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Background

- **Share Our Strength (No Kid Hungry): Federal program**
  - Nutrition for at need school age kids
  - Resource education for families
  - Funding through grants
  - Alternative Breakfast Program

- **Montana No Kid Hungry: local connection**
  - Network between schools and grant
  - Local partnerships
  - Local education

http://www.usnews.com/cmsmedia/07/34/806ae523453ab2bab2ab83c4e4c75b1/kidscafeteria.jpg
The Alternative Breakfast Model

- Kids need to eat breakfast to do well in class
- Factors of time and money prevent this at home
- Past breakfast programs had inadequate coverage
  - Peer pressure
  - Scheduling
- The solution is to provide more options for breakfast
  - Grab and go
  - Breakfast in the Classroom
  - Breakfast after First Period
Project Summary

• Creating analysis tools
  • ADP (Average Daily Participation)
  • Program monitoring and Grant applications

• Examining the effectiveness of grants
  • School by school, month by month
  • Comparing by participation percentage
  • Comparing through meal counts
  • Trends in pooled analysis

• State vs. nation checkup

Data Analysis

- Average Daily Participation (ADP)
  - Actual breakfasts in a claim
  - Number of days
- Percent participation
  - ADP
  - Possible breakfasts in a claim

Example Elementary

\[
\frac{1029 \text{ breakfasts served}}{(63 \text{ FRP students}) (20 \text{ days})} = 81.69\%
\]
May 2015 Outliers
Without the May 2015 Outliers
Schools and Grants

- Grants have been given in fall or spring the last two years
- Roughly 50 schools have participated in the grant program
- Compared ADP pre and post grant
- Awaiting data for 2016 grants
Pooled Pre- and Post-Grant Data

- Small sample sizes per school mean statistics cannot be applied
- Pooling all of the data enables statistical analysis and shows trends
- Results:
  - There is a statistical increase from pre-grant to post-grant breakfast percentages.
  - There is a statistical increase from pre-grant to post-grant actual breakfasts served.
Breakfast Percentages per Month

Effect on Breakfast Percentages by Receiving Grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Grant</th>
<th>Post-Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min.</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.01401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Qu.</td>
<td>0.2202</td>
<td>0.38315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>0.3361</td>
<td>0.65244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.3318</td>
<td>0.57378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Qu.</td>
<td>0.4247</td>
<td>0.75619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>0.8807</td>
<td>0.96875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA's</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Breakfast Percentages per Month Continued

Pre-Grant Breakfast Percentages

Post-Grant Breakfast Percentages
Actual Breakfasts per Month

Effect on Actual Breakfasts by Receiving Grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Grant</th>
<th>Post-Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Qu.</td>
<td>340.8</td>
<td>919.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>919.5</td>
<td>2592.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1103.5</td>
<td>2748.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Qu.</td>
<td>1587.8</td>
<td>4258.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>6291.0</td>
<td>8571.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual Breakfasts (monthly)
Actual Breakfasts per Month Continued

Pre-Grant Actual Breakfasts Served

Post-Grant Actual Breakfasts Served
Final Thoughts & Recommendations

• Grants have a significant effect on breakfast participation

• The Alternative Breakfast Model appears to be working

• Montana numbers are below the national average
Further Research

• Continued examination of participation numbers after grants are implemented
  • Analysis of post-grant data for each school after reaching a significant sample size
  • Give additional assistance for the schools that are struggling with implementation

• Given more detailed grant information and ideally several more years of data
  • Analysis of what types of breakfast programs work best
  • Projections of expected breakfast participation post-grant