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## Summary

The Food and Health Network of South Central New York is coalition of diverse stakeholders working to build food-secure communities and a sustainable regional food system through collaboration. The Food and Health Network (FaHN) covers an eight county region that includes Broome, Chemung, Chenango, Cortland, Delaware, Otsego, Tioga and Tompkins counties. In 2011, FaHN conducted the first Regional Food System Assessment for South Central New York, which collected information and stories that define our regional food system and illuminated steps needed to fulfill our vision of healthy environments, economic vitality, farm to consumer connections, and healthy people. A full update was completed in 2012 with extensive stakeholder input, and in 2014, FaHN released an update titled "Helping to Create Hunger-Free Communities." This report identified the alarming gap between the number of children receiving free and reduced priced lunches during the school year, and the number of children accessing meals through the Summer Food Service Program. In 2015, only 3,322 children receiving free or reduced price meals during the school year, or $29 \%$, participated in the Summer Food Service Program ${ }^{1}$. These findings, along with widespread community input and support from the Broome County Child Hunger Task Force, prompted FaHN to initiate this Summer Food Access Assessment.


## Childhood Hunger in Broome County

Food insecurity means lack of regular access to basic food needs. Children are disproportionately affected by poverty and hunger. In 2013, 24.4\% of Broome County children were food insecure, while the total population rate of food insecurity was $14.1 \%^{2}$. In 2015, $24.8 \%$ of children were living in poverty. The total population poverty rate was $17.8 \%^{3}$. Such disparities among children living in poverty and experiencing food insecurity are staggering and unacceptable.

Hunger and food insecurity put children's futures at risk. Food insecurity affects development through, among other factors, nutrient insufficiency and family stress ${ }^{4}$. Children living in food insecure households are more likely to suffer from stomachaches; frequent headaches and colds; higher hospitalizations rates; behavior problems; lower physical function; higher rates of anxiety and depression; and higher numbers of chronic health conditions, including obesity ${ }^{5}$. In school, this can result in more frequent absences, reduced concentration, and lower test scores. Increased food insecurity during the summer months also impacts students' readiness to learn when they return to school in the Fall.

## Closing the Gap: Summer Food Service Program

During the 2014-2015 school year, 15,868 students in Broome County, or $56 \%$, were eligible for free or reduced price school breakfast and lunch ${ }^{6}$. 11,376 students participated in the free or reduced price lunch program, and for many of these children school meals are the most consistent and nutritious source of food available ${ }^{7}$. When school is out for the summer, the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) is available to help fill the gap, providing free meals and snacks to children who might otherwise be at risk of hunger.

Summer meal sites may be located at schools, parks, recreation centers, public housing, YMCAs, Boys and Girls Clubs, churches, summer camps, and other places where children gather when school is out. Sponsors may choose to serve breakfast, lunch, supper, snack, or a certain combination of meals throughout the summer. The USDA provides reimbursement for the cost of meals that meet federal nutritional guidelines, and individual sponsors may choose which foods to serve as part of the meal.

Currently, the SFSP is underused. Statewide, only 1 out of every 4 children who receive free or reduced price meals during the school year continues to receive meals during the summer months ${ }^{8}$.

## Summary

| 2015 Broome County: National School Lunch Program (NSLP) |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| \& Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) Data ${ }^{9}$ |  |
| Total students enrolled | 28,123 |
| Students eligible for free/reduced price meals | $56 \%$ (15,868 students) |
| Students eating free/reduced price lunch | $72 \%$ (11,376 students) |
| Students participating in Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) | 3,322 |
| Children participating in both NSLP and SFSP | $29 \%$ |

## Summer Food Access Assessment

The objective of this assessment is to establish the number, capacity, and location of all summer meal sites in Broome County, identify unique characteristics and needs of summer meal programs, and determine the current and potential ability to serve additional children. Through community collaboration and improved communication, new summer meal sites, and the innovative CHOW Bus program, significant progress was made during the Summer of 2015.

Following the Rochester Needs Assessment Model, this report will ask the following questions:

1. How many children received meals through the Summer Food Service Program?
2. How many children qualified for free and reduced price meals during the school year as opposed to those who participated in summer meals during the summer?
3. What methods can be taken to increase the number of eligible children participating in summer meals?
4. How can barriers that prevent more families and children from participating be addressed for the summer of 2016 and beyond?
5. What can partners do to encourage more organizations to become Summer Food Service Program sites?

## Overview of Summer 2016

1. $24.8 \%$ of Broome County children were living below the poverty level in $2015^{10}$.
2. In the 2014-15 school year, 11,376 low-income children received free and reduced price lunches at school through the National School Lunch Program ${ }^{11}$.
3. Average daily participation (ADP) rates $^{12}$ increased by 51\% from 2013-2015.
a. 2013: 2,201
b. 2014: 2,400
c. 2015: 3,322
4. Number of summer meal sites increased by 43\% from 2013-2015.
a. 2013: 28 sites
b. 2014: 29 sites
c. 2015: 40 sites
5. Three new rural sites opened in 2015: Windsor Central High School, AF Palmer Elementary School in Windsor, and Lisle Community Pool, brought the total number of rural sites to eight.

## Summary

## Critical Policy Change is Needed

Several of the key barriers preventing children and families from accessing summer meals are the result of policy restrictions on the federal Summer Food Service Program. It has been widely documented both nationally and locally that more flexibility is needed in how the SFSP is implemented. In rural communities in particular, public transportation to meal sites is not available, and low-income families are often working during the day or lack adequate personal transportation to bring children to meal sites. The current SFSP regulations require that meals are served at a congregate site, which means children and families without transportation are unable to participate. Under the current regulations, organizations cannot receive federal and state reimbursement for successful mobile meal distribution models, such as the CHOW Bus.

In order to address these barriers, groups across the country are advocating for flexibility in the congregate meal site requirement and for the USDA to simply increase the amount of SNAP benefits families with school
 aged children receive during the summer months, thereby eliminating the problem of season food insecurity. Groups are also advocating for a seamless summer option, so that sites participating in child nutrition programs during the school year can easily transition into a summer meal site without a huge paperwork burden.

What follows in the remainder of the report is an overview of summer meal programs in Broome County, data and case studies from Summer 2015, and recommendations for closing the gap to ensure that all children have access to nutritious, affordable food when school is out.

## Broome County in Context
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## Nation

In the United States, average daily participation in the Summer Food Service Program in July 2014 was 2,061,938 ${ }^{13}$.

## New York State

In New York State, average daily participation in the Summer Food Service Program in July 2014 was 289,404 ${ }^{14}$.

## Broome County

In Broome County, average daily participation in the Summer Food Service Program in July 2014 was $\mathbf{2 , 4 0 0}{ }^{15}$.

## SUMMER NUTRITION PROGRAMS

 CLOSING THE HUNGER GAP IN BROOME COUNTYYEAR
\% GROWTH IN PARTICIPATION

2013-2014
2014-2015
38\%

## In July 2015, that means:

1,121 more low-income children ate summer meals in 2015 compared to 2013.

3,322 children ate summer meals per day.

## Why is this important?

More children are eating healthy meals.

## More children are benefitting from

 summer programming.More children are hunger free, staying active, and learning.

Envisioning a Hunger-Free Community
While summer meals programs are a vital tool in reducing seasonal food insecurity, there are also additional indicators of community food security. The Food and Health Network's Food System Assessment (FSA) tracks progress towards a healthy, thriving, and food-secure regional food system. This assessment also highlights trends towards the Networks' vision for a hunger free community where residents of all income levels are connected to local agriculture and consume more locally produced, fresh, safe and healthful food.

Indicators on this page address the need for 1) Decrease in the poverty rate, 2) Increase in the number of community and school gardens, 3) Increase in the number of CSAs, 4) Increase in the number of farmers' markets using Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT), and 5) Increase in the availability of fresh produce and local healthy meats from food banks and pantries.

Poverty in our community:

- Decrease in poverty from $25.4 \%$ of children in 2013 to $24.8 \%$ of children in $2015^{16,17}$

Community and School Gardens:

- Growth from 10 gardens in 2011 to 23 gardens in $2015^{18}$

Community Supported Agriculture:

- Growth from 2 CSAs in 2012 to 5 CSAs in $2015^{19}$


## Farmers' Markets:

- 3 farmers' markets accepting Electronic Benefits Transfer in $2015^{20}$

Fresh produce donated to hunger relief agencies:

- Increase from 253,185 lbs. donated in 2014 to $366,460 \mathrm{lbs}$. in $2015^{21}$

Venison donated to hunger relief agencies:

## Broome County Summer Meals Overview

| School Lunch and Summer Meals Participation |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table 1 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| \# of children qualified for F/RP lunch | 14,099 | 14,756 | 15,868 |
| \% of children qualified for F/RP lunch* | $49 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $56 \%$ |
| \# of children eating F/RP lunch | 10,392 | 10,879 | 11,376 |
| \% of children eating F/RP lunch | $74 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $72 \%$ |
| \# of children participating in SFSP | 2,201 | 2,400 | 3,322 |
| $\%$ of children participating in both NSLP and SFSP** | $21 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $29 \%$ |

Note: *Binghamton City School District participated in the Community Eligibility Provision in 2013-15 and provides free breakfast and lunch to all students. As a result, their higher percentage of eligibility affects the total county percentage.
**SFSP participation rates are the average daily number of claims of SFSP lunches in July, divided by the average daily number of claims for free/reduced lunches in March of the same school year.

| Broome County Summer Meal Sponsors $2015{ }^{24}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sponsor Name | Count of Sites | Count of Sites | Lunch ADP (July) | Lunch ADP (July) |
| Table 2 | 2014 | 2015 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Binghamton City SD | 24 | 30 | 1,866 | 1,834 |
| Chenango Forks CSD | 1 | 1 | 74 | 68 |
| Deposit | 1 | 1 | 93 | 137 |
| Family Enrichment Network | 1 | 1 | 44 | 80 |
| Harpursville CSD | 1 | 1 | 161 | 143 |
| SUNY Binghamton Trio Programs | 1 | 1 | 162 | 187 |
| Windsor CSD* | 0 | 2 | 0 | 335 |
| Total | 28 | 37 | 2,400 | 2,784 |

Note: *Data shown for Windsor High School are for August, to more accurately portray meals served over the summer at this site.

| Additional Summer Meals <br> Distributed through CHOW 25 |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Table 3 |  |

Note: For details on the CHOW summer meals program, see the Best Practices \& Challenges section.

Table 1 Data: Prepared by Hunger Solutions New York, October 2015, from NYS Education Department.
Table 2 Data: Collected from Summer Meal Site Sponsors and Hunger Solutions New York.
Table 3 Data: Compiled by Leslie Cody, CHOW.

## Area Eligibility in Broome County

The following maps show areas eligible for summer meal sites by census tract. Areas are eligible to have open summer meal sites where 50 percent or more of the children are eligible for free and reduced price school meals ${ }^{26}$.

Broome County 2015: Urban Summer Meal Sites with Area Eligibility


USDA Capacity Builder
Broome County 2015: Summer Meal Sites with Area Eligibility


## Food Deserts in Broome County

The maps below show areas in Urban Broome County where residents do not have nearby access to supermarkets. ${ }^{27}$ These neighborhoods face acute challenges in food access and are potential areas of focus for new or expanded summer meal sites.

City of Binghamton: Council Districts 1, 4, 7


Village of Johnson City


Village of Endicott


Measurements for low income and low access layers: Low-income census tracts where a significant number or share of residents is more than 1 mile (urban) or 10 miles (rural) from the nearest supermarket.

## Food Access in Broome County

Transportation is a major barrier to food access in Broome County, as indicated by the maps below. Families in rural areas are at increased risk of food insecurity due to lack of transportation resources and nearby grocery stores. Smaller convenience stores may be available but seldom provide fresh, healthy food options.

The following maps show the percentage of households in Broome Country without access to a vehicle, in addition to the locations of major grocery stores. ${ }^{28}$ Urban Broome County has the highest concentration of grocery stores, while rural areas have very few options. Northern Broome County has no major grocery stores, and yet over eight percent of households in the northeastern portion of the county do not have access to a vehicle.


Northern Broome County


Eastern Broome County
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## Chapter 1: Structure of the Summer Food Service Program

## About the Summer Food Service Program

The Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) is administered at the Federal level by the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS), an agency of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). FNS decides overall program policy and publishes regulations and payment rates. State education agencies administer SFSP in most states. Other state agencies may also be assigned to run the program.

The state agency approves sponsor applications, conducts training of sponsors, monitors SFSP operations, and processes program payments. Sponsors sign agreements with their state agencies to run the program.

SFSP reimburses approved sponsors for serving meals that meet federal nutritional guidelines. Sponsors receive payments from USDA, through their state agencies, based on the number of meals they serve. All meals are served free to eligible children.

## Role of a Sponsor

Sponsors are organizations that manage SFSP feeding sites. A sponsor will:

- Attend State agency's training
- Locate and recruit eligible sites
- Hire, train, and supervise staff and volunteers
- Arrange for meals to be prepared or delivered
- Monitor your sites
- Prepare claims for reimbursement
- Ensure that Summer Food project and sites are sustainable through community partnerships, fundraising, and volunteer recruitment.


## Who Can Be a Sponsor

Sponsors must be organizations that are fully capable of managing a food service program. To be a sponsor, one must follow regulations and be responsible, financially and administratively, for running the program.

The following types of organizations can be sponsors:

- Public or private nonprofit schools
- Units of local, municipal, county, tribal, or State government
- Private nonprofit organizations
- Public or private nonprofit camps
- Public or private nonprofit universities or colleges



## Chapter 1: Structure of the Summer Food Service Program

## What is a Summer Meals Site?

A site is the physical location, approved by the state agency, where you serve SFSP meals during a supervised time period. States classify and approve SFSP meal sites as open, closed enrolled, or camp:

- Open sites operate in low-income areas where at least 50 percent of children residing in the area are eligible for free and reduced price school meals, based on local school or census data. The meals are served free to any child at the site on a first-come, first-serve basis.
- Closed enrolled sites are established for a specific group of children who enroll in an organized activity or who do not reside in an eligible low-income area. The site becomes eligible for SFSP if at least half of the enrolled children qualify for free and reduced price meals. Because the site is not open to the community, meals are served free only to enrolled children.
- Camps are sites that offer regularly scheduled food service along with organized activities for enrolled residential or day campers. The camp receives reimbursement only for meals served to enrolled children who qualify for free and reduced price meals.


## Who Can Become a Site?

Meal service sites may be located in a variety of settings, including schools, recreation centers, playgrounds, parks, churches, community centers, day camps, residential summer camps, or housing projects.

Some organizations do not have the financial or administrative ability to run the program, but they can supervise a food service for children, along with recreational or enrichment activities, at a site. If you supervise a site, you will:

- Attend sponsor's training
- Supervise activities and meal service at site
- Manage volunteers
- Distribute meals by following SFSP guidelines
- Keep daily records of meals served
- Store food appropriately
- Keep the site clean and sanitary
- Help the sponsor of the site promote the program in the community
- Meals preparation

A sponsor may prepare their own meals, purchase meals through an agreement with an area school, or contract meals with a food service management company. If the site has its own kitchen, meals can be prepared on site and the sponsor will receive a slightly higher "self-prep" reimbursement rate. If the kitchen is not on the premises, meals still can be prepared, and then be transported to the site.

## Chapter 2: Structure of Summer Meals in Broome County



## Broome County Open and Closed Sites

In 2015, there were 40 total summer meal sites. 35 were open to allow all children to participate. The timeline below illustrates the gap in access to meals during the summer months for food-insecure children. While some sites were open for the majority of the summer, others were open for a shorter amount of time. The gap between school ending and sites opening, and the gap between sites closing and school starting again, leaves children at risk for food insecurity and is an opportunity for expanding summer meals in 2016 and beyond.

Note: The timeline measures weekly segments for open enrolled sites and does not indicate exact opening and closing days for each site. Dates provided by NYS Education Dept. ${ }^{29}$


## Chapter 2: Structure of Summer Meals in Broome County

## 2015 Summer Meals: Broome County ${ }^{30}$

| Site Name | Lunch Total | Lunch DOS | ADP Lunch (July) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A F Palmer ES / Windsor Central MS | 3,276 | 16 | 205 |
| Benjamin Franklin Elementary | 2,400 | 20 | 120 |
| Binghamton High School | 1,018 | 16 | 64 |
| Binghamton Housing Authority Youth Center | 968 | 20 | 48 |
| Boys \& Girls Club of Binghamton | 1,473 | 21 | 70 |
| Boys \& Girls Club W. Broome | 1,308 | 22 | 59 |
| Broome County Public Library | 610 | 22 | 28 |
| Broome-Tioga Boces | 5,073 | 19 | 267 |
| Camp Sertoma | 2,291 | 20 | 115 |
| Carlisle Apartments | 634 | 19 | 33 |
| Caryl E Adams Primary School | 1,715 | 16 | 107 |
| Centenary Chenango St United Methodist | 50 | 8 | 6 |
| CHOW (sites in Deposit, Whitney Point, Windsor) | Not available from source | Not available from source | 538 |
| Conklin Presbyterian Church | 238 | 18 | 13 |
| Cornerstone Community Church | 19 | 7 | 3 |
| Chenango Forks High School | 1,085 | 16 | 68 |
| Deposit Elementary School | 2,746 | 20 | 137 |
| F P Donnelly School | 348 | 15 | 23 |
| Family Enrichment Network, Inc. | 1,831 | 23 | 80 |
| First Assembly Of God | 483 | 22 | 22 |
| High Street United Methodist Church | 267 | 22 | 12 |
| Horace Mann School | 1,740 | 20 | 87 |
| Identity Youth Center | 133 | 22 | 6 |
| Johnson City Elem/Primary School | 2,131 | 21 | 101 |
| Lisle Community Pool | 80 | 4 | 20 |
| Mt. Sinai Church Of God In Christ | 318 | 10 | 32 |
| Pal Camp | 571 | 20 | 29 |
| Parents As Leaders | 121 | 17 | 7 |
| Redeemer Lutheran Church | 1,260 | 22 | 57 |
| Schorr Family Firehouse Stage | 123 | 6 | 21 |
| SUNY Binghamton (Trio Programs) | 5,617 | 30 | 187 |
| Theodore Roosevelt School | 2,722 | 20 | 136 |
| United Presbyterian Church | 762 | 19 | 40 |
| W A Olmsted Elementary School | 2,867 | 20 | 143 |
| West Middle School | 2,763 | 16 | 173 |
| Whitney Point Pre School | 1,445 | 22 | 66 |
| Windsor Central High School* | 1,565 | 12 | 130 |
| Woodrow Wilson School | 1,383 | 20 | 69 |
|  |  | TOTAL: | 3,322 |
| DOS = Days of Service <br> ADP = Average Daily Participation |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| *Data shown for Windsor High School are for August, to more accurately portray meals served over the summer at the site. |  |  |  |
| Data sources: Hunger Solutions New York, from NYS Education Department. Data for Family Enrichment Network provided by site. Data for CHOW sites provided by Leslie Cody. |  |  |  |

## Chapter 3: Best Practices \& Challenges at Summer Meal Sites

Summer meal program sites in Broome County are hosted at a variety of locations; through schools, summer enrichment and parks \& recreation programs, faith-based organizations, food pantries, agencies such as the Boys \& Girls Club and Family Enrichment Network, and mobile distribution through the Community Hunger Outreach Warehouse (CHOW) Bus. Sites operate in rural and urban Broome County.

## Urban and Suburban Sites

The 2015 urban and suburban summer meal sites in Broome County were located in the City of Binghamton, Johnson City, Union-Endicott, Chenango Forks, Conklin, and Vestal. The highest number of sites and diversity of summer meal program sites were in the City of Binghamton. As in rural communities, school based summer food service sites typically served the largest number of children but may not run the full length of the summer. Community and faith-based organizations such
 as Family Enrichment Network and First Assembly of God operated for longer periods of time and were able to offer additional resources, including meals for parents and food for the weekends. Maintaining consistent and sustainable participation rates at new and smaller faith-based and agency-based sites can be a challenge without outside resources. Additional support is often necessary for some of the best practices discussed throughout the assessment, including meals for parents, engaging programming, and extensive outreach.

## Rural Sites

In Broome County, almost all rural Summer Food Service Program sites are located at schools. Often these are run in conjunction with a summer enrichment or summer recreation program, but are also open to all children under the age of 18. In 2015, there were school based meal sites in Deposit, Harpursville, Whitney Point, and Windsor. A common challenge for rural school based sites is maintaining participation rates in summer meals when enrichment programs end. Children are less inclined to participate at meal sites without additional activities offered, and they may also lose access to transportation after the enrichment program ends. School based sites typically lack the resources to provide meals to parents, which presents another challenge to participation. In 2015, CHOW also provided summer meals at the Lisle Community Pool, and the CHOW Bus delivered meals to food pantries in Windsor and Deposit and the Saving Grace Arts Center in Whitney Point.

## Fostering Community Partnerships

Whitney Point is a rural village in Broome County that had three active summer meal programs available for children in 2015. Open meal sites were held at Whitney Point Preschool and Daycare and Caryl E. Adams Primary School, and were delivered by the CHOW Bus to an enrollment-based summer camp program. Through the CHOW Bus, meal boxes were distributed in


Whitney Point that provided several days' worth of food for children and their entire families. The CHOW Bus was also in Whitney Point one day a week throughout the summer offering low-cost and free produce.

The collaboration between the Whitney Point Preschool and Daycare, Whitney Point Promise Zone, CHOW, and the Rural Health Network highlights the power of community partners to reach more children and families and bring together multiple resources to address the challenges of rural access to meal sites.

## Chapter 3: Best Practices \& Challenges at Summer Meal Sites

## Cultivating Innovative Solutions

The Community Hunger Outreach Warehouse (CHOW) became involved with the Summer Food Service Program in 2014, after launching their innovative CHOW Bus initiative in response to the acute challenges rural communities face accessing fresh, healthy food and getting to summer meal locations. Although summer meal sites exist in rural communities, a lack of transportation from the more remote areas into the town centers still leaves some of the most vulnerable children at risk of hunger when school is out.

Current USDA Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) regulations require that meal sites be at a congregate location, meaning meals are consumed on site at a designated place. In response, CHOW partnered with the community to raise funds to purchase meals from Binghamton City School District, a SFSP sponsor who was already preparing summer meals. Because meals were purchased separately from SFSP, they could
 be dropped off at accessible locations and delivered further into the community as needed.

At the same time, the CHOW Bus also delivered larger meal boxes for entire families and provided low-cost or no cost fresh produce through a mobile market. Through a partnership with Cornell Cooperative Extension of Broome County's Nutrition Education program, nutrition information, cooking demonstrations, and taste tests were also offered for free when the mobile market stopped in rural communities and at various locations around Binghamton.

Through the CHOW Bus and partner agencies, summer meals were delivered to locations in the rural communities of Windsor, Deposit, and Whitney Point. CHOW also ran congregate summer meal sites at the Broome County Public Library in Downtown Binghamton, and at the Lisle Community Pool in the rural town of Lisle. The Lisle program was piloted one day a week for four weeks in 2015, and the site was well attended and demonstrated the possibility to partner with additional park locations where children are already gathered to host a summer meal program. The Broome County Public Library site was open 5 days a week, and the CHOW Bus visited once a week to also offer fresh produce.

In total, CHOW was able to provide:

- 4,095 lunches for children
- 507 lunches for parents
- 7,070 meal boxes to 42 families (including 120 children)

AmeriCorps members serving with CHOW through the Rural Health Service Corps were integral to the daily operations and success of CHOW's innovative efforts in 2014 and 2015, as well as volunteers, an intern from the Broome County Health Department, and several youth participating in a summer youth employment program through CHOW. Widespread community support and collaboration was also key to this successful initiative, including an innovative partnership between VINES (Volunteers Improving Neighborhood Environments) and the CHOW Farm to grow fresh produce for the mobile market.

## Chapter 3: Best Practices \& Challenges at Summer Meal Sites

## Including Families in Summer Meals

A frequently cited challenge of the USDA Summer Food Service Program is the inability to serve reimbursable meals to parents or caretakers who may be accompanying children to meal sites. If children are experiencing food insecurity, it is likely that other members of their household also face challenges accessing enough nutritious food at all times. Recognizing that a lack of food for parents may deter participation, many sites have developed cre-
 ative solutions in order to meet the needs of the whole family, using outside resources and community support. When possible, offering meals to adults accompanying children helps to create a positive meal-time experience, increases participation, and considers the needs and wellbeing of the whole household.


First Assembly of God located on Washington Street in downtown Binghamton is one example of a summer meal site that focuses on the entire family. In addition to providing meals for children, the program is able to utilize additional resources to offer meals for over 50 adults each week. Through a food pantry located at the same site, families are also able to receive groceries for the weekend when summer meal programs are not available. The program also ran for the full length of the summer, giving children a dependable, local, and nutritious food. When other nearby sites closed for the summer, First Assembly became a referral site for children.

Another summer meal site, High Street United Methodist Church, was also able to offer meals to parents in 2015, thanks to a unique partnership with the Community Hunger Outreach Warehouse (CHOW). Because CHOW was already working with Binghamton City School District to purchase summer meals using private funds, they were easily able to increase the number of meals ordered each week so that High Street could offer the same lunches to children and adults visiting their site. Through parent meals, increased activities for children, and special programs on Friday evenings, High Street was able to increase the number of children participating in the summer meal program by 100\% in 2015.

## Expanding Days of Service

The Summer Food Service Program is designed so that children have access to nutritious food throughout the summer, and it is important for sites to maintain consistent schedules and operate for as many days as possible. Centenary United Methodist Church, a new site in Binghamton in 2015, experienced the positive benefits of expanding their days of service firsthand. After initially opening two days a week, Centenary began offering meals five days per week at the end of July.

The site supervisors were able to partner with the Healthy Lifestyles Coalition and Lee Barta Community Center, also located on Binghamton's North Side, for outreach and activities. FaHN AmeriCorps member Victoria Delaney was able to link the supervisors at Centenary with the supervisor at High Street United Methodist Church to help the new site learn from past challenges and successes.


## Chapter 3: Best Practices \& Challenges at Summer Meal Sites

## Focus on Programming

The summer meal program hosted by Catholic Charities of Broome County at Redeemer Lutheran Church reflects the positive effects robust programming can have on participation rates. Through community collaborations, the meal site at Redeemer Lutheran offered activities with the Roberson Museum, Ross Park Mobile Zoo, Broome County Library, and Cornell Cooperative Extension. Christmas in July was their most successful activity, involving over 90 children and their parents. 127 children also signed up for a book program. Those who completed at least 20 hours of reading over the summer and attended the meal site $90 \%$ of the time were able to earn a new backpack, school supplies, and gift cards. The site also developed a volunteer program that fosters leadership and participation among children and families attending the meal site.

In addition to programming for children, Catholic Charities is able to offer meals for parents at Redeemer Lutheran Church. They distributed 480 weekend fresh fruit and vegetable bags
 during the summer to prevent food insecurity over the weekend.

## Building Awareness

Despite the enormous impact of the Summer Food Service Program on children and families in Broome County, many are still unaware that the resource exists. Great effort was taken by a large collaboration of partners to change this in 2015 and ensure that more children, families, school staff, and the community at large was aware of available food resources during the summer. Learning from partners in Chemung County, FaHN AmeriCorps member Victoria Delaney created a promotional postcard listing all open summer meal sites and their hours, which was widely distributed. 2015 was the first widespread and coordinated effort to promote the program, and members of the Broome County Child Hunger Task Force were integral to increased outreach. Broome-Tioga BOCES Food Service was able to work with a local media company for radio promotion, and razor banners were distributed for all summer meal sites. Individual meal sites also tried new ways to build awareness, like Deposit Elementary School.

Deposit Elementary School is an open summer meal site that includes access to a pool, located in the rural village of Deposit. In Summer 2015, the school used a variety of outreach strategies to promote their summer meals and enrichment program. They were able to double participation rates from 2014 to 2015, with an average daily participation of 137 children in July 2015.

The school advertised widely, used bilingual posters, and had articles in the local newspaper. Deposit also utilized the yellow Summer Food Service Program banner created by the USDA that are available through summer meal sponsors. Outreach efforts were spread across various platforms to effectively reach more children and families.

## Chapter 4: Stakeholder Views of the Summer Food Service Program

Early in the Spring of 2015, surveys were distributed to Summer Food Service Program sponsors, meal site supervisors, and parents in Broome County. Assistance with distributing surveys to parents and families was provided by Catholic Charities of Broome County, Healthy Lifestyles Coalition, Lee Barta Community Center, Rural Health Service Corps members, Whitney Point Preschool \& Daycare, and Whitney Point Promise Zone.

The surveys were designed to better determine public knowledge of the Summer Food Service Program and other food resources in the summer, and to identify the level of need and potential barriers to participation. Meal site sponsor and supervisor surveys were designed to better understand capacity and programming at individual meal sites. Barriers and other feedback were considered during Summer 2015 and have been integrated into recommendations presented in this assessment and planning efforts for 2016 and beyond.

## Parent/Guardian Survey Results at a Glance

- How does summer hunger affect families? 34\% of survey participants reported that summer food insecurity was highest during the weekend when pantries are closed. $30 \%$ of respondents use food pantries or soup kitchens during the summer.
- How many kids eat free and reduced price school meals? The majority of parents surveyed, 67\%, reported that their children received free or reduced price meals at school, indicating they may not have adequate access to food when school is not in session.
- What types of food are children eating? 51\% of parents in Broome County are concerned about making sure their children are getting enough to eat and are eating nutritious food.
- Where are children in the summer? Parents reported that $7.89 \%$ of their children are in summer school, and $10.53 \%$ are at summer camps, summer enrichment, or recreation programs. Survey results indicated that $39.47 \%$ of children are with an adult at home, and $23.32 \%$ are at home with other children but no adult present.
- How many parents know about SFSP? 29\% of parents did not know where to take their children for summer meals or did not know there were free summer meals available.
- How do children access meal sites? $13 \%$ of parents needed transportation, while $5 \%$ did not feel their children were safe walking to a nearby meal site.
- What type of meal sites need to be offered? Parents preferred a site where they could drop in during the day Monday through Friday.


## Chapter 4: Stakeholder Views of the Summer Food Service Program

| This year, did your children mostly: |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Take lunch to school | $23.53 \%$ |
| Get free lunch at school | $67.65 \%$ |
| Get reduced price lunch at school | $5.88 \%$ |
| Buy lunch offsite/not at school | $0 \%$ |
| Not eat lunch | $0 \%$ |
| Idon't know | $2.94 \%$ |



| Last summer, how did your school-age <br> children spend most of their time during the day? <br> (Select two most common) |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| At home alone | $7.89 \%$ |
| At home with other children | $23.32 \%$ |
| With an adult in your home or |  |
| another's home | $39.47 \%$ |
| At daycare center | $39.47 \%$ |
| At summer school | $7.89 \%$ |
| At summer camps/rec centers | $10.53 \%$ |
| At work | $0 \%$ |
| Out of town | $5.26 \%$ |
| Don't know | $0 \%$ |



## Chapter 4: Stakeholder Views of the Summer Food Service Program



| Please mark a check if any of these are TRUE for you: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| I worry about my children eating enough of the right kinds of foods | $51.43 \%$ |
| I worry about having enough food for my children | $31.43 \%$ |
| I choose summer activities for my children based on whether food is <br> included in the program | $31.43 \%$ |
| Many families in my neighborhood struggle to feed their children during <br> the summer months | $31.43 \%$ |
| There are enough places in my neighborhood to get free food if we need it <br> Providing enough food for my children in the summer is harder than during <br> the school year | $\mathbf{2 8 . 5 7 \%}$ |

## Chapter 4: Stakeholder Views of the Summer Food Service Program

| Which, if any, of the following were true <br> for you last summer? |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| I struggled to have enough food to <br> feed everyone in the household | $26 \%$ |
| Providing enough food for my  <br> children was harder on the  <br> weekend than during the week  <br> We got food from a food pantry or <br> soup kitchen $34 \%$ <br> We had to skip meals or cut the size <br> of meals $30 \%$ |  |


| If available, what type of meal program <br> would your children use this summer? |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Meals served at a community site <br> where children can go during the <br> day Mon-Fri |  |
| A mobile food truck that tours the <br> neighborhood | $53.3 \%$ |
| A mobile food truck that sets up at a <br> playground or housing complex | $23 \%$ |
| Picking up a backpack of food once <br> a week to prepare and eat at home | $33 \%$ |



## If available, what type of meal program would your children use this summer?



## Chapter 4: Stakeholder Views of the Summer Food Service Program



| If your child DID NOT eat at a free summer meal site, why not? |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| I did not know where to take them to get free meals | $29 \%$ |
| I did not know that all children could get free meals in the summer | $29 \%$ |
| I did not know when the free meal sites were open | $26 \%$ |
| We did not need the food | $18 \%$ |
| My children did not have transportation to the site | $13 \%$ |
| My children were in a program where food was already provided | $11 \%$ |
| There were no summer meals sites in our neighborhood | $8 \%$ |
| Idid not feel my children were safe walking to the meal sites | $5 \%$ |
| My children didn't like the food | $5 \%$ |
| My children did not like going because there was nothing else to do there | $5 \%$ |
| We did not go because adults couldn't eat at the summer meal sites | $3 \%$ |

## Chapter 5: Recommendations for Closing the Hunger Gap

Promotion and outreach are essential components of a successful summer meals program, and both require early planning and an effective use of resources. A variety of methods should be used to reach parents and children, as well as agencies, who can refer families to summer meal sites. The USDA provides materials to be used for promotion, and there are a number of methods that have been successful in increasing awareness of the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP).

## Increase Access to Summer Meals: Outreach

One new method of outreach in 2015 was the creation of promotional post cards. This effort was accomplished by a collaboration between FaHN and the Healthy Lifestyles Coalition. Cards were distributed through member organizations of the Broome County Hunger Task Force and additional service providers.

The Nutrition Outreach and Education Program (NOEP) Coordinator for Broome County was also essential for sharing information on summer meal
 locations with agencies and individuals.

To diversify methods of outreach, Broome-Tioga BOCES Food Service organized a radio promotion through Clear Channel Media. Broome County Transit placed flyers for summer meal site locations on all public buses, as well as BC Country, which serves rural residents of Broome County.

## Key Strategies: Awareness \& Promotion

1. Reaching students before school ends is a crucial step in outreach. Promotion must start in the spring, a few weeks before summer vacation. Distributing promotional cards through schools and publishing information on school lunch menus requires working with each school district to encourage them to promote summer meals. It is also important to notify the front office staff of each school building about site locations.
2. The USDA provides banners for participating providers to hang outside their sites at no cost to the provider, which is distributed by the sponsors. Place the banners in school cafeterias so children will recognize it. When they see this banner in the summer, they will know meals are being served at that location.
3. Make sure each site receives and uses the SFSP banners. Customize each banner with dates and times for each site.
4. An assembly or tabling promotion should occur at area schools before the end of the school year to raise awareness of the program, in addition to transportation options through Mobility Management for students to access sites.
5. Promotion in 2015 included television interviews and announcements, social media, newsletters, and inter-agency promotion among stakeholders. Greater media promotion is needed for 2016 to effectively target parents and direct them to resources for locating sites.
6. Tap into existing community events to promote summer meals. The Stand for Children event in June is an opportunity to distribute promotional cards and increase awareness of SFSP.
7. Establish partnerships with the healthcare community to ensure that all primary care, urgent care and walk-in practices serving children and families are aware of SFSP resources.

## Chapter 5: Recommendations for Closing the Hunger Gap

One of the major barriers to participation in summer meals is transportation. In both urban and rural areas, children may be unable to travel to an open meal site during the summer. Children in urban areas may face unsafe walking conditions, particularly if they are young children crossing major intersections without an adult. Even if public transportation is available, bus passes are often not a cost-effective option for low-income families. Rural areas experience a lack of public transportation, leaving children without a way to travel to a meal site during the summer. Families who only have access to one car may be unable to take children to a meal site.

## Increase Access to Summer Meals: Transportation

As part of the pilot program to increase participation in summer meal programs, the Food and Health Network sought to better understand transportation needs and possible solutions. When sites close before the end of the summer, children are often unaware of alternative sites or unable to easily switch to another location. If there are no sites within a safe walking distance, parents either need to drive or use public transportation, or have children take public transportation on their own. Many families reported that they did not have access to a vehicle, but spending $\$ 70$ per person for a one-month bus pass can be a prohibitive financial burden for families relying on summer meal programs. To help alleviate this barrier, FaHN AmeriCorps member Victoria Delaney worked with Broome County Transit to purchase bus passes for children at the same student rate they would receive during the school year. Funding from the Roger Kresge Foundation allowed FaHN to purchase and distribute bus passes as part of a pilot.

Victoria Delaney was able to identify families in need of transportation assistance by visiting all summer meal sites before they closed early. One such site was Redeemer Lutheran Church on Binghamton's West Side. While the nearest site was unable to take on additional children, several other meal programs in Binghamton were glad to accept more but required transportation to attend. Bus passes were provided to children with the assistance of the site supervisor, and families received resources on how to reach new sites and on utilizing Mobility Management of South Central New York for assistance. Additional families were identified at sites around Binghamton, and children received bus passes to attend new meal programs when theirs ended early.

Moving forward, Broome County Transit should extend student rate bus passes to all children throughout the summer to ensure those who have access to public transportation can get to meal sites. Creative opportunities to utilize existing vehicle assets of organizations, such as ACHIEVE, should also be explored to alleviate the transportation barrier.

## Key Strategies: Bus Passes \& Agency Collaboration

1. Promote collaboration between Broome County Transit and the GetThere Call Center at Mobility Management of South Central New York. Mobility Management can provide travel training to children and families to use public transportation.
2. Work with $B C$ Transit to make sure student rate bus passes are available to children during the summer.
3. Support the promotion and growth of the CHOW Bus mobile meal distribution model.
4. Develop an inventory of existing transportation assets, such as vans used by agencies that are not in use during the middle of the day, that could be used for transporting children to summer camps and enrichment programs that offer free meals.
5. The limited number of sites in Johnson City and Endicott mean that more children in those communities require transportation to reach summer meal programs. In addition to rural locations, specific attention should be paid to these communities in 2016.

## Chapter 5: Recommendations for Closing the Hunger Gap

Broadening the reach of summer meals in Broome County is a core component of closing the childhood hunger gap during the summer months. By increasing Summer Food Service Program participation rates from $29 \%$ to $40 \%$, an additional 4,550 children in Broome County would be better nourished over the summer.

## Increase Access to Summer Meals: Capacity-building

In Broome County, sites vary widely in the number of days they are open. Sites should be encouraged to stay open longer during the summer in order to close the gap in days of service. The time period between school ending and sites opening leaves children vulnerable to food insecurity. Likewise, the gap between summer meal sites closing and school starting again can leave children without a reliable source of food.

Certain sites indicated a capacity to serve more kids each day, and partner organizations should work with them to identify resources necessary to do so. Increased promotion and outreach is also necessary to make sure that more children attend underutilized sites.


Opening new sites is another method of increasing capacity of summer meals. Through assessment and collaboration, a number of locations have been identified as possible new sites in 2016. These locations should be encouraged to become open meal sites this summer. Increasing the number of available sites will close the barrier in access for a number of families.

## Key Strategies: Expanding the Reach of Summer Meals

1. Open new meal sites in 2016. Possible locations include the Maine-Endwell Summer Camp program, Sarah Jane Johnson Memorial United Methodist Church, American Civic Association in Binghamton, and additional currently underserved areas of Union-Endicott and Johnson City.
2. The earlier that locations can commit to hosting a Summer Food Service Program site, the sooner community partners can help with promotion and outreach. Partner agencies should work with sponsors and past/potential summer meal sites to establish 2016 sites by early Spring to allow for adequate outreach and planning support.
3. Increase the number of days sites are open, as well as the length of time each day.
4. Increase the number of volunteers to support meal sites. For example, recruit volunteers to support the Lisle Community Pool meal site.
5. Ensure that all summer enrichment and summer camp programs are aware of the Summer Food Service Program. If they are serving an income eligible population or operating in an eligible area, they should be encouraged to become either open or closed enrolled sites.

## Chapter 5: Recommendations for Closing the Hunger Gap

Expanding outreach, improving transportation, and increasing the capacity of existing summer meal sites is not possible without added community agency and support. Through the Broome County Child Hunger Task Force, organizations are collaborating to address these core community needs. Involving more agencies in the process will strengthen current summer meals work and allow for expansion to reach more hungry kids.

## Increase Access to Summer Meals: Enhance Community Agency and Support

The Broome County Child Hunger Task Force (BCCHTF) has provided a key forum for community organizations, summer meal sites and school food service/summer meal sponsors to plan, collaborate, and evaluate. In 2015, the Food and Health Network AmeriCorps member was able formalize on-going community wide collaboration and provide additional support for summer meal sites and coordinating stakeholders as part of the summer meal assessment. In Spring 2015, FaHN organized a planning forum to bring together summer meal sites, sponsors, and support organizations to gather input for the assessment and develop key strategies for that summer. A de-brief meeting was also held in the Fall for summer meal sites, sponsors, and partner organizations to evaluate success and challenges of the Summer and begin a work plan for 2016. Moving forward, a sustained focus on summer meals and the recommendations and next steps identified in this assessment will be integrated into the Child Hunger Task Force work plan, monthly meetings, and child nutrition program subcommittee meetings. Additional support and coordination of these efforts will be provided by the Food Bank of the Southern Tier, with additional help from BCCHTF members.

Enhancing community support for summer meals is a twofold process that needs to involve 1) Ensuring that more partner organizations are at the table in planning and promotion, especially those who manage summer meal sites; and 2 ) leveraging community and BCCHTF resources to provide additional support to summer meal sites such as funding for parent meals, developing a toolkit of available programming, and building a mentoring system between new and experienced meal site supervisors.

## Key Strategies: Building a Community-wide Network

1. Work with community partners year round, including schools, HeadStart programs, after school programs, Promise Zone and others, to identify families and children who would benefit from the Summer Food Service Program. Work with partners early on to identify children that may need additional assistance with transportation to meal sites/summer programs.
2. Develop relationships with health care providers to refer parents to food resources.
3. Build a stronger support and resource network among site supervisors and volunteers by actively involving them in all planning, outreach and evaluation discussions. Provide opportunities for networking and mentoring between new and more established summer meal sites.
4. Develop a toolkit for summer meal site supervisors that lists the different types of programming and activities that are available for free, such as nutrition education, and also lists community organizations available to provide support.
5. Develop a volunteer network to assist sites with delivering meals and providing programming/activities for children and families.
School Breakfast Program: Data gathered by Hunger Solutions NYS, 2015

| School District | School Building | Total Enrollment | \# Students Qualified for Free | \# Students <br> Qualified for <br> ReducedPrice | \# Students Qualified F/RP | \% Qualified for F/RP | \# Students <br> Eating for <br> Free <br> Breakfast | \# Students <br> Eating RP <br> Breakfast | \# Students <br> Eating <br> F/RP <br> Breakfast | \% Students <br> Eating <br> F/RP <br> Breakfast | \# Students <br> Eating Paid <br> Breakfast | Avg. \# of Total Students Eating Breakfast | \% of ALL <br> Students <br> Eating <br> Breakfast | Provision Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Binghamton <br> City SD | Benjamin <br> Franklin <br> Elementary <br> School | 537 | 537 |  | 537 | 100\% | 275 |  | 275 | 51\% |  | 275 | 51\% | CEP |
| Binghamton City SD | Binghamton High School | 1,518 | 1,518 |  | 1,518 | 100\% | 209 |  | 209 | 14\% |  | 209 | 14\% | CEP |
| Binghamton City SD | BT BOCES | 483 | 312 | 33 | 345 | 71\% | 150 | 10 | 160 | 47\% | 32 | 193 | 40\% | None |
| Binghamton City SD | Calvin Coolidge School | 339 | 339 |  | 339 | 100\% | 174 |  | 174 | 51\% | - | 174 | 51\% | CEP |
| Binghamton City SD | Columbus School | 227 | 180 | 18 | 198 | 87\% | 74 | 7 | 81 | 41\% | 11 | 93 | 41\% | None |
| Binghamton City SD | East Middle School | 579 | 579 |  | 579 | 100\% | 177 |  | 177 | 31\% | - | 177 | 31\% | CEP |
| Binghamton City SD | Horace Mann School | 338 | 338 |  | 338 | 100\% | 175 |  | 175 | 52\% | - | 175 | 52\% | CEP |
| Binghamton City SD | Macarthur School | 447 | 447 |  | 447 | 100\% | 186 |  | 186 | 42\% | - | 186 | 42\% | CEP |
| Binghamton City SD | St. John School | 150 | 12 | 3 | 15 | 10\% | 5 |  | 5 | 32\% | 2 | 7 | 5\% | None |
| Binghamton City SD | Theodore Roosevelt School | 438 | 438 |  | 438 | 100\% | 232 |  | 232 | 53\% | - | 232 | 53\% | CEP |
| Binghamton City SD | Thomas Jefferson School | 327 | 327 |  | 327 | 100\% | 102 |  | 102 | 31\% | - | 102 | 31\% | CEP |
| Binghamton City SD | West Middle School | 648 | 648 |  | 648 | 100\% | 145 | - | 145 | 22\% | - | 145 | 22\% | CEP |
| Binghamton City SD | Woodrow Wilson School | 424 | 424 |  | 424 | 100\% | 219 | - | 219 | 52\% | - | 219 | 52\% | CEP |
| Binghamton <br> City SD <br> TOTAL |  | 6,455 | 6,099 | 54 | 6,153 | 95\% | 2,124 | 17 | 2,141 | 35\% | 46 | 2,187 | 34\% |  |

School Breakfast Program: Data gathered by Hunger Solutions NYS, 2015

| School District | School <br> Building | Total Enrollment | \# Students Qualified for Free | \# Students Qualified for Reduced-Price | \# Students Qualified for F/RP | \% Qualified for F/RP | \# Students Eating for Free Breakfast | \# Students <br> Eating RP <br> Breakfast | \# Students <br> Eating F/RP Breakfast | \% Students Eating F/RP Breakfast | \# Students <br> Eating Paid <br> Breakfast | Avg. \# of Total Students Eating Breakfast | \% of ALL <br> Students <br> Eating <br> Breakfast | Provision Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chenango <br> Forks CSD | Chenango <br> Forks <br> Elementary | 675 | 234 | 47 | 281 | 42\% | 134 | 13 | 147 | 52\% | 46 | 193 | 29\% | None |
| Chenango <br> Forks CSD | Chenango Forks High School | 467 | 108 | 34 | 142 | 30\% | 70 | 6 | 76 | 53\% | 9 | 84 | 18\% | None |
| Chenango <br> Forks CSD | Chenango Forks Middle School | 364 | 105 | 36 | 141 | 39\% | 28 | 5 | 33 | 23\% | 4 | 37 | 10\% | None |
| Chenango <br> Forks CSD TOTAL |  | 1,506 | 447 | 117 | 564 | 37\% | 231 | 24 | 255 | 45\% | 59 | 314 | 21\% |  |
| Chenango Valley CSD | Chenango Bridge Elem | 368 | 119 | 26 | 145 | 39\% | 51 | 6 | 57 | 39\% | 10 | 67 | 18\% | None |
| Chenango Valley CSD | Chenango Valley HS | 773 | 216 | 46 | 262 | 34\% | 62 | 11 | 73 | 28\% | 29 | 102 | 13\% | None |
| Chenango Valley CSD | Port Dickinson Elementary School | 618 | 228 | 53 | 281 | 45\% | 92 | 20 | 112 | 40\% | 50 | 162 | 26\% | None |
| Chenango Valley CSD TOTAL |  | 1,759 | 563 | 125 | 688 | 39\% | 205 | 37 | 242 | 35\% | 90 | 331 | 19\% |  |
| Deposit CSD | Deposit Elem | 309 | 176 | 24 | 200 | 65\% | 84 | 7 | 91 | 46\% | 28 | 119 | 38\% | None |
| Deposit CSD | Deposit Middle-Senior High School | 238 | 115 | 34 | 149 | 63\% | 36 | 10 | 46 | 31\% | 11 | 57 | 24\% | None |
| Deposit CSD TOTAL |  | 547 | 291 | 58 | 349 | 64\% | 120 | 17 | 137 | 39\% | 39 | 175 | 32\% |  |
| Harpursville CSD | Harpursville Junior-Senior High School | 378 | 152 | 48 | 200 | 53\% | 52 | 12 | 63 | 32\% | 17 | 80 | 21\% | None |
| Harpursville CSD | W A Olmsted Elementary | 438 | 226 | 51 | 277 | 63\% | 116 | 25 | 141 | 51\% | 28 | 168 | 38\% | None |
| Harpursville CSD TOTAL |  | 816 | 378 | 99 | 477 | 58\% | 168 | 36 | 204 | 43\% | 44 | 248 | 30\% |  |

School Breakfast Program：Data gathered by Hunger Solutions NYS， 2015

|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \stackrel{0}{\circ} \\ \text { Z } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 0 \\ \vdots \\ \text { ¿ } \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \stackrel{0}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{0}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \stackrel{0}{\delta} \\ & \stackrel{\delta}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{2}}$ | $\stackrel{\text { İ }}{ }$ | Oio | $\begin{gathered} \text { సे } \\ \text { స్ } \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{0}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{N}} \end{array}$ | ®ั | Nิे | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{i}} \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { సे } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | －̀ |
|  | n | न＇ | ¢ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ | d | J | $\stackrel{6}{6}$ | ～ | लু | রু | $\stackrel{\sim}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{N}{ }$ | － |
|  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | － | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\square}$ | $\infty$ | $\underset{\sim}{7}$ | $\infty$ | F | － | ～ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{ }{ }$ | ¢ |
|  | ঙ্寸ে | $\underset{\sim}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{m}}$ | ì | స్లి | 染 | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{N}}$ | oेio | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \stackrel{\circ}{2} \\ \text { 年 } \end{array}$ | 盗 | ঙ্ণে | స్లి | 発 |
|  | ¢ | $\infty$ | ${ }^{\circ}$ | 8 | $\stackrel{6}{6}$ | N | \％ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{0}{6}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{n}$ | n | $\stackrel{6}{6}$ | N |
|  | m | － | \％ | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | 6 | m | n | N | 9 | 7 | m | 6 | \％ |
|  | － | $\stackrel{\square}{\infty}$ | 앙 | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | \％ | \％ | む | $\bar{\sim}$ | n | \％ | ¢ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{6}$ | N |
|  | ¢ั | oì | 合 | ঙ্লি | 获 |  | 菅 | 蓶 | 䧲 | oì | 导 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline 0 \\ \hline \infty \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 屰 |
|  | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{\sim}}$ | ホ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \underset{\sim}{N} \\ \underset{\sim}{2} \end{array}$ | $\underset{\text { a }}{\text { d }}$ | م | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7}$ | \％ | $\underset{\sim}{7}$ | $\hat{\sim}$ | 兌 | $\stackrel{\text { O}}{\sim}$ | － |
|  | $\underset{7}{7}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathbf{T}}$ | ¢ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | ǹ | T | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim}$ | へ | 入 | \％ | － |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \vec{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{7} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 苟 } \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | 盗 | 㞧 | $$ | 욱 | 악 | N | $\stackrel{0}{\square}$ | N |
|  | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\lambda}{N}}$ | $\stackrel{+}{\infty}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \mathrm{N} \\ \mathrm{~N} \end{array}$ | $0$ | \％ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|} \hline \end{array}$ | $\vec{\lambda}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \underset{\sim}{J} \\ & \underset{N}{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|l\|} \hline \stackrel{\sim}{2} \end{array}$ | $\stackrel{N}{N}$ | 钻 | ¢ | $\xrightarrow{\text { O }}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| School District | School Building | Total Enrollment | \# Students Qualified for Free | \# Students Qualified for ReducedPrice | \# Students Qualified for F/RP | \% Qualified for F/RP | \# Students Eating for Free Breakfast | \# Students Eating RP Breakfast | \# Students <br> Eating <br> F/RP <br> Breakfast | \% Students <br> Eating <br> F/RP <br> Breakfast |  | Avg. \# of Total Students Eating Breakfast | \% of ALL Students Eating Breakfast | Provision Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Union-Endicott | Ann G Mcguinness Elem | 415 | 201 | 17 | 218 | 53\% | 77 | 7 | 85 | 39\% | 14 | 99 | 24\% | None |
| Union-Endicott | Charles F Johnson Jr Elem | 414 | 297 | 28 | 325 | 79\% | 200 | 13 | 214 | 66\% | 20 | 234 | 56\% | None |
| Union-Endicott | George F Johnson Elem | 630 | 274 | 25 | 299 | 47\% | 70 | 3 | 74 | 25\% | 6 | 79 | 13\% | None |
| Union-Endicott | Jennie F Snapp MS | 951 | 402 | 61 | 463 | 49\% | 101 | 9 | 110 | 24\% | 6 | 116 | 12\% | None |
| Union-Endicott | Thomas J Watson Sr Elem | 322 | 190 | 12 | 202 | 63\% | 103 | 4 | 107 | 53\% | 6 | 114 | 35\% | None |
| Union-Endicott | Union-Endicott HS | 1,232 | 432 | 76 | 508 | 41\% | 122 | 12 | 135 | 27\% | 92 | 227 | 18\% | None |
| Union-Endicott CSD TOTAL |  | 3,964 | 1,796 | 219 | 2,015 | 51\% | 675 | 49 | 724 | 36\% | 145 | 869 | 22\% |  |
| Vestal CSD | African Road Elem | 265 | 71 | 6 | 77 | 29\% | 21 | 1 | 21 | 28\% | 18 | 40 | 15\% | None |
| Vestal CSD | Clayton Avenue Elem | 279 | 82 | 19 | 101 | 36\% | 37 | 5 | 43 | 42\% | 23 | 66 | 24\% | None |
| Vestal CSD | Glenwood Elem | 275 | 53 | 10 | 63 | 23\% | 25 | 1 | 26 | 42\% | 18 | 45 | 16\% | None |
| Vestal CSD | Tioga Hills Elem | 305 | 63 | 14 | 77 | 25\% | 31 | 7 | 37 | 48\% | 30 | 67 | 22\% | None |
| Vestal CSD | Vestal Hills Elem |  | 71 | 5 | 76 | 24\% | 20 | - | 20 | 26\% | 17 | 37 | 11\% | None |
| Vestal CSD | Vestal Middle School | 855 | 168 | 31 | 199 | 23\% | 38 | 3 | 42 | 21\% | 31 | 73 | 9\% | None |
| Vestal CSD | Vestal Senior HS | 1,058 | 174 | 31 | 205 | 19\% | 34 | 3 | 37 | 18\% | 21 | 58 | 5\% | None |
| Vestal CSD TOTAL |  | 3,359 | 682 | 116 | 798 | 24\% | 206 | 20 | 226 | 28\% | 159 | 385 | 11\% |  |
| Whitney Point CSD | Caryl E Adams Primary School | 516 | 260 | 46 | 306 | 59\% | 114 | 15 | 129 | 42\% | 25 | 154 | 30\% | None |
| Whitney Point CSD | Tioughnioga Riverside Academy | 537 | 268 | 52 | 320 | 60\% | 93 | 7 | 100 | 31\% | 9 | 109 | 20\% | None |
| Whitney Point CSD | Whitney Point Senior High School | 439 | 152 | 44 | 196 | 45\% | 38 | 5 | 43 | 22\% | 6 | 49 | 11\% | None |
| Whitney Point TOTAL |  | 1,492 | 680 | 142 | 822 | 55\% | 246 | 26 | 272 | 33\% | 40 | 312 | 21\% |  |
| Windsor CSD | A F Palmer ES / Windsor Central MS | 585 | 228 | 43 | 271 | 46\% | 71 | 4 | 75 | 28\% | 23 | 97 | 17\% | None |
| Windsor CSD | C R Weeks Elem | 267 | 123 | 23 | 146 | 55\% | 43 | 10 | 53 | 36\% | 16 | 69 | 26\% | None |
| Windsor CSD | Floyd Bell Elem | 306 | 135 | 28 | 163 | 53\% | 60 | 13 | 73 | 45\% | 18 | 91 | 30\% | None |
| Windsor CSD | Windsor Central HS | 542 |  | 31 | 259 | 48\% | 65 | 7 | 72 | 28\% | 19 | 91 | 17\% | None |
| Windsor CSD TOTAL |  | 1,700 | 714 | 125 | 839 | 49\% | 238 | 34 | 273 | 32\% | 75 | 348 | 20\% |  |
| Broome County TOTAL |  | 28,123 | 14,408 | 1,460 | 15,868 | 56\% | 5,233 | 354 | 5,588 | 35\% | 835 | 6,423 | 23\% |  |

National School Lunch Program：Data gathered by Hunger Solutions NYS， 2015

|  | 壬 | 峼 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline 0 \\ \vdots \\ \text { ¿ } \end{array}$ | 茪 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 0 \\ \vdots \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 茪 | 苧 | 岮 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \stackrel{y}{0} \\ \stackrel{0}{2} \end{array}$ | 㒴 | 㒴 | 㟯 | 岃 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $$ | Oio | 侖 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \stackrel{\circ}{\infty} \\ & \hline \infty \end{aligned}$ | 侖 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{R}} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 敛 | ¿̀ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \stackrel{\sim}{0} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ 0 \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ | 苍 | $\stackrel{\circ 0}{\infty}$ | ¢0\％ |
|  | \％ | 읏 | $\stackrel{\circ}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{N}{N}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{7}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{m}$ | $\bigcirc$ | N | $\stackrel{\square}{\sim}$ | \％ | N | $\stackrel{\circ}{\stackrel{0}{m}}$ |
|  |  |  | n |  | $\sigma$ |  |  |  | ¢ |  |  |  |  | К |
|  | $\underset{\infty}{\text { in }}$ | Oi̊ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ®o } \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\infty}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty}}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ \hline 0 \end{array}$ | 哭 | ஃì | ঃ̀ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\circ}{\infty}}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty}}$ | ৪io | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \hline 1 \end{aligned}$ | 骨 | $\stackrel{\circ}{\infty}$ | ⿳亠二口欠幺 |
|  | $\stackrel{\text { \％}}{ }$ | 읏 | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{N}{N}$ | $\stackrel{7}{7}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{9}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | N | ন | \％ | N |  |
|  |  | ＋ | ～ | ＇ | 9 | ${ }^{\prime}$ | ＇ | ${ }^{\prime}$ | $\sim$ |  | ${ }^{\prime}$ |  | ＋ | m |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{o} \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\underset{\sim}{*}} \end{aligned}$ | Ni | $\begin{aligned} & \text { } \\ & \underset{\sim}{\mathrm{I}} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{N}{N}$ | $\widehat{ু}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \dot{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\underset{\sim}{\infty}}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{i} \end{aligned}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\hat{i}}{\hat{i}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { تें } \\ & \underset{\gamma}{ } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { o} \\ & \underset{\sim}{i} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\text { ¢ }}{\substack{\text { J }}}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | ৯ু | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ®ㅇ }}{\infty}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $$ | Іे0 | ⿳亠㐅口冖丁口 | ò̀ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | ò̀ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | \％ั้ |
|  | Nิ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{n} \\ & \underset{i}{n} \end{aligned}$ | ¢ | m | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{i}$ | m | F | $\stackrel{\sim}{n}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\%}$ | N | $\mathrm{O}_{6}^{\infty}$ | フ | $\stackrel{\sim}{n}$ |
|  |  | ＇ | m | ＇ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\square}$ | ＇ | ， |  | m |  | ＇ |  |  | ¢ |
|  | へิ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\text { r }}$ | \％ | $\stackrel{\square}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\text { ® }}$ | \％ | F | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | ल̀ | ¢0 | $\stackrel{\text { J }}{\text { ¢ }}$ | \％ |
|  | N | $\stackrel{\infty}{n}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\square}$ | \％ | N | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\text { ® }}$ | m | F | 윽 | $\stackrel{\infty}{\%}$ | N | ¢ ${ }_{6}$ | $\stackrel{\text { J }}{\text { ¢ }}$ | 烍 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Appendix

National School Lunch Program: Data gathered by Hunger Solutions NYS, 2015

| COUNTY NAME | School District | Total Enrollment | \# Students Qualified for Free | \# Students Qualified for Reduced-Price | \# Students Qualified for F/RP | \% Qualified for F/RP | \# Students Eating Free Lunch | \# <br> Students <br> Eating RP Lunch | \# <br> Students <br> Eating F/RP Lunch | \% Students <br> Eating F/RP <br> Eating Lunch | \# Students <br> Eating Paid Lunch | Avg. \# of Total Students Eating Lunch | \% of ALL <br> Students <br> Eating Lunch | Provision Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Susquehanna Valley CSD | Brookside Elementary | 365 | 120 | 21 | 141 | 39\% | 92 | 19 | 111 | 79\% | 109 | 220 | 60\% | None |
| Susquehanna Valley CSD | F P Donnelly School | 275 | 110 | 27 | 137 | 50\% | 89.8 | 18 | 108 | 79\% | 75 | 183 | 67\% | None |
| Susquehanna Valley CSD | Richard T Stank Middle School | 354 | 127 | 27 | 154 | 44\% | 102.5 | 21 | 123 | 80\% | 102 | 226 | 64\% | None |
| Susquehanna Valley CSD | Susquehanna Valley Sr High School | 546 | 167 | 39 | 206 | 38\% | 128.1 | 28 | 156 | 76\% | 102 | 258 | 47\% | None |
| Susquehanna <br> Valley CSD <br> TOTAL |  | 1,540 | 524 | 114 | 638 | 41\% | 412 | 87 | 499 | 78\% | 388 | 887 | 58\% |  |
| UE CSD | Ann G Mcguinness Elementary | 415 | 201 | 17 | 218 | 53\% | 142.6 | 12 | 155 | 71\% | 64 | 219 | 53\% | None |
| UE CSD | Charles F Johnson Jr Elementary | 414 | 297 | 28 | 325 | 79\% | 231.2 | 19 | 251 | 77\% | 42 | 292 | 71\% | None |
| UE CSD | George F Johnson Elementary | 630 | 274 | 25 | 299 | 47\% | 187.9 | 15 | 203 | 68\% | 79 | 282 | 45\% | None |
| UE CSD | Jennie F Snapp Middle School | 951 | 402 | 61 | 463 | 49\% | 268.1 | 38 | 306 | 66\% | 136 | 443 | 47\% | None |
| UE CSD | Thomas J Watson Sr Elementary | 322 | 190 | 12 | 202 | 63\% | 155.4 | 8 | 164 | 81\% | 41 | 204 | 63\% | None |
| UE CSD | Union-Endicott HS | 1,232 | 432 | 76 | 508 | 41\% | 232.4 | 41 | 273 | 54\% | 248 | 521 | 42\% | None |
| Union- <br> Endicott CSD TOTAL |  | 3,964 | 1,796 | 219 | 2,015 | 51\% | 1,218 | 133 | 1,351 | 67\% | 610 | 1,961 | 49\% |  |
| Vestal CSD | African Road Elementary | 265 | 71 | 6 | 77 | 29\% | 51.7 | 5 | 57 | 74\% | 92 | 149 | 56\% | None |
| Vestal CSD | Clayton Avenue Elementary | 279 | 82 | 19 | 101 | 36\% | 65.6 | 16 | 82 | 81\% | 86 | 168 | 60\% | None |
| Vestal CSD | Glenwood Elementary | 275 | 53 | 10 | 63 | 23\% | 44.2 | 9 | 53 | 84\% | 107 | 160 | 58\% | None |
| Vestal CSD | Tioga Hills Elementary | 305 | 63 | 14 | 77 | 25\% | 45 | 12 | 57 | 74\% | 94 | 151 | 50\% | None |
| Vestal CSD | Vestal Hills Elementary | 322 | 71 | 5 | 76 | 24\% | 56 | 3 | 59 | 77\% | 116 | 175 | 54\% | None |
| Vestal CSD | Vestal Middle School | 855 | 168 | 31 | 199 | 23\% | 115.3 | 18 | 134 | 67\% | 168 | 302 | 35\% | None |
| Vestal CSD | Vestal Sr HS | 1,058 | 174 | 31 | 205 | 19\% | 94 | 16 | 110 | 53\% | 146 | 256 | 24\% | None |
| Vestal CSD TOTAL |  | 3,359 | 682 | 116 | 798 | 24\% | 472 | 79 | 551 | 69\% | 810 | 1,361 | 41\% |  |

National School Lunch Program: Data gathered by Hunger Solutions NYS, 2015

| COUNTY NAME | School District | Total Enrollment | \# Students Qualified for Free | \# Students Qualified for ReducedPrice | ```# Students Qualified for F/RP``` | $\%$ Qualified for $F / R P$ | \# Students Eating Free Lunch | \# Students Eating RP Lunch | \# Students Eating F/RP Lunch | \% Students Eating F/RP Eating Lunch | \# Students Eating Paid Lunch | Avg. \# of Total Students Eating Lunch | \% of ALL Students Eating Lunch | Provision Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Whitney Point CSD | Caryl E Adams <br> Primary School | 516 | 260 | 46 | 306 | 59\% | 205 | 32 | 237 | 77\% | 77 | 313 | 61\% | None |
| Whitney Point CSD | Tioughnioga Riverside Academy | 537 | 268 | 52 | 320 | 60\% | 224.3 | 41 | 266 | 83\% | 105 | 370 | 69\% | None |
| Whitney Point CSD | Whitney Point Sr HS | 439 | 152 | 44 | 196 | 45\% | 100.7 | 32 | 133 | 68\% | 76 | 210 | 48\% | None |
|  |  | 1,492 | 680 | 142 | 822 | 55\% | 530 | 105 | 635 | 77\% | 258 | 893 | 60\% |  |
| Windsor CSD | A F Palmer ES / Windsor Central MS | 585 | 228 | 43 | 271 | 46\% | 179.3 | 35 | 214 | 79\% | 130 | 344 | 59\% | None |
| Windsor CSD | C R Weeks Elem | 267 | 123 | 23 | 146 | 55\% | 91.8 | 18 | 110 | 75\% | 44 | 154 | 58\% | None |
| Windsor CSD | Floyd Bell Elem | 306 | 135 | 28 | 163 | 53\% | 101.6 | 23 | 124 | 76\% | 65 | 189 | 62\% | None |
| Windsor CSD | Windsor Central High School | 542 | 228 | 31 | 259 | 48\% | 142.8 | 18 | 161 | 62\% | 124 | 286 | 53\% | None |
| Windsor CSD TOTAL |  | 1,700 | 714 | 125 | 839 | 49\% | 516 | 94 | 610 | 73\% | 363 | 973 | 57\% |  |
| Broome County TOTAL |  | 28,123 | 14,408 | 1,460 | 15,868 | 56\% | 10,348 | 1,029 | 11,376 | 72\% | 4,338 | 15,714 | 56\% |  |
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