we'd need				
Major barrier	6.1	9.1	5.6	5.1
Minor barrier	14.1	16.0	11.0	14.4
Not a barrier	69.8	67.8	71.9	70.0
Don't know	9.8	7.1	10.9	10.5
No response	0.1	0.0	0.7	0.0
Need to solicit or identify new recipes				
Major barrier	11.9	14.4	12.9	10.5
Minor barrier	36.2	35.5	22.8*	41.2*
Not a barrier	44.9	45.8	52.7*	41.7*
Don't know	6.8	4.2	10.9	6.5
No response	0.1	0.0	0.7	0.0
Need to change menu and nutrition analysis methods to ensure menus meet meal pattern requirements				
Major barrier	20.6	21.9	20.5	20.0
Minor barrier	29.7	28.3	22.6*	32.7*
Not a barrier	43.5	44.9	46.6	41.7
Don't know	6.2	4.8	9.7	5.6
No response	0.1	0.0	0.7	0.0
It's more challenging to prepare kosher or halal foods or foods for special diets with scratch cooking				
Major barrier	16.0	23.9*	21.9*	10.6*
Minor barrier	18.4	16.1	18.0	19.6
Not a barrier	42.8	39.4	34.8*	47.1*
Don't know	22.6	20.6	24.7	22.7
No response	0.1	0.0	0.7	0.0

Challenge	All SFAs %	SFA urbanicity		
		Suburban %	Urban %	Rural %
Concern about more waste				
Major barrier	17.1	20.1	13.7	17.1
Minor barrier	34.6	37.0	26.2*	36.6
Not a barrier	42.6	37.8	49.4	42.3
Don't know	5.5	5.1	10.2*	4.1*
No response	0.1	0.0	0.7	0.0
Concern about lower participation				
Major barrier	18.5	21.6	13.5*	19.1
Minor barrier	30.8	31.1	24.3*	33.0
Not a barrier	44.9	42.1	51.4	43.8
Don't know	5.6	5.2	10.2*	4.2
No response	0.1	0.0	0.7	0.0
Concern about student acceptance of new recipes or menus				
Major barrier	22.8	22.8	17.4*	24.8
Minor barrier	40.9	40.8	32.4*	43.9*
Not a barrier	31.6	32.9	41.1*	27.8*
Don't know	4.5	3.6	8.5*	3.5
No response	0.1	0.0	0.7	0.0
Concern about parent acceptance of new recipes or menus				
Major barrier	8.6	8.0	9.7	8.5
Minor barrier	31.6	36.5	21.6*	33.1
Not a barrier	53.1	49.9	59.2	52.2
Don't know	6.6	5.6	8.9	6.2
No response	0.1	0.0	0.7	0.0
<i>n</i>	918	259	189	470

Survey question: G7

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA urbanicity obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey, with missing values imputed according to the SFA’s geographic location.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported each response option for each challenge by the number of SFAs within each urbanicity level.

Scratch-based food preparation: Produces meal components from whole or minimally processed basic ingredients, often using a recipe.

Speed-scratch food preparation: Produces meal components using some processed ingredients in an otherwise scratch-based food preparation, such as premade pizza dough, shredded cheese, canned pizza sauce, and pre-cut vegetables.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs reporting each challenge as being a barrier between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.4.17. Percentage of SFAs that reported certain frequencies of offering a daily breakfast menu without animal-based proteins (meat, poultry, fish, eggs, or dairy) during SY 2022–2023, by school type

Frequency	All SFAs %	SFA school types			
		Elementary %	Middle %	High %	Other %
Never	41.7	40.2	40.1	39.6	37.3
Less than once per week	7.5	7.9	7.4	7.4	5.3
Once per week	9.2	8.3	8.2	8.8	8.9
2-4 times per week	21.8	21.3	21.3	19.9	19.4
Every day	11.9	10.4	11.6	13.6	11.0
Don't know	13.9	11.8	11.3	10.5	17.1
No response	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.2	1.0
<i>n</i>	1,100	934	861	807	262

Survey question: G8

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs reporting each frequency by the total number of SFAs within each school type.

Table B.4.18. Percentage of SFAs that reported certain frequencies of offering a daily breakfast menu without animal-based proteins (meat, poultry, fish, eggs, or dairy) during SY 2022–2023, by SFA size

Frequency	All SFAs %	SFA size				
		1-499 %	500-2,499 %	2,500-4,999 %	5,000-99,999 %	100,000+ %
Never	41.7	47.8*	38.1	36.2	36.6	22.2*
Less than once per week	7.5	5.1*	9.3	10.2	8.1	14.8
Once per week	9.2	6.2*	11.1	13.4	10.6	18.5
2-4 times per week	21.8	16.7*	24.2	26.8	28.8*	7.4*
Every day	11.9	4.6*	14.2	20.9*	22.6*	37.0*
Don't know	13.9	21.1*	10.4*	6.6*	6.0*	0.0*
No response	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.5	0.0
<i>n</i>	1,100	389	336	166	182	27

Survey question: G8

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs reporting each frequency by the total number of SFAs within each SFA size.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs reporting each frequency between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.4.19. Percentage of SFAs that reported certain frequencies of offering a daily breakfast menu without animal-based proteins (meat, poultry, fish, eggs, or dairy) during SY 2022–2023, by SFA poverty level

Frequency	All SFAs %	SFA poverty level	
		< 60% approved for F/RP meals %	60% + approved for F/RP meals %
Never	41.7	42.3	41.1
Less than once per week	7.5	6.7	8.7
Once per week	9.2	8.3	10.5
2-4 times per week	21.8	20.8	23.5
Every day	11.9	13.0	10.2
Don't know	13.9	15.4	11.8
No response	0.3	0.3	0.4
<i>N</i>	1,100	654	419

Survey question: G8

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs reporting each frequency by the total number of SFAs within each SFA poverty level.

Table B.4.20. Percentage of SFAs that reported certain frequencies of offering a daily breakfast menu without animal-based proteins (meat, poultry, fish, eggs, or dairy) during SY 2022–2023, by SFA urbanicity

Frequency	All SFAs %	SFA urbanicity		
		Urban %	Suburban %	Rural %
Never	41.7	44.0	44.0	39.9
Less than once per week	7.5	4.4*	7.9	8.6
Once per week	9.2	8.8	8.5	9.7
2-4 times per week	21.8	21.2	21.0	22.5
Every day	11.9	10.5	16.8*	10.3
Don't know	13.9	15.1	10.0*	15.2
No response	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.2
<i>n</i>	1,100	240	309	551

Survey question: G8

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs reporting each frequency by the total number of SFAs within each SFA urbanicity.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs reporting each frequency between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.4.21. Percentage of SFAs that reported certain frequencies of offering a daily lunch menu without animal-based proteins (meat, poultry, fish, eggs, or dairy) during SY 2022–2023, by school type

Frequency	All SFAs %	SFA school types			
		Elementary %	Middle %	High %	Other %
Never	55.2	54.7	53.9	54.9	58.3
Less than once per week	10.1	10.0	9.5	9.1	6.9
Once per week	7.8	7.3	6.8	5.6	8.1
2-4 times per week	7.2	6.4	7.2	6.5	7.4
Every day	12.0	10.4	11.9	14.0	7.7
Don't know	12.1	11.1	10.7	9.9	11.2
No response	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.2
<i>n</i>	1,100	934	861	807	262

Survey question: G9

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs reporting each frequency by the total number of SFAs within each school type.

Table B.4.22. Percentage of SFAs that reported certain frequencies of offering a daily lunch menu without animal-based proteins (meat, poultry, fish, eggs, or dairy) during SY 2022–2023, by SFA size

Frequency	All SFAs %	SFA size				
		1-499 %	500-2,499 %	2,500-4,999 %	5,000-99,999 %	100,000+ %
Never	55.2	57.8	54.2	56.8	47.7*	37.0
Less than once per week	10.1	9.3	10.4	9.6	13.0	22.2
Once per week	7.8	6.7	8.7	7.3	9.6	7.4
2-4 times per week	7.2	5.9	6.9	9.6	10.6	18.5
Every day	12.0	4.4*	14.5	19.5*	24.4*	29.6*
Don't know	12.1	17.0*	10.1	6.0*	6.2*	0.0*
No response	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.5	0.0
<i>n</i>	1,100	389	336	166	182	27

Survey question: G9

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs reporting each frequency by the total number of SFAs within each SFA size.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs reporting each frequency between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.4.23. Percentage of SFAs that reported certain frequencies of offering a daily lunch menu without animal-based proteins (meat, poultry, fish, eggs, or dairy) during SY 2022–2023, by SFA poverty level

Frequency	All SFAs %	SFA poverty level	
		< 60% approved for F/RP meals %	60% + approved for F/RP meals %
Never	55.2	53.9	57.3
Less than once per week	10.1	10.6	9.4
Once per week	7.8	7.6	8.2
2-4 times per week	7.2	6.2	8.7
Every day	12.0	13.6*	9.6*
Don't know	12.1	12.9	10.9
No response	0.2	0.1	0.3
<i>n</i>	1,100	654	419

Survey question: G9

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs reporting each frequency by the total number of SFAs within each SFA poverty level.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs reporting each frequency between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.4.24. Percentage of SFAs that reported certain frequencies of offering a daily lunch menu without animal-based proteins (meat, poultry, fish, eggs, or dairy) during SY 2022–2023, by SFA urbanicity

Frequency	All SFAs %	SFA urbanicity		
		Urban %	Suburban %	Rural %
Never	55.2	51.6	53.8	57.3
Less than once per week	10.1	9.0	8.6	11.3
Once per week	7.8	12.0*	8.7	5.8*
2-4 times per week	7.2	8.4	9.2	5.9
Every day	12.0	10.2	16.9*	10.6
Don't know	12.1	12.4	10.6	12.6
No response	0.2	0.0	0.7	0.0
<i>n</i>	1,100	240	309	551

Survey question: G9

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs reporting each frequency by the total number of SFAs within each SFA urbanicity.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs reporting each frequency between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.4.25. Percentage of SFAs that reported certain challenges in making accommodations for students with disabilities during SY 2022–2023, by SFA characteristic

Challenge	All SFAs %	SFA size (enrollment)					SFA poverty level		SFA urbanicity		
		1-499 %	500-2,499 %	2,500-4,999 %	5,000-99,999 %	100,000+ %	< 60% %	60% + %	Suburban %	Urban %	Rural %
Meal or food component substitutions	51.1	41.1*	55.5*	56.7	67.8*	59.3	49.2	53.7	51.2	50.4	51.3
Obtaining needed medical statements	49.2	38.3*	52.2	61.3*	68.0*	70.4*	46.0*	53.7*	49.2	45.5	50.7
Tracking individual student needs	29.3	25.5*	28.1	37.0*	39.9*	55.6*	28.6	30.2	29.8	28.0	29.6
Working with parents or guardians	27.9	19.0*	29.4	38.9*	45.2*	59.3*	26.8	29.4	30.9	25.4	27.6
Ingredient tracking	24.7	19.0*	25.6	28.7	39.4*	25.9	26.7	22.0	29.4	18.5*	25.2
Training staff	22.4	17.0*	32.2	27.9	34.3*	40.7	21.4	23.7	23.8	21.3	22.2
Cross-contamination/cross-contact	14.8	11.0*	16.6	16.0	22.1*	11.1	17.4*	11.1*	16.4	13.2	14.8
Physical accessibility of meal service	5.4	2.8*	7.5*	6.1	7.3	3.7	4.6	6.6	6.3	3.8	5.6
Not applicable – no challenges or no students with disabilities	9.4	15.4*	5.9*	5.2*	3.1*	3.7	10.4	8.1	11.1	13.0	7.3*
Other ^a	1.3	2.1	0.3*	0.0*	2.6	14.8*	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.6	1.2
No response	1.1	2.1*	0.6	0.0*	0.0*	0.0*	1.3	0.8	2.2	0.5	0.8
<i>n</i>	1,100	389	336	166	182	27	654	419	309	240	551

Survey question: G10

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA poverty level obtained from the latest available FNS-742 file, with missing values obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey. SFA urbanicity obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey, with missing values imputed according to the SFA’s geographic location.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs reporting each challenge by the total number of SFAs within each SFA characteristic. SFAs could select multiple challenges.

^a Other challenges SFAs reported in making accommodations for students with disabilities included the cost of acquiring foods.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs reporting a challenge between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic)

Supplement B.5:
Additional Funding Sources Available to School Food Authorities

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Table B.5.1. Number and percentage of State agencies that provided SFAs subsidies in addition to Federal reimbursements for breakfasts in SY 2022–2023, nationwide and by FNS region

	Nationwide		MARO		MPRO		MWRO		NERO		SERO		SWRO		WRO	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State agencies that provided subsidies to SFAs for breakfasts	29	52	6	75	3	38	5	71	7	88	2	25	1	11	5	63
State agencies that did not provide subsidies to SFAs for breakfasts	27	48	2	25	5	63	2	29	1	13	6	75	8	89	3	38
n	56	46	8	8	8	8	7	7	8	8	8	8	9	9	8	8

Survey question: D1

Source: School Meals Operations Study, State Agency Child Nutrition Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Fifty-six State agencies administered NSLP, SBP, or SSO in the 50 States, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands during this time period.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of State agencies that reported providing subsidies to SFAs for breakfasts in SY 2022–2023 by the total number of State agencies that administered NSLP, SBP, or SSO, nationwide or in the region.

Table B.5.2. Number and percentage of State agencies that provided SFAs certain subsidies in addition to Federal reimbursements for breakfasts in SY 2022–2023, nationwide

Subsidies	Nationwide	
	#	%
Per-meal reimbursement based on the number of reduced-price meals	20	36
Per-meal reimbursement based on the number of paid meals	11	20
Per-meal reimbursement based on the number of free meals	8	14
Supplement to cover specific costs	6	11
Universal free breakfast	5	9
Amount based on a percentage of low-income students	3	5
Annual lump sum	3	5
Other subsidies	5	9
Grant funds to improve participation	1	2
Paid the difference between free and paid reimbursement rates in CEP schools	1	2
Per-meal reimbursement based on the number of breakfasts served in prior school year	1	2
Per-meal reimbursement based on the total number of meals served	1	2
Per-meal reimbursement for SFAs operating a Breakfast After the Bell program	1	2
Did not provide subsidies in addition to federal reimbursements for breakfasts	27	48
n	56	56

Survey question: D1 and D2

Source: School Meals Operations Study, State Agency Child Nutrition Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Fifty-six State agencies administered NSLP, SBP, or SSO in the 50 States, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands during this time period.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of State agencies that reported providing each subsidy to SFAs for breakfasts in SY 2022–2023 by the total number of State agencies that administered NSLP, SBP, or SSO. Respondents could select multiple subsidies.

Table B.5.3. Number and percentage of State agencies that provided SFAs subsidies in addition to Federal reimbursements for lunches in SY 2022–2023, nationwide and by FNS region

	Nationwide		MARO		MPRO		MWRO		NERO		SERO		SWRO		WRO	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State agencies that provided subsidies to SFAs for lunches	26	46	5	63	2	25	4	57	6	75	2	25	2	22	5	63
State agencies that did not provide subsidies to SFAs for lunches	30	54	3	38	6	75	3	43	2	25	6	75	7	78	3	38
<i>n</i>	56	56	8	8	8	8	7	7	8	8	8	8	9	9	8	8

Survey question: D3

Source: School Meals Operations Study, State Agency Child Nutrition Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Fifty-six State agencies administered NSLP, SBP, or SSO in the 50 States, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands during this time period.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of State agencies that reported providing subsidies to SFAs for lunches in SY 2022–2023 by the total number of State agencies that administered NSLP, SBP, or SSO, nationwide or in the region.

Table B.5.4. Number and percentage of State agencies that provided certain subsidies in addition to Federal reimbursements for lunches in SY 2022–2023, nationwide

Subsidies	Nationwide	
	#	%
Per-meal reimbursement based on the number of reduced-price meals	18	32
Per-meal reimbursement based on the number of paid meals	11	20
Per-meal reimbursement based on the number of free meals	9	16
Supplement to cover specific costs	7	13
Universal free lunch	4	7
Annual lump sum	1	2
Amount based on a percentage of low-income students	1	2
Other subsidies	5	9
Paid the difference between free and paid reimbursement rates	1	2
Per-meal reimbursement based on the number of lunches served	1	2
Per-meal reimbursement based on the number of lunches served in prior school year	1	2
Per-meal reimbursement based on the number of meals served	1	2
Per-meal reimbursement based on the total number of meals served	1	2
Did not provide subsidies in addition to federal reimbursements for lunches	30	54
<i>n</i>	56	56

Survey question: D3 and D4

Source: School Meals Operations Study, State Agency Child Nutrition Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Fifty-six State agencies administered NSLP, SBP, or SSO in the 50 States, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands during this time period.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of State agencies that reported providing each subsidy to SFAs for lunches in SY 2022–2023 by the total number of State agencies that administered NSLP, SBP, or SSO. Respondents could select multiple subsidies.

Table B.5.5. States that provided SFAs subsidies in addition to Federal reimbursements for breakfasts only, lunches only, or both breakfasts and lunches in SY 2022–2023

Provided subsidies for breakfasts only	Provided subsidies for lunches only	Provided subsidies for breakfasts and lunches	Did not provide subsidies in addition to Federal reimbursements
Nebraska	Kansas	Arizona	Alabama
New Hampshire	Utah	California	Alaska
North Dakota		Colorado	Arkansas ^a
Puerto Rico		Connecticut	Delaware
Wisconsin		District of Columbia	Georgia
		Florida	Hawaii
		Guam	Idaho
		Illinois	Indiana
		Iowa	Kentucky
		Maine	Louisiana
		Maryland	Mississippi
		Massachusetts	Missouri
		Michigan	Montana
		Minnesota	New Mexico
		Nevada	Ohio
		New Jersey	Oklahoma ^a
		New York	South Carolina
		North Carolina	South Dakota
		Oregon	Tennessee
		Pennsylvania	Texas
		Rhode Island	U.S. Virgin Islands
		Vermont	West Virginia
		Virginia	Wyoming
		Washington	

Survey questions: D1 and D3

Source: School Meals Operations Study, State Agency Child Nutrition Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Fifty-six State agencies administered NSLP, SBP, or SSO in the 50 States, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands during this time period.

^a Two State agencies administered NSLP, SBP, or SSO in their respective State and neither provided subsidies for breakfasts or lunches in SY 2022–2023

Table B.5.6. Number and percentage of States that provided SFAs subsidies in addition to Federal reimbursements for breakfasts only, lunches only, or both breakfasts and lunches in SY 2022–2023

	Nationwide	
	#	%
Provided subsidies for breakfasts only	5	9
Provided subsidies for lunches only SFAs for lunches	2	4
Provided subsidies for breakfasts and lunches	24	44
Did not provide subsidies in addition to Federal reimbursements ^a	23	43
<i>n</i>	54	56

Survey questions: D1 and D3

Source: School Meals Operations Study, State Agency Child Nutrition Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Fifty-six State agencies administered NSLP, SBP, or SSO in the 50 States, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands during this time period.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of States with agencies that reported providing each subsidy to SFAs for breakfasts or lunches in SY 2022–2023 by the total number of States with agencies that administered NSLP, SBP, or SSO. Respondents could select multiple subsidies.

^a Two State agencies (AR and OK) administered NSLP, SBP, or SSO in their respective State and neither provided subsidies for breakfasts or lunches in SY 2022–2023.

Table B.5.7. Percentage of SFAs that reported financial impacts from the additional per-meal reimbursements from the Keep Kids Fed Act during SY 2022–2023, by SFA characteristic

SFA characteristic	Impact on Finances					No response %	n
	Slightly improved finances %	Moderately improved finances %	Substantially improved finances %	No impact on finances %	Don't know %		
All SFAs	25.6	22.1	14.3	9.1	28.6	0.3	1,100
SFA size (enrollment)							
SFA size (1–499)	25.2	14.4*	8.2*	11.6*	39.8*	0.8	389
SFA size (500–2,499)	28.4	25.9*	12.9	6.9	26.0	0.0	336
SFA size (2,500–4,999)	22.4	27.7	25.1*	7.8	17.0*	0.0	166
SFA size (5,000–99,999)	20.9	33.1*	30.5*	8.7	6.8*	0.0	182
SFA size (100,000+)	33.3	18.5	37.0*	7.4	3.7*	0.0	27
SFA poverty level							
SFA poverty level <60% approved for F/RP meals	26.5	21.9	13.7	8.2	29.3	0.4	654
SFA poverty level 60%+ approved for F/RP meals	24.3	22.4	14.9	10.5	27.7	0.3	419
SFA urbanicity							
Suburban	23.9	23.9	16.9	8.9	26.0	0.4	309
Urban	25.8	20.2	15.9	9.3	28.4	0.5	240
Rural	26.3	22.1	12.5	9.2	29.8	0.2	551

Survey question: E1

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA poverty level obtained from the latest available FNS-742 file, with missing values obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey. SFA urbanicity obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey, with missing values imputed according to the SFA’s geographic location.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs reporting each financial impact by the total number of SFAs within each SFA characteristic.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs reporting financial impacts between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.5.8. Percentage of SFAs that reported receiving Supply Chain Assistance funds during SY 2022–2023

Received Supply Chain Assistance Funds	Percentage of SFAs
Yes	72.4
No	12.2
Don't know	15.1
No response	0.2

Survey question: E2

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported each response option by the total number of SFAs.

Table B.5.9. Of SFAs that received Supply Chain Assistance funds, percentage that reported purchasing certain food products with funds during SY 2022–2023

Food products	Percentage of SFAs
Fluid milk	80.8
Vegetables	57.4
Fruits	57.8
Meats or meat alternates	30.8
Other dairy foods	25.3
Grains	25.3
Local foods	15.9
Other	1.1
Don't know	7.3
No response	0.0
<i>n</i>	826

Survey question: E3

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported purchasing each food product by the total number of SFAs that reported receiving Supply Chain Assistance funds. SFAs could select multiple responses.

Table B.5.10. Percentage of SFAs that reported receiving Equipment Assistance Grants during SY 2022–2023

Received Equipment Assistance Grants	Percentage of SFAs
Yes	14.4
No	73.9
Don't know	11.6
No response	0.1
<i>n</i>	1,100

Survey question: E4

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported each response option by the total number of SFAs.

Table B.5.11. Of SFAs that received Equipment Assistance Grants, percentage that reported using grants for certain purposes during SY 2022–2023

Purpose	Percentage of SFAs
Replace aging or broken equipment	78.8
Acquire new equipment, neither replacing nor increasing capacity (for example, buying a pizza oven when SFA did not previously have one)	26.0
Increase capacity (for example, buying an additional freezer)	19.9
Don't know	0.4
No response	0.0
<i>n</i>	169

Survey question: E5

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported each purpose by the total number of SFAs that reported receiving Equipment Assistance Grants. SFAs could select multiple responses.

Table B.5.12. Of SFAs that received Equipment Assistance Grants, percentage that reported using grants to procure certain types of equipment during SY 2022–2023

Equipment	Percentage of SFAs
Range or oven	34.7
Refrigerator	24.8
Food warmer	18.8
Freezer	17.7
Cart	15.6
Holding and proofing cabinet	14.7
Cold food table (for example, serving bar or sandwich prep table)	11.7
Dishwasher – sink or supplies	10.0
Countertop equipment (for example, griddle, microwave, or blender)	11.6
Steam table	7.1
Food mixer	6.9
Work table	6.0
Ice machine	5.1
Transportation (for example, food transport van or lift gate)	3.1
Service (for example, point of service hardware or electronic menu boards)	2.0
Processing/packaging (for example, dough press or shrink wrap machine)	1.5
Farm to School or school garden supplies	0.8
Steamer	6.6
Serving line	2.0
Milk cooler	2.2
Tilt skillet	2.2
Other ^a	10.5
Don't know	0.7
No response	0.5
<i>n</i>	169

Survey question: E6

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported each type of equipment by the total number of SFAs that reported receiving Equipment Assistance Grants. SFAs could select multiple responses.

^a Other types of equipment reported by SFAs include exhaust fan, vending machine shelving, and tables and chairs.

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Supplement B.6:
Meal Prices

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Table B.6.1. Percentage of SFAs in States without UFSM policies that reported all schools in their SFA served all meals at no charge during SY 2022–2023, by SFA characteristic

SFA characteristic	Yes %	No %	No response %	<i>n</i>
All SFAs	35.3	64.5	0.2	979
SFA size (enrollment)				
SFA size (1–499)	41.4*	58.0*	0.6	346
SFA size (500–2,499)	31.4	68.6*	0.0	305
SFA size (2,500–4,999)	34.6	65.4	0.0	149
SFA size (5,000–99,999)	26.2*	73.8*	0.0	155
SFA size (100,000+)	41.7	58.3	0.0	24
SFA poverty level				
SFA poverty level <60% approved for F/RP meals	11.8*	88.0*	0.2	589
SFA poverty level 60%+ approved for F/RP meals	70.3*	29.4*	0.3	366
SFA urbanicity				
Suburban	25.3*	74.2*	0.5	269
Urban	54.9*	44.5*	0.6	204
Rural	32.1*	67.9*	0.0	506
Availability of State-provided breakfast subsidy				
Breakfast subsidy provided	35.3	64.2	0.5	515
Breakfast subsidy not provided	35.3	64.7	0.0	464
Availability of State-provided lunch subsidy				
Lunch subsidy provided	36.4	63.1	0.5	479
Lunch subsidy not provided	34.3	65.7	0.0	500

Survey question: D1

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. Analysis excludes SFAs in States with Universal Free School Meal (UFSM) policies. Five States had UFSM policies during SY 2022–2023: California, Nevada, Massachusetts, Maine, and Vermont. SFA poverty level obtained from the latest available FNS-742 file, with missing values obtained from the U.S. Department of Education's CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey. SFA urbanicity obtained from the U.S. Department of Education's CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey, with missing values imputed according to the SFA's geographic location. Availability of State-provided breakfast and lunch subsidies obtained from School Meals Operations Study State Agency Child Nutrition Director Survey SY 2023–2024.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported all schools in their SFA served meals at no charge by the total number of SFAs within each SFA characteristic.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs that used the program between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.6.2. Of SFAs with schools that charge for meals, average prices charged by SFAs for reduced-price and paid breakfasts during SY 2022–2023, by school type

Average price charged	All SFAs (\$)	SFA school types			
		Elementary (\$)	Middle (\$)	High (\$)	Other (\$)
Reduced-price	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30
Paid	1.80	1.74	1.79	1.81	1.77

Percentage of SFAs reporting breakfasts were served free of charge	All SFAs (%)	SFA school types			
		Elementary (%)	Middle (%)	High (%)	Other (%)
Not applicable – breakfasts were served free of charge to all students	22.1	13.9	14.2	14.9	10.8
Not applicable – breakfasts were served free of charge to students certified for reduced-price meals	14.4	21.0	20.3	20.4	25.5
No response	5.5	4.3	5.9	4.5	5.9
<i>n</i>	539	490	450	453	107

Survey question: D2, D3

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Analysis excludes SFAs in States with Universal Free School Meal (UFSM) policies. Five States had UFSM policies during SY 2022–2023: California, Nevada, Massachusetts, Maine, and Vermont. Averages were calculated by summing the values reported by SFAs for reduced-price and paid meal and dividing by the total number of SFAs that reported charging for meals. Averages for SFAs with each school type were calculated by dividing the sum of the values reported by SFAs for the school type by the total number of SFAs with the school type that reported charging for meals.

Percentages for SFAs that reported breakfasts were served at no charge were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported breakfasts were served at no charge by the total number of SFAs that reported charging for meals.

Percentages for SFAs with each school type were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs with the school type and not applicable response option by the total number of SFAs with the school type that reported charging for meals.

Prices reported for reduced-price and paid meals that were over the federal limits of \$0.40 for lunch were excluded from our calculation of average prices and incorporated in the “No response” category. SFAs that reported charging \$0.00 were assigned to the “No response” category.

Table B.6.3. Of SFAs with schools that charge for meals, average price charged by SFAs for paid breakfasts during SY 2022–2023, by school type and SFA characteristic

SFA characteristic	SFA school types							
	Elementary		Middle		High		Other	
	Average (\$)	n	Average (\$)	n	Average (\$)	n	Average (\$)	n
All SFAs	1.74	382	1.79	355	1.81	358	1.77	75
SFA size (enrollment)								
SFA size (1–499)	1.83	95	1.88	81	1.85	63	1.99	13
SFA size (500–2,499)	1.69	126	1.74	114	1.76	124	1.65	24
SFA size (2,500–4,999)	1.75	65	1.83	61	1.88	69	1.81	9
SFA size (5,000–99,999)	1.69	85	1.76	88	1.85	91	1.78	23
SFA size (100,000+)	1.39	11	1.48	11	1.48	11	1.59	6
SFA poverty level								
SFA poverty level <60% approved for F/RP meals	1.73	318	1.79	294	1.82	300	1.73	60
SFA poverty level 60%+ approved for F/RP meals	1.80	53	1.80	50	1.76	47	2.04	9
SFA urbanicity								
Suburban	1.71	126	1.79	121	1.84	120	1.76	24
Urban	2.04	43	2.07	41	2.05	37	1.98	13
Rural	1.70	213	1.75	193	1.77	201	1.72	38
Availability of State-provided breakfast subsidy								
Breakfast subsidy provided	1.79	188	1.87	177	1.91	177	1.79	33
Breakfast subsidy not provided	1.69	194	1.71	178	1.72	181	1.76	42

Survey question: D2

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA poverty level obtained from the latest available FNS-742 file, with missing values obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey. SFA urbanicity obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey, with missing values imputed according to the SFA’s geographic location.

Note: Analysis excludes SFAs in States with Universal Free School Meal (UFSM) policies. Five States had UFSM policies during SY 2022–2023: California, Nevada, Massachusetts, Maine, and Vermont. Averages were calculated by summing the values reported by SFAs for a paid meal and dividing by the total number of SFAs that reported charging for meals within each SFA characteristic. Averages for SFAs with each school type were calculated by dividing the sum of the values reported by SFAs for the school type by the total number of SFAs with the school type that reported charging for meals. Availability of State-provided breakfast and lunch subsidies obtained from School Meals Operations Study State Agency Child Nutrition Director Survey SY 2023–2024.

Table B.6.4. Of SFAs with schools that charge for meals, average price charged by SFAs for reduced-price breakfasts during SY 2022–2023, by school type and SFA characteristic

SFA characteristic	SFA school types							
	Elementary		Middle		High		Other	
	Average (\$)	<i>n</i>	Average (\$)	<i>n</i>	Average (\$)	<i>n</i>	Average (\$)	<i>n</i>
All SFAs	0.30	255	0.30	231	0.30	234	0.30	50
SFA size (enrollment)								
SFA size (1–499)	0.30	64	0.30	51	0.30	42	0.30	7
SFA size (500–2,499)	0.30	91	0.30	80	0.30	86	0.30	18
SFA size (2,500–4,999)	0.30	47	0.30	45	0.30	50	0.30	6
SFA size (5,000–99,999)	0.30	48	0.30	50	0.30	51	0.30	16
SFA size (100,000+)	0.28	5	0.28	5	0.28	5	0.27	3
SFA poverty level								
SFA poverty level <60% approved for F/RP meals	0.30	207	0.30	189	0.30	194	0.30	39
SFA poverty level 60%+ approved for F/RP meals	0.30	43	0.30	37	0.30	35	0.30	8
SFA urbanicity								
Suburban	0.30	72	0.30	67	0.30	64	0.30	16
Urban	0.30	31	0.30	28	0.30	27	0.30	8
Rural	0.30	152	0.30	136	0.30	143	0.30	26
Availability of State-provided breakfast subsidy								
Breakfast subsidy provided	0.30	86	0.30	81	0.30	81	0.30	13
Breakfast subsidy not provided	0.30	169	0.30	150	0.30	153	0.30	37

Survey question: D3

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA poverty level obtained from the latest available FNS-742 file, with missing values obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey. SFA urbanicity obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey, with missing values imputed according to the SFA’s geographic location.

Note: Analysis excludes SFAs in States with Universal Free School Meal (UFSM) policies. Five States had UFSM policies during SY 2022–2023: California, Nevada, Massachusetts, Maine, and Vermont. Averages were calculated by summing the values reported by SFAs for reduced-price meal and dividing by the total number of SFAs that reported charging for meals within each SFA characteristic. Averages for SFAs with each school type were calculated by dividing the sum of the values reported by SFAs for the school type by the total number of SFAs with the school type that reported charging for meals. Availability of State-provided breakfast and lunch subsidies obtained from School Meals Operations Study State Agency Child Nutrition Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Prices reported for reduced-price meals that were over the federal limits of \$0.30 for breakfast were excluded from our calculation of average prices and incorporated in the “No response” category. SFAs that reported charging \$0.00 were assigned to the “No response” category.

Table B.6.5. Of SFAs with schools that charge for meals, average prices charged by SFAs for reduced-price and paid lunches during SY 2022–2023, by school type

Average price charged	All SFAs (\$)	SFA school types			
		Elementary (\$)	Middle (\$)	High (\$)	Other (\$)
Reduced-price	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40
Paid	2.99	2.85	2.99	3.03	2.99

Percentage of SFAs reporting lunches were served free of charge	All SFAs (%)	SFA school types			
		Elementary (%)	Middle (%)	High (%)	Other (%)
Not applicable – lunches were served free of charge to all students	4.3	14.7	15.0	16.4	15.2
Not applicable – lunches were served free of charge to students certified for reduced-price meals	15.3	3.5	2.5	1.4	5.7
No response	4.9	3.6	4.4	2.9	8.5
<i>n</i>	641	573	516	491	130

Survey question: D4, D5

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Analysis excludes SFAs in States with Universal Free School Meal (UFSM) policies. Five States had UFSM policies during SY 2022–2023: California, Nevada, Massachusetts, Maine, and Vermont. Averages were calculated by summing the values reported by SFAs for reduced-price and paid meals and dividing by the total number of SFAs that reported charging for meals. Averages for SFAs with each school type were calculated by dividing the sum of the values reported by SFAs for the school type by the total number of SFAs with the school type that reported charging for meals.

Percentages for SFAs that reported lunches were served at no charge were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported lunches were served at no charge by the total number of SFAs that reported charging for meals. Percentages for SFAs with each school type were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs with the school type and not applicable response option by the total number of SFAs with the school type that reported charging for meals.

Prices reported for reduced-price and paid meals that were over the federal limits of \$0.40 for lunch were excluded from our calculation of average prices and incorporated in the “No response” category. SFAs that reported charging \$0.00 were assigned to the “No response” category.

Table B.6.6. Of SFAs with schools that charge for meals, average price charged by SFAs for a paid lunch during SY 2022–2023, by school type and SFA characteristic

SFA characteristic	SFA school types							
	Elementary		Middle		High		Other	
	Average (\$)	<i>n</i>	Average (\$)	<i>n</i>	Average (\$)	<i>n</i>	Average (\$)	<i>n</i>
All SFAs	2.85	552	2.99	502	3.03	483	2.99	117
SFA size (enrollment)								
SFA size (1–499)	3.01	149	3.10	118	3.13	83	3.22	35
SFA size (500–2,499)	2.76	186	2.92	171	2.96	178	2.83	30
SFA size (2,500–4,999)	2.74	91	2.96	84	3.05	92	2.79	15
SFA size (5,000–99,999)	2.79	112	3.01	115	3.07	116	2.91	28
SFA size (100,000+)	2.67	14	2.92	14	2.94	14	2.92	9
SFA poverty level								
SFA poverty level <60% approved for F/RP meals	2.84	454	3.00	410	3.05	395	3.00	89
SFA poverty level 60%+ approved for F/RP meals	2.86	84	2.93	78	2.90	74	2.96	19
SFA urbanicity								
Suburban	2.95	182	3.10	171	3.14	160	3.04	40
Urban	3.12	68	3.22	67	3.33	56	3.22	23
Rural	2.75	302	2.89	264	2.93	267	2.89	54
Availability of State-provided lunch subsidy								
Lunch subsidy provided	2.94	283	3.09	263	3.13	242	3.02	59
Lunch subsidy not provided	2.75	269	2.88	239	2.93	241	2.96	58

Survey question: D4

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA poverty level obtained from the latest available FNS-742 file, with missing values obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey. SFA urbanicity obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey, with missing values imputed according to the SFA’s geographic location.

Note: Analysis excludes SFAs in States with Universal Free School Meal (UFSM) policies. Five States had UFSM policies during SY 2022–2023: California, Nevada, Massachusetts, Maine, and Vermont. Averages were calculated by summing the values reported by SFAs for a paid meal and dividing by the total number of SFAs that reported charging for meals within each SFA characteristic. Averages for SFAs with each school type were calculated by dividing the sum of the values reported by SFAs for the school type by the total number of SFAs with the school type that reported charging for meals. Availability of State-provided breakfast and lunch subsidies obtained from School Meals Operations Study State Agency Child Nutrition Director Survey SY 2023–2024.

Table B.6.7. Of SFAs with schools that charge for meals, average price charged by SFAs for a reduced-price lunch during SY 2022–2023, by school type and SFA characteristic

SFA characteristic	SFA school types							
	Elementary		Middle		High		Other	
	Average (\$)	<i>n</i>	Average (\$)	<i>n</i>	Average (\$)	<i>n</i>	Average (\$)	<i>n</i>
All SFAs	0.40	402	0.40	363	0.40	348	0.40	78
SFA size (enrollment)								
SFA size (1–499)	0.40	115	0.40	91	0.40	65	0.40	22
SFA size (500–2,499)	0.40	141	0.40	130	0.40	135	0.40	22
SFA size (2,500–4,999)	0.40	66	0.40	61	0.40	66	0.40	9
SFA size (5,000–99,999)	0.39	73	0.39	74	0.39	75	0.40	20
SFA size (100,000+)	0.40	7	0.40	7	0.40	7	0.40	5
SFA poverty level								
SFA poverty level <60% approved for F/RP meals	0.40	330	0.40	300	0.40	285	0.40	59
SFA poverty level 60%+ approved for F/RP meals	0.40	65	0.40	56	0.40	56	0.40	1
SFA urbanicity								
Suburban	0.40	114	0.40	107	0.40	96	0.40	25
Urban	0.40	52	0.40	49	0.40	43	0.40	16
Rural	0.40	236	0.40	207	0.40	209	0.40	37
Availability of State-provided lunch subsidy								
Lunch subsidy provided	0.40	157	0.40	145	0.40	129	0.40	27
Lunch subsidy not provided	0.40	245	0.40	218	0.40	219	0.40	51

Survey question: D5

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA poverty level obtained from the latest available FNS-742 file, with missing values obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey. SFA urbanicity obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey, with missing values imputed according to the SFA’s geographic location.

Note: Analysis excludes SFAs in States with Universal Free School Meal (UFSM) policies. Five States had UFSM policies during SY 2022–2023: California, Nevada, Massachusetts, Maine, and Vermont. Averages were calculated by summing the values reported by SFAs for a reduced-price meal and dividing by the total number of SFAs that reported charging for meals within each SFA characteristic. Averages for SFAs with each school type were calculated by dividing the sum of the values reported by SFAs for the school type by the total number of SFAs with the school type that reported charging for meals. Availability of State-provided breakfast and lunch subsidies obtained from School Meals Operations Study State Agency Child Nutrition Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Prices reported for reduced-price meals that were over the federal limits of \$0.40 for lunch were excluded from our calculation of average prices and incorporated in the “No response” category. SFAs that reported charging \$0.00 were assigned to the “No response” category.

Table B.6.8. Percentage of SFAs that reported taking certain actions in response to the Paid Lunch Equity provision during SY 2022–2023, by SFA size

Action	All SFAs %	SFA size (enrollment)				
		1-499 %	500- 2,499 %	2,500- 4,999 %	5,000- 99,999 %	100,000+ %
No action taken – Operating balance was positive	29.2	22.4*	28.8	39.0*	42.1*	78.6*
Increased paid lunch prices in all schools	24.3	21.9	26.6	24.9	24.0	0.0*
Used the Paid Lunch Equity waiver for SY 2022–2023	13.6	13.4	10.8	20.9	17.2	14.3
No action taken – Paid lunch pricing already complied with provision	9.8	10.5	10.3	6.1	9.2	0.0*
Added funds from non-Federal sources to the nonprofit school food services account	4.9	6.0	4.7	3.0	3.8	0.0*
Increased paid lunch prices in some schools	1.1	0.0*	1.9	0.0*	2.9	7.1
Don't know	17.7	25.9*	17.8	9.0*	0.8*	0.0*
Other ^a	1.7	1.0	1.9	1.0	3.3	0.0*
No response	0.4	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>n</i>	648	201	213	100	120	14

Survey question D6

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Analysis excludes SFAs in States with Universal Free School Meal (UFSM) policies. Five States had UFSM policies during SY 2022–2023: California, Nevada, Massachusetts, Maine, and Vermont. Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported each action by the number of SFAs within each SFA characteristic that reported charging for meals. SFAs could select all applicable actions.

^a Other responses included SFAs reporting that some schools operated under CEP or that they used district or school funds to cover the negative balances.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs reporting each action between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.6.9. Percentage of SFAs that reported taking certain actions in response to Paid Lunch Equity provision during SY 2022–2023, by poverty level

Action	All SFAs %	SFA poverty level	
		< 60% approved for F/RP meals %	60% + approved for F/RP meals %
No action taken – Operating balance was positive	29.2	28.9	30.2
Increased paid lunch prices in all schools	24.3	25.9*	17.5*
Used the Paid Lunch Equity waiver for SY 2022–2023	13.6	13.2	15.7
No action taken – Paid lunch pricing already complied with provision	9.8	9.1	12.7
Added funds from non-Federal sources to the nonprofit school food services account	4.9	5.0	4.1
Increased paid lunch prices in some schools	1.1	0.6	3.6
Don't know	17.7	18.4	15.1
Other ^a	1.7	1.2	3.9
No response	0.4	0.5	0.0
<i>n</i>	648	524	110

Survey question D6

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA poverty level obtained from the latest available FNS-742 file, with missing values obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey.

Note: Analysis excludes SFAs in States with Universal Free School Meal (UFSM) policies. Five States had UFSM policies during SY 2022–2023: California, Nevada, Massachusetts, Maine, and Vermont. Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported each action by the number of SFAs that reported charging for meals within each SFA characteristic. SFAs could select all applicable actions.

^a Other responses included SFAs reporting that some schools operated under CEP or that they used district or school funds to cover the negative balances.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs reporting using each action between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs with fewer than 60 percent of students below poverty level, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs with at least 60 percent of students above the poverty level).

Table B.6.10. Percentage of SFAs that reported taking certain actions in response to Paid Lunch Equity provision during SY 2022–2023, by urbanicity

Action	All SFAs %	SFA urbanicity		
		Suburban %	Urban %	Rural %
No action taken – Operating balance was positive	29.2	31.2	24.6	29.4
Increased paid lunch prices in all schools	24.3	28.8	17.7	23.9
Used the Paid Lunch Equity waiver for SY 2022–2023	13.6	13.0	10.6	14.7
No action taken – Paid lunch pricing already complied with provision	9.8	7.2	20.3*	8.4
Added funds from non-Federal sources to the nonprofit school food services account	4.9	2.8	9.7	4.6
Increased paid lunch prices in some schools	1.1	0.8	1.0	1.3
Don't know	17.7	16.2	18.1	18.3
Other ^a	1.7	2.6	0.7	1.5
No response	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.6
<i>n</i>	648	207	96	345

Survey question D6

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA urbanicity obtained from the U.S. Department of Education's CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey, with missing values imputed according to the SFA's geographic location.

Note: Analysis excludes SFAs in States with Universal Free School Meal (UFSM) policies. Five States had UFSM policies during SY 2022–2023: California, Nevada, Massachusetts, Maine, and Vermont. Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported each action by the number of SFAs that reported charging for meals within each SFA characteristic. SFAs could select all applicable actions.

^aOther responses included SFAs reporting that some schools operated under CEP or that they used district or school funds to cover the negative balances.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs reporting each action between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.6.11. Of SFAs that charged for school meals, percentage that reported lowering prices for paid meals in SY 2022–2023 compared to prices charged prior to the COVID-19 pandemic (in SY 2019–2020), by SFA characteristic

SFA characteristic	SFA lowered prices for paid meals			No response %	n
	Yes %	No %	Don't know %		
All SFAs	1.8	89.5	8.7	0.0	648
SFA size (enrollment)					
SFA size (1–499)	3.0	81.6*	15.4*	0.0	201
SFA size (500–2,499)	1.5	92.9*	5.6*	0.0	213
SFA size (2,500–4,999)	1.0	93.0	6.0	0.0	100
SFA size (5,000–99,999)	0.0*	99.2*	0.8*	0.0	120
SFA size (100,000+)	0.0*	100.0*	0.0*	0.0	14
SFA poverty level					
SFA poverty level <60% approved for F/RP meals	1.5	89.4	9.1	0.0	524
SFA poverty level 60%+ approved for F/RP meals	3.2	89.9	6.9	0.0	110
SFA urbanicity					
Suburban	0.4*	92.6	7.0	0.0	207
Urban	1.3	80.5*	18.2*	0.0	96
Rural	2.6	90.3	7.1	0.0	345

Survey question: D7

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA poverty level obtained from the latest available FNS-742 file, with missing values obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey. SFA urbanicity obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey, with missing values imputed according to the SFA’s geographic location.

Note: Analysis excludes SFAs in States with Universal Free School Meal (UFSM) policies. Five States had UFSM policies during SY 2022–2023: California, Nevada, Massachusetts, Maine, and Vermont. Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs reporting lowering prices by the total number of SFAs within each SFA characteristic that charged for school meals.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs lowering prices between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.6.12. Of SFAs that charged for school meals, percentage that reported lowering prices for paid meals during SY 2022–2023, by school type

SFA school types	Lowered prices for paid meals		No response %	n
	Yes %	No %		
All SFAs	1.8	98.2	0.0	648
Elementary	1.8	98.2	0.0	582
Middle	1.8	98.2	0.0	523
High	1.7	98.3	0.0	497
Other	1.8	98.2	0.0	146

Survey question: D8

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Analysis excludes SFAs in States with Universal Free School Meal (UFSM) policies. Five States had UFSM policies during SY 2022–2023: California, Nevada, Massachusetts, Maine, and Vermont. Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs reporting lowering prices by the total number of SFAs that charged for school meals. Percentages of SFAs with each school type were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs with the school type reporting lowering prices by the total number of SFAs with the school type. SFAs could select all applicable school types.

Supplement B.7:
Unpaid Meal Charges

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Table B.7.1. Percentage of SFAs that reported having a local and/or State-level unpaid meal charge policy during SY 2022–2023

Meal charge policy	Percentage of SFAs
Local unpaid meal charge policy	52.7
State-level unpaid meal charge policy	6.5
Not applicable – all schools in SFA serve meals at no charge	30.6
Don't know	13.1
No response	0.2
<i>n</i>	979

Survey question: E7

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported each response option by the total number of SFAs that reported charging for school meals. SFAs could indicate that they had both local and State-level unpaid meal charge policies.

Table B.7.2. Percentage of SFAs that reported having a local and/or State-level unpaid meal charge policy during SY 2022–2023, by SFA characteristic

SFA characteristic	Local unpaid meal charge policy %	State-level unpaid meal charge policy %	Not applicable – all schools in SFA serve meals at no charge %	Don't know %	No response %	n
All SFAs	52.7	6.5	30.6	13.1	0.2	979
SFA size (enrollment)						
SFA size (1–499)	41.6*	4.9	35.6*	19.6	0.3	346
SFA size (500–2,499)	58.2*	7.1	27.0*	11.7	0.3	305
SFA size (2,500–4,999)	57.6	10.4	31.3	4.6	0.0	149
SFA size (5,000–99,999)	71.4*	7.0	23.5*	1.1	0.0	155
SFA size (100,000+)	58.3	0.0*	37.5	4.2	0.0	24
SFA poverty level						
SFA poverty level <60% approved for F/RP meals	68.8*	9.0*	8.3*	17.4	0.0	589
SFA poverty level 60%+ approved for F/RP meals	28.7*	2.8*	63.8*	6.6	0.6	366
SFA urbanicity						
Suburban	58.3	14.0*	20.3*	13.2	0.0	269
Urban	36.1*	2.6*	50.1*	12.2	0.6	204
Rural	56.6*	4.9*	27.7*	13.4	0.2	506

Survey question: E7

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA poverty level obtained from the latest available FNS-742 file, with missing values obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey. SFA urbanicity obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey, with missing values imputed according to the SFA’s geographic location.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported each response option by the total number of SFAs that reported charging for school meals within each SFA characteristic. SFAs could indicate that they had both local and State-level unpaid meal charge policies.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs reporting a meal charge policy between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.7.3. Of SFAs with a meal charge policy, percentage that reported including certain components in their meal charge policy during SY 2022–2023

Policy component	Percentage of SFAs
Households are notified of low or negative balances (for example, phone calls, text messages, and/or notes sent home)	88.6
Households are encouraged to apply for free or reduced-price school meals when their student is unable to pay	83.9
Students unable to pay receive and are charged for regular, reimbursable meals (breakfast, lunch, and/or afterschool snacks)	62.3
Outside funding sources (for example, community donations) are provided to pay for meals or debt when students incur meal charges	45.7
Students unable to pay have a limit on the number of meals they can receive and are charged for regular, reimbursable meals (breakfast, lunch, and/or afterschool snacks)	16.6
Students unable to pay receive an alternate meal at no cost	13.5
Students unable to pay receive and are charged for an alternate meal	8.1
Students unable to pay are denied a meal	1.5
Other	1.2
No response	0.0
<i>n</i>	582

Survey question: E8

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported each policy component by the total number of SFAs that reported having a meal charge policy. SFAs could select multiple responses.

Table B.7.4. Of SFAs with a meal charge policy, percentage that reported including certain components in their meal charge policy during SY 2022–2023, by SFA size

Policy component	All SFAs %	SFA size (enrollment)				
		1-499 %	500- 2,499 %	2,500- 4,999 %	5,000- 99,999 %	100,000+ %
Households are notified of low or negative balances (for example, phone calls, text messages, and/or notes sent home)	88.6	84.5	89.0	93.8*	92.2	85.7
Households are encouraged to apply for free or reduced-price school meals when their student is unable to pay	83.9	79.3	82.6	89.6	92.7*	92.9
Students unable to pay receive and are charged for regular, reimbursable meals (breakfast, lunch, and/or afterschool snacks)	62.3	53.5*	64.4	69.8	70.2	71.4
Outside funding sources (for example, community donations) are provided to pay for meals or debt when students incur meal charges	45.7	35.5*	49.8	51.2	52.2	57.1
Students unable to pay have a limit on the number of meals they can receive and be charged for	16.6	12.9	16.2	21.3	22.2	35.7
Students unable to pay receive an alternate meal at no cost	13.5	11.6	10.9	19.1	21.0*	14.3
Students unable to pay receive and are charged for an alternate meal	8.1	9.0	7.2	7.0	9.1	14.3
Students unable to pay are denied a meal	1.5	1.3	2.1	1.0	0.7	0.0*
Other	1.2	2.6	0.5	1.0	0.0*	7.1
No response	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>n</i>	582	155	192	99	122	14

Survey question: E8

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported each component by the total number of SFAs with a meal charge policy within each SFA characteristic.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs that included the policy component between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.7.5. Of SFAs with a meal charge policy, percentage that reported including certain components in their meal charge policy during SY 2022–2023, by poverty level

Policy component	All SFAs %	SFA poverty level	
		< 60% approved for F/RP meals %	60% + approved for F/RP meals %
Households are notified of low or negative balances (for example, phone calls, text messages, and/or notes sent home)	88.6	89.0	86.9
Households are encouraged to apply for free or reduced-price school meals when their student is unable to pay	83.9	86.0*	75.8*
Students unable to pay receive and are charged for regular, reimbursable meals (breakfast, lunch, and/or afterschool snacks)	62.3	64.7*	53.6*
Outside funding sources (for example, community donations) are provided to pay for meals or debt when students incur meal charges	45.7	49.1*	32.9*
Students unable to pay have a limit on the number of meals they can receive and be charged for	16.6	16.3	17.6
Students unable to pay receive an alternate meal at no cost	13.5	13.5	13.8
Students unable to pay receive and are charged for an alternate meal	8.1	7.8	9.1
Students unable to pay are denied a meal	1.5	1.4	2.0
Other	1.2	1.2	1.0
No response	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>n</i>	582	454	114

Survey question: E8

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA poverty level obtained from the latest available FNS-742 file, with missing values obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported each component by the total number of SFAs with a meal charge policy within each SFA characteristic.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs that included the policy component between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.7.6. Of SFAs with a meal charge policy, percentage that reported including certain components in their meal charge policy during SY 2022–2023, by urbanicity

Policy component	All SFAs %	SFA urbanicity		
		Suburban %	Urban %	Rural %
Households are notified of low or negative balances (for example, phone calls, text messages, and/or notes sent home)	88.6	78.5*	88.4	91.1*
Households are encouraged to apply for free or reduced-price school meals when their student is unable to pay	83.9	80.7	86.6	83.3
Students unable to pay receive and are charged for regular, reimbursable meals (breakfast, lunch, and/or afterschool snacks)	62.3	57.5	70.6*	59.6
Outside funding sources (for example, community donations) are provided to pay for meals or debt when students incur meal charges	45.7	31.8*	40.6	51.3*
Students unable to pay have a limit on the number of meals they can receive and be charged for	16.6	16.9	13.9	17.8
Students unable to pay receive an alternate meal at no cost	13.5	10.8	10.2	15.8
Students unable to pay receive and are charged for an alternate meal	8.1	9.7	6.5	8.4
Students unable to pay are denied a meal	1.5	0.8	1.2	1.8
Other	1.2	1.6	0.8	1.3
No response	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>n</i>	582	85	194	303

Survey question: E8

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA urbanicity obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey, with missing values imputed according to the SFA’s geographic location.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported each component by the total number of SFAs with a meal charge policy within each SFA characteristic.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs that included the policy component between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.7.7. Of SFAs with unpaid meal charge policies, percentage that reported tracking unpaid meal charges during SY 2022–2023, by SFA characteristic

SFA characteristic	Yes %	No %	No response %	<i>n</i>
All SFAs	90.9	8.9	0.2	698
SFA size (enrollment)				
SFA size (1–499)	84.4*	15.2*	0.4	224
SFA size (500–2,499)	93.4	6.6	0.0	229
SFA size (2,500–4,999)	97.1*	2.9*	0.0	106
SFA size (5,000–99,999)	98.3*	1.7*	0.0	124
SFA size (100,000+)	100.0*	0.0*	0.0	15
SFA poverty level				
SFA poverty level <60% approved for F/RP meals	91.6	8.4	0.0	545
SFA poverty level 60%+ approved for F/RP meals	88.3	10.9	0.8	138
SFA urbanicity				
Suburban	92.8	7.2	0.0	223
Urban	80.8*	18.1*	1.1	107
Rural	92.6	7.4	0.0	368

Survey question: E9

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA poverty level obtained from the latest available FNS-742 file, with missing values obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey. SFA urbanicity obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey, with missing values imputed according to the SFA’s geographic location.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs reporting each response option by the total number of SFAs with a meal charge policy within each SFA characteristic.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs reporting tracking unpaid meal charge policies between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.7.8. Of SFAs that tracked unpaid meal charges, average amount of money SFAs reported being owed at the end of SY 2022–2023, by SFA characteristic

	Average amount owed (\$)	Don't know (%)	No response (%)	n
All SFAs	21,573.03	22.8	0.0	643
SFA size (enrollment)				
SFA size (1–499)	1,693.42*	31.7*	0.0	189
SFA size (500–2,499)	10,050.78*	22.0	0.0	214
SFA size (2,500–4,999)	18,850.34	14.5*	0.0	103
SFA size (5,000–99,999)	75,203.46*	7.8*	0.0	122
SFA size (100,000+)	307,696.33*	0.0*	0.0	15
SFA poverty level				
SFA poverty level <60% approved for F/RP meals	19,973.45	23.9	0.0	505
SFA poverty level 60%+ approved for F/RP meals	23,822.14	18.8	0.0	123
SFA urbanicity				
Suburban	39,064.57*	20.2	0.0	210
Urban	38,945.12*	17.6	0.0	90
Rural	7,962.94*	25.1	0.0	343
Availability of State-provided breakfast subsidy				
Breakfast subsidy provided	25,260.65	26.7*	0.0	338
Breakfast subsidy not provided	17,689.76	18.4*	0.0	305
Availability of State-provided lunch subsidy				
Lunch subsidy provided	26,675.83*	24.5	0.0	314
Lunch subsidy not provided	16,738.13*	21.2	0.0	329

Survey question: E10

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA poverty level obtained from the latest available FNS-742 file, with missing values obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey. SFA urbanicity obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey, with missing values imputed according to the SFA’s geographic location.

Note: Averages were calculated by summing the values SFAs reported being owed and dividing by the total number of SFAs that reported tracking unpaid meal charges within each SFA characteristic. Availability of State-provided breakfast and lunch subsidies obtained from School Meals Operations Study State Agency Child Nutrition Director Survey SY 2023–2024.

* Indicates that the difference in the average amount of money SFAs reported being owed between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.7.9. Of SFAs that tracked unpaid meal charges, average amount of money SFAs reported recovering since the end of SY 2022–2023, by SFA characteristic

	Average amount recovered (\$)	Don't know (%)	No response (%)	n
All SFAs	9,540.43	24.0	0.0	419
SFA size (enrollment)				
SFA size (1–499)	1,164.55*	14.8*	0.0	81
SFA size (500–2,499)	2,760.99*	28.1	0.0	143
SFA size (2,500–4,999)	5,011.52*	32.1	0.0	75
SFA size (5,000–99,999)	35,022.49*	20.8	0.0	105
SFA size (100,000+)	157,092.00*	6.7*	0.0	15
SFA poverty level				
SFA poverty level <60% approved for F/RP meals	8,622.28	24.0	0.0	325
SFA poverty level 60%+ approved for F/RP meals	11,311.89	24.0	0.0	79
SFA urbanicity				
Suburban	14,792.73	33.0*	0.0	153
Urban	27,393.94*	31.3	0.0	62
Rural	4,058.65*	17.3*	0.0	204
Availability of State-provided breakfast subsidy				
Breakfast subsidy provided	8,779.62	24.3	0.0	216
Breakfast subsidy not provided	10,241.68	23.6	0.0	203
Availability of State-provided lunch subsidy				
Lunch subsidy provided	9,529.35	24.5	0.0	207
Lunch subsidy not provided	9,549.90	23.5	0.0	212

Survey question: E11

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA poverty level obtained from the latest available FNS-742 file, with missing values obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey. SFA urbanicity obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey, with missing values imputed according to the SFA’s geographic location.

Note: Averages were calculated by summing the values SFAs reported recovering and dividing by the total number of SFAs that reported tracking unpaid meal charges within each SFA characteristic. Availability of State-provided breakfast and lunch subsidies obtained from School Meals Operations Study State Agency Child Nutrition Director Survey SY 2023–2024.

* Indicates that the difference in the average amount of money SFAs reported recovering between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.7.10. Of SFAs that tracked unpaid meal charges, average percentage of unpaid meal charge money SFAs reported recovering from certain sources since the end of SY 2022–2023, by SFA characteristic

SFA characteristic	Source					Don't know	No response	n
	Household payments	District funding	Charitable donations	State funding	Other ^a			
All SFAs	65.5	61.7	43.8	13.6	34.8	3.8	0.5	267
SFA size (enrollment)								
SFA size (1–499)	82.3	38.8	41.8	0.0	0.0	5.2	0.0	58
SFA size (500–2,499)	65.5	63.3	44.2	25.5	37.4	3.8	1.2	82
SFA size (2,500–4,999)	52.4	66.8	50.0	0.0	47.1	2.3	0.0	42
SFA size (5,000–99,999)	43.2	69.5	41.7	0.0	37.1	2.4	0.0	76
SFA size (100,000+)	30.3	68.7	21.2	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0	9
SFA poverty level								
SFA poverty level <60% approved for F/RP meals	63.6	60.0	43.4	16.8	36.5	2.8	0.6	210
SFA poverty level 60%+ approved for F/RP meals	73.4	69.2	47.1	0.0	29.1	7.7	0.0	48
SFA urbanicity								
Suburban	59.7	77.2	39.1	0.0	37.6	3.5	0.0	82
Urban	69.4	56.9	39.0	0.0	17.5	0.0	3.8	37
Rural	66.7	54.7	46.5	22.0	38.1	4.7	0.0	148

Survey question: E12

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA poverty level obtained from the latest available FNS-742 file, with missing values obtained from the U.S. Department of Education's CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey. SFA urbanicity obtained from the U.S. Department of Education's CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey, with missing values imputed according to the SFA's geographic location.

Note: Average percentages were calculated by summing the values SFAs reported recovering from each source and dividing by the total number of SFAs that reported tracking unpaid meal charges within each SFA characteristic.

^a Other sources SFAs reported recovering unpaid meal charge money from included general reserve funds and non-federal fund sources.

Table B.7.11. Of SFAs that tracked unpaid meal charges, percentage that reported using certain strategies to recover money during SY 2022–2023, by SFA size

Strategy	All SFAs %	SFA size (enrollment)				
		1-499 %	500- 2,499 %	2,500- 4,999 %	5,000- 99,999 %	100,000+ %
Billed or otherwise notified households of negative balances	86.6	83.6	87.3	91.2	89.0	80.0
Provided households with a repayment plan	34.7	30.2	36.1	34.8	43.1	13.3*
Involved school staff member to facilitate household repayment process	28.1	16.4*	26.5	36.9	57.7*	60.0*
Took nonfinancial actions with parents (for example, not allowed to receive student’s grades)	10.1	6.9*	12.2	14.6	8.3	6.7
Used administrative actions with student (for example, not allowed to participate in programs and events, such as field trips or prom)	7.0	2.1*	6.6	13.6*	16.4*	6.7
Used a debt collection agency	3.2	0.0*	4.2	5.9	7.0	0.0*
Covered by external sources or other funds (district, donations, grants, other budgets)	3.8	3.2	4.2	5.7	2.5	26.7*
Other	1.9	2.1	2.3	0.0*	1.8	6.7
None – SFA did not use any strategies to recover unpaid charges	6.9	10.1	4.8	5.0	6.5	0.0*
No response	0.2	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>n</i>	643	189	214	103	122	15

Survey question: E13

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported using each strategy by the total number of SFAs that tracked unpaid meal charges within each SFA size.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs that used the strategy between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.7.12. Of SFAs that tracked unpaid meal charges, percentage that reported using certain strategies to recover money during SY 2022–2023, by poverty level

Strategy	All SFAs %	SFA poverty level	
		< 60% approved for F/RP meals %	60% + approved for F/RP meals %
Billed or otherwise notified households of negative balances	86.6	87.9	81.9
Provided households with a repayment plan	34.7	33.8	38.2
Involved school staff member to facilitate household repayment process	28.1	27.9	28.6
Took nonfinancial actions with parents (for example, not allowed to receive student’s grades)	10.1	9.0	14.2
Used administrative actions with student (for example, not allowed to participate in programs and events, such as field trips or prom)	7.0	6.7	8.0
Used a debt collection agency	3.2	3.8*	1.2*
Covered by external sources or other funds (district, donations, grants, other budgets)	3.8	3.9	3.4
Other	1.9	2.0	1.5
None – SFA did not use any strategies to recover unpaid charges	6.9	5.6*	11.6*
No response	0.2	0.2	0.0
<i>n</i>	643	505	123

Survey question: E13

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA poverty level obtained from the latest available FNS-742 file, with missing values obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported using each strategy by the total number of SFAs that tracked unpaid meal charges within each SFA poverty level.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs that used the strategy between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.7.13. Of SFAs that tracked unpaid meal charges, percentage that reported using certain strategies to recover money during SY 2022–2023, by urbanicity

Strategy	All SFAs %	SFA urbanicity		
		Urban %	Suburban %	Rural %
Billed or otherwise notified households of negative balances	86.6	85.5	88.5	86.0
Provided households with a repayment plan	34.7	34.5	36.3	34.0
Involved school staff member to facilitate household repayment process	28.1	29.8	36.1*	24.1*
Took nonfinancial actions with parents (for example, not allowed to receive student’s grades)	10.1	8.1	8.5	11.3
Used administrative actions with student (for example, not allowed to participate in programs and events, such as field trips or prom)	7.0	4.8	9.6	6.3
Used a debt collection agency	3.2	3.2	4.0	2.9
Covered by external sources or other funds (district, donations, grants, other budgets)	3.8	3.3	4.8	3.5
Other	1.9	1.4	2.5	1.8
None – SFA did not use any strategies to recover unpaid charges	6.9	11.6	6.1	6.2
No response	0.2	1.4	0.0	0.0
<i>n</i>	643	90	210	343

Survey question: E13

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA urbanicity obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey, with missing values imputed according to the SFA’s geographic location.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported using each strategy by the total number of SFAs that tracked unpaid meal charges within each SFA characteristic.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs that used the strategy between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.7.14. Of SFAs that used certain strategies to recover unpaid meal charges, percentage that reported certain strategies as successful in recovering unpaid meal charges during SY 2022–2023, by SFA size

Strategy	All SFAs %	SFA size (enrollment)				
		1-499 %	500- 2,499 %	2,500- 4,999 %	5,000- 99,999 %	100,000+ %
Used administrative actions with student	86.7	100.0*	77.8	91.1	90.9	100.0*
Billed or otherwise notified households of negative balances	78.3	84.2*	76.2	73.6	73.7	83.3
Took nonfinancial actions with parents	69.7	84.6	61.2	67.2	78.7	100.0*
Involved school staff member to facilitate household repayment process	66.6	67.7	56.8*	71.5	76.7*	100.0*
Used debt collection agency	61.0	61.0	55.6	65.5	68.0	61.0
Provided households with a repayment plan	59.0	75.4*	52.1	61.5	43.4*	100.0*
Other	91.6	100.0*	90.6	80.0	85.2	83.3
None – No strategies were successful	15.4	11.0*	18.6	14.2	18.0	6.7
No response	0.2	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0

Survey question: E14

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported the strategy as successful by the total number of SFAs that reported using the strategy within each SFA size.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs that reported the strategy between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.7.15. Of SFAs that used certain strategies to recover unpaid meal charges, percentage that reported certain strategies as successful in recovering unpaid meal charges during SY 2022–2023, by poverty level

Strategy	All SFAs %	SFA poverty level	
		< 60% approved for F/RP meals %	60% + approved for F/RP meals %
Used administrative actions with student	86.7	90.3	76.0
Billed or otherwise notified households of negative balances	78.3	79.5	73.6
Took nonfinancial actions with parents	69.7	72.8	62.2
Involved school staff member to facilitate household repayment process	66.6	66.5	66.1
Used debt collection agency	61.0	61.6	53.1
Provided households with a repayment plan	59.0	57.4	63.9
Other	91.6	89.9*	100.0*
None – No strategies were successful	15.4	14.3	19.7
No response	0.2	0.2	0.0

Survey question: E14

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA poverty level obtained from the latest available FNS-742 file, with missing values obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported the strategy as successful by the total number of SFAs that reported using the strategy within each SFA poverty level.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs that reported the strategy between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.7.16. Of SFAs that used certain strategies to recover unpaid meal charges, percentage that reported certain strategies as successful in recovering unpaid meal charges during SY 2022–2023, by urbanicity

Strategy	All SFAs %	SFA urbanicity		
		Suburban %	Urban %	Rural %
Used administrative actions with student	86.7	100.0*	88.3	83.3
Billed or otherwise notified households of negative balances	78.3	81.5	74.3	79.5
Took nonfinancial actions with parents	69.7	73.1	67.8	69.7
Involved school staff member to facilitate household repayment process	66.6	69.0	56.9*	72.6
Used debt collection agency	61.0	77.6	55.0	60.6
Provided households with a repayment plan	59.0	57.9	47.8*	64.6*
Other	91.6	100.0*	81.7	95.1
None – No strategies were successful	15.4	14.1	17.4	14.7
No response	0.2	1.6	0.0	0.0

Survey question: E14

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA urbanicity obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey, with missing values imputed according to the SFA’s geographic location.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported the strategy as successful by the total number of SFAs that reported using the strategy within each urbanicity.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs that reported the strategy between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Supplement B.8:
Additional Tables

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Table B.8.1. Number and percentage of State agencies that prefer to use USDA resources online or as paper copies

Preferred format	Nationwide	
	#	%
Online	49	88
Paper copies	2	4
No preference	5	9
<i>n</i>	56	56

Survey question: F1

Source: School Meals Operations Study, State Agency Child Nutrition Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Fifty-six State agencies administered NSLP, SBP, or SSO in the 50 States, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands during this time period.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of State agencies that reported preference for each mode by the total number of State agencies that administered NSLP, SBP, or SSO.

Table B.8.2. Percentage of State agencies reporting additional thoughts for FNS about State and local efforts to provide Child Nutrition Program meals during SY 2022–2023

Additional thoughts for FNS	Nationwide	
	#	%
Appreciated the ongoing support and technical assistance provided by FNS	1	2
Encouraged SFAs to adopt CEP or Provision 2 to support implementation of free meals in the state	1	2
Establishing Provision 2 base year percentages to implement universal meals took a lot of effort	1	2
Grateful to USDA for providing waivers that allowed SFAs to focus on providing meals to students	1	2
Guidance from FNS should be timely to better support State agencies	1	2
Guidance should be timely and better support State agencies	1	2
Hiring and retaining enough staff to operate programs was challenging	1	2
Received program award later than expected	1	2
Timing for implementing new guidance was challenging	1	2
Without waivers allowing all meals to be free, schools experienced a large increase in debt	1	2
No other comments	48	86
Missing ^a	0	0
<i>n</i>	56	56

Survey question: F2

Source: School Meals Operations Study, State Agency Child Nutrition Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Thoughts listed were derived from State agencies’ open-ended responses.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of State agencies that reported each thought by the total number of State agencies that administered NSLP, SBP, or SSO.

^a Percentage missing calculated by dividing the number of State agencies that did not answer the question total number of State agencies that administered NSLP, SBP, or SSO.

Table B.8.3. Percentage of SFAs that used NSLP or SBP to provide meals during SY 2022–2023, by school type

Child Nutrition Program	All SFAs %	SFA school types				n
		Elementary %	Middle %	High %	Other ^a %	
National School Lunch Program (NSLP)	98.8	99.6	99.4	99.3	96.5	1,088
School Breakfast Program (SBP)	84.8	86.6	88.4	91.5	80.3	955
SFA does not know if they used NSLP or SBP	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.1	1.7	4
Did not use NSLP or SBP	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.4	3
No response	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.2	1.5	4

Survey question: A2

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs with the program by the total number of SFAs. Percentages of SFAs with each school type were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs with the school type and program by the total number of SFAs with the school type. SFAs could select all applicable school types.

^a Other schools included secondary schools (serving grades 6 or 7 through 12), early elementary schools (serving pre-kindergarten or kindergarten through 2), K through 8 schools (serving pre-kindergarten or kindergarten through 8), and K through 12 schools (serving all grades).

Table B.8.4. Percentage of SFAs that used NSLP or SBP to provide meals during SY 2022–2023, by SFA size

Child Nutrition Program	All SFAs %	SFA size (enrollment)				
		1-499 %	500-2,499 %	2,500-4,999 %	5,000-99,999 %	100,000+ %
National School Lunch Program (NSLP)	98.8	98.5	99.1	98.8	99.3	100.0*
School Breakfast Program (SBP)	84.8	74.8*	88.4*	97.7*	97.5*	100.0*
SFA does not know if they used NSLP or SBP	0.4	0.8	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0
Did not use NSLP or SBP	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.7	0.0
No response	0.4	0.3	0.6	0.6	0.0	0.0
n	1,100	389	336	166	182	27

Survey question: A2

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs with the Child Nutrition Program by the total number of SFAs within each SFA characteristic. SFAs could select all applicable Child Nutrition Programs.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs that used the program between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.8.5. Percentage of SFAs that used NSLP or SBP to provide meals during SY 2022–2023, by poverty level

Action	All SFAs %	SFA poverty level	
		< 60% approved for F/RP meals %	60% + approved for F/RP meals %
National School Lunch Program (NSLP)	98.8	99.3	98.2
School Breakfast Program (SBP)	84.8	80.8*	90.6*
SFA does not know if they used NSLP or SBP	0.4	0.3	0.5
Did not use NSLP or SBP	0.3	0.0	0.7
No response	0.4	0.5	0.3
<i>n</i>	1,100	654	419

Survey question: A2

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA poverty level obtained from the latest available FNS-742 file, with missing values obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs with the Child Nutrition Program by the total number of SFAs within each SFA characteristic. SFAs could select all applicable Child Nutrition Programs.

* Indicates that the difference in the percentage of SFAs that used the program between the following two groups is statistically significant at the .05 level: (a) SFAs that have the characteristic, and (b) all other SFAs (in other words all SFAs that do not have the characteristic).

Table B.8.6. Percentage of SFAs that used NSLP or SBP to provide meals during SY 2022–2023, by urbanicity

	SFA urbanicity			
	All SFAs %	Suburban %	Urban %	Rural %
National School Lunch Program (NSLP)	98.8	98.6	98.5	99.1
School Breakfast Program (SBP)	84.8	84.2	83.5	85.6
SFA does not know if they used NSLP or SBP	0.4	0.7	0.0	0.4
Did not use NSLP or SPB	0.3	0.4	0.0	0.3
No response	0.4	0.2	1.0	0.2
<i>n</i>	1,100	309	240	551

Survey question: A2

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs. SFA urbanicity obtained from the U.S. Department of Education’s CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey, with missing values imputed according to the SFA’s geographic location.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs with the Child Nutrition Program by the total number of SFAs within each SFA characteristic. SFAs could select all applicable Child Nutrition Programs.

Table B.8.7. Of SFAs in States with UFSM policies, percentage that reported operating CEP, Provision 2 or 3, or no provisions during SY 2022–2023

Provision	Percentage of SFAs
Community Eligibility Provision (CEP)	40.2
Provision 2 or 3	16.2
None	31.6
Don't know	11.9
No response	0.0
<i>n</i>	121

Survey question: B1

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported each response option by the total number of SFAs in States with Universal Free School Meal (UFSM) policies. Five States had UFSM policies during SY 2022–2023: California, Nevada, Massachusetts, Maine, and Vermont.

Table B.8.8. Of SFAs in States with UFSM policies that operated CEP, percentage that reported whether new State legislation impacted their decision to elect or continue operating CEP during SY 2022–2023

State legislation influence on decision	Percentage of SFAs
Yes, elected CEP as a result of new State legislation	11.6
Yes, continued to operate CEP as a result of new State legislation	15.2
No, new State legislation had no impact on decision to operate CEP	69.0
Don't know	4.2
No response	0.0
<i>n</i>	51

Survey question: B2

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported each response option by the total number of SFAs in States with Universal Free School Meal (UFSM) policies that operated CEP. Five States had UFSM policies during SY 2022–2023: California, Nevada, Massachusetts, Maine, and Vermont.

Table B.8.9. Of SFAs in States with UFSM policies that did not operate CEP, percentage that reported being eligible to elect CEP during SY 2022–2023

Eligible to elect CEP	Percentage of SFAs
Yes	7.3
No	75.1
Don't know	17.6
No response	0.0
<i>n</i>	58

Survey question: B4

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported each response option by the total the number of SFAs in States with Universal Free School Meal (UFSM) policies that did not operate CEP. Five States had UFSM policies during SY 2022–2023: California, Nevada, Massachusetts, Maine, and Vermont.

Table B.8.10. Of SFAs in States with UFSM policies that operated Provision 2 or 3, percentage that reported whether new State legislation impacted their decision to elect or continue operating Provision 2 or 3 during SY 2022–2023

State legislation influence on decision to operate Provision 2 or 3	Percentage of SFAs
Yes, elected Provision 2 or 3 as a result of new State legislation	37.7
Yes, continued to operate Provision 2 or 3 as a result of new State legislation	15.4
No, new State legislation had no impact on decision to operate Provision 2 or 3	22.5
Don't know	24.5
No response	0.0
<i>n</i>	18

Survey question: B3

Source: School Meals Operations Study, SFA Director Survey SY 2023–2024. Nationally representative sample of 1,100 SFAs.

Note: Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of SFAs that reported each response option by the total number of SFAs in States with Universal Free School Meal (UFSM) policies that operated Provision 2 or 3. Five States had UFSM policies during SY 2022–2023: California, Nevada, Massachusetts, Maine, and Vermont.