APPENDIX D1

LEA Foodservice Director Web Survey: Eligible Participating LEAs

OMB Number: 0584-XXXX Expiration Date: X/XX/XXXX

Community Eligibility Provision Characteristics Study (CEP)

LEA Foodservice Director Web Survey Eligible Participating LEAs

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is OSSA-XXXX, expires XX/XX/XXXX. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 2 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of time estimates or suggestions for improving this form, please contact: Office of Policy Support, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, Office of Policy Support, Alexandria, VA 22302. Attention: Dr. John Endahl.

Prepared for: US Department of Agriculture Food and Nutrition Service Office of Policy Support Prepared by: 2M Research Services This survey is being conducted for the Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture as part of a study called Community Eligibility Provision (CEP) Characteristics Study. 2M Research Services has been hired by the Food and Nutrition Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture to conduct this survey. Information provided in this survey will be kept private, to the extent provided by law. No data will be attributed to specific survey respondents. De-identified data from this study will be provided to the Food and Nutrition Service of the U.S Department of Agriculture. Responses to the study will in no way affect your agency's receipt of funds from USDA's school meals program.

The study is authorized by the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 (HHFKA) and participation by selected states, local education agencies, and schools is required under Section 305 of the HHFKA. Section 305 of the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 States that "States, State educational agencies, local educational agencies, schools, institutions, facilities, and contractors participating in programs authorized under this Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq.) shall cooperate with officials and contractors acting on behalf of the Secretary, in the conduct of evaluations and studies under those Acts."

Throughout this survey numerous terms and acronyms are utilized. You can always click the definitions link (give location on web page) to see the definitions of these terms while you are completing the survey.

Please note, if you cannot complete the survey in one sitting, you can save it and complete it at a later date. You may also share the login credentials with appropriate personnel as you deem necessary in order to report accurate information. This survey will take about 60 minutes to complete.

We thank you for your cooperation and participation in this very important study.

Contact information it	or the LEA Foodservice	E DITECTOL.	
Name:			
Address:			
Suite, Bldg.:			
	City	State	Zip Code
Phone Number:			
	(XXX) XXX-XXX	X Ext. XXXX	
Email Address:			
Name and address of p	person filling out this	survey (if other than the LEA	A Foodservice Director):
Name:			
Address:			
Suite, Bldg.:			
	City	State	Zip Code
Phone Number:			
	(XXX) XXX-XXX	X Ext. XXXX	
Email Address:			

Community Eligibility Provision Schools

First we would like to collect some information about the schools in your LEA that are eligible to participate in the Community Eligibility Provision (CEP).

1.1 During SY 2016-17, please provide in the table below, (1) the total number of schools in your LEA,(2) the number of schools eligible for CEP (either individually or as part of a group), and (3) the total number of schools participating in CEP.

Please record your responses separately for:

- Elementary schools (i.e., schools composed of any span of grades from kindergarten through 6th grade; K-4, 4-6, K-5);
- Middle or junior high schools (i.e., schools that have no grade lower than 6 and no grade higher than 9; 6-8, 6-7, 7-8, 6-9); or
- High schools (i.e., schools that have no grade lower than 9 and continue through 12th grade).
- Other schools include any school that does not meet the elementary, middle or junior high, or high school definition; (6-12, K-8, K-12).

School Type	1-Number of Schools in your LEA	2-Number of Schools CEP-Eligible but not Participating	3-Number of Schools Participating in CEP
Elementary Schools			
Middle or Junior High Schools			
High Schools			
Other Schools			
Total:			

☐ Please confirm that the total number of schools in your LEA is correct. (Select to conf	inue)
---	-------

(If the total number of schools in your LEA equals total eligible but not all are participating, complete 1.1.1-1.1.4; otherwise, go to 1.2)

1.1.1	You are eligible for district-wide eligibility in CEP but not all schools are participating. Please indicate the reasons for this decision. (Check all that apply)	
		Reluctance by district-level administration Reluctance by school-level administration Lack the capacity to feed all students Financially not viable at all schools (ask 1.1.3) Difficulty in providing school breakfast in all schools (ask 1.1.4) Other (Specify):
		Other (2) - (Specify):
		Other (3) - (Specify):
		Other (4) - (Specify):

1.1.2 Shown below are the reasons that you indicated for all schools not participating in CEP. Rate the importance of each of these reasons in not using grouping.

Reason	Very Important	Moderately Important	Not Very Important	Not at All Important	Don't Know
Reluctance by district-level administration					
Reluctance by school-level administration					
Financially not viable at all schools					
Difficulty in providing school breakfast in all schools					
Other (Specify):					
Other (2) - (Specify):					
Other (3) - (Specify):					
Other (4) - (Specify):					

1.1.3 In the table below, please indicate the number of schools by school type (e.g., elementary, middle, high, and other school) that did not participate in CEP during SY 2016-17 because it is not financially viable.

Please record your responses separately for:

- Elementary schools (i.e., schools composed of any span of grades from kindergarten through 6th grade; K-4, 4-6, K-5);
- Middle or junior high schools (i.e., schools that have no grade lower than 6 and no grade higher than 9; 6-8, 6-7, 7-8, 6-9); or
- High schools (i.e., schools that have no grade lower than 9 and continue through 12th grade).
- Other schools include any school that does not meet the elementary, middle or junior high, or high school definition; (6-12, K-8, K-12).

School Type	1-Number of Schools where CEP is not Financially Viable		
Elementary Schools			
Middle or Junior High Schools			
High Schools			
Other Schools			
Total:			

1.1.4 In the table below, please indicate the number of schools by school type (e.g., elementary, middle, high, and other school) that did not participate in CEP during SY 2016-17 because it is too difficult to establish a SBP.

Please record your responses separately for:

- Elementary schools (i.e., schools composed of any span of grades from kindergarten through 6th grade; K-4, 4-6, K-5);
- Middle or junior high schools (i.e., schools that have no grade lower than 6 and no grade higher than 9; 6-8, 6-7, 7-8, 6-9); or
- High schools (i.e., schools that have no grade lower than 9 and continue through 12th grade).
- Other schools include any school that does not meet the elementary, middle or junior high, or high school definition; (6-12, K-8, K-12).

School Type	1-Number of Schools where it is too Difficult to Establish a SBP
Elementary Schools	
Middle or Junior High Schools	
High Schools	
Other Schools	
Total:	

(If total number participating is less than eligible go to 1.2. If the total eligible is equal to participating, go to 1.18)

1.2	CEP can be implemented district-wide, for just some schools on an individual basis, where each school is eligible for the Provision and is reimbursed based on only that school's identified student percentage (ISP), or for groups of schools where eligibility for the Provision and reimbursement rate may be determined using pooled data from the group of schools.		
How o	did your LE	EA elect to participate in CEP (grouped, districtwide, or individual)?? (Select one)	
		District-wide (go to 1.3)	
		One or more schools on an individual basis (go to 1.4)	
		Groups of schools (go to 1.5)	
		Both individual and groups of schools (go to 1.5)	
1.3	.3 Did your LEA use the district-wide ISP, ISPs for various groupings of schools, or the ISPs of the		
	individua	I schools? (Select one)	
		District-wide ISP	
		ISPs for two or more groupings	
		ISPs for one or more groupings and ISPs for one or more schools	
		Just the ISPs for one or more individual schools	
(go to	1.20)		

1.4	Did your LEA consider grouping schools to increase the number of schools and students that would be eligible for benefits under CEP?	
		Yes
	П	No (go to 1.7)
		Don't know (go to 1.7)
1.5	Who wa	s responsible at the LEA-level for initially communicating with individual schools regarding
	grouping	g to qualify for CEP? (Select one)
		Superintendent
		Food Service Director
		Food Service Contract Management Company
		Other LEA administrator
		Other (Specify):
		Don't know
1.6		ocedures/strategies did you use to determine which schools should be grouped together by for CEP? (Select all that apply)
		Examine the ISP of individual schools before creating groups
		Create groups to ensure that the most students receive free meals
		Used school types; for example looked at all elementary schools as a group
		Other (Specify):
		Don't know

Do not answer 1.7 if indicated that "Groups of schools" or "Both individual and groups of schools" in question 1.2; Instead go to 1.8. 1.7 Why was grouping not utilized? (Select all that apply) No groups were found to be eligible Difficult to determine optimal groupings Key LEA and/or school officials not supportive Eligible groups were not as financially viable as individual schools Other (Specify): Other (2) - (Specify): Other (3) - (Specify): Other (4) - (Specify): Other (5) - (Specify): Don't know

Go to 1.10 if "No" or "Don't Know"

1.8 Compared to determining eligibility for individual schools, how difficult was it to determine eligibility for groups of schools?

Approximately the same level of difficulty (go to 1.10)
More difficult

☐ Much more difficult

1.9 Please indicate the number of schools by school type (e.g., elementary, middle, high, and other school) for (1) participating schools through school eligibility, and (2) participating schools through group eligibility during SY 2016-17 in the table below.

Please record your responses separately for:

- Elementary schools (i.e., schools composed of any span of grades from kindergarten through 6th grade; K-4, 4-6, K-5);
- Middle or junior high schools (i.e., schools that have no grade lower than 6 and no grade higher than 9; 6-8, 6-7, 7-8, 6-9); or
- High schools (i.e., schools that have no grade lower than 9 and continue through 12th grade).
- Other schools include any school that does not meet the elementary, middle or junior high, or high school definition; (6-12, K-8, K-12).

School Type	1-Number of Schools Participating in CEP through Individual School Eligibility	2-Number of Schools Participating in CEP through Grouping of Schools
Elementary Schools		
Middle or Junior High Schools		
High Schools		
Other Schools		
Total:		

1.10 Which of the following possible barriers either made CEP difficult to implement in your LEA or caused your LEA to decide against adopting the Provision in your non-participating eligible schools? (Select all that apply)

Possible Barriers to Adopting CEP

	CEP not financially viable
	Increased administrative burden
	Uncertainty or concern about how much reimbursement the LEA would receive
	Uncertainty or concern about how the Provision will affect State/local education funding
	Not enough time to implement the Provision and train staff
	Concern about schools participating in the Provision being treated differently than other schools
	LEAs participating in CEP may be viewed as low-income
	Difficulty establishing a SBP
	Community not supportive
	Key LEA and/or school officials not supportive
	Increased cost in overall school programs
	Need to collect alternative income forms for State and local funding
	Other (Specify):
	Other (2) - (Specify):
П	Other (3) - (Specify):
	Carlet (6) (Opeciny).
_	
	Other (4) - (Specify):
	Other (5) - (Specify):
_	
	Don't Know (go to 1.15)

1.11 Shown below are the possible barriers that you indicated either made CEP difficult to implement in your LEA or caused your LEA to decide against adopting the Provision in your non-participating eligible schools. Rate the importance of each of these possible barriers.

Possible barriers to adopting CEP	Very Important	Moderately Important	Not Very Important	Not at All Important	Don't Know
CEP not financially viable					
Increased administrative burden					
Uncertainty or concern about how much reimbursement the LEA would receive					
Uncertainty or concern about how the Provision will affect State/local education funding					
Not enough time to implement the Provision and train staff					
Concern about schools participating in the Provision being treated differently than other schools					
LEAs participating in CEP may be viewed as low income					
Difficulty establishing a SBP					
Community not supportive					
Key LEA and/or school officials not supportive					
Increased cost in overall school programs					
Other (Specify):					
Other (2) - (Specify):					
Other (3) - (Specify):					
Other (4) - (Specify):					

Other	(5) - (Specif	fy):					
1.12		ere the most import ate in CEP in all of yo		_		ered in decidin	g not to
		ISP or rate of reim	bursement fo	r school meals			
		Staffing needs					
		Financial impact of					
		Financial impact o		_			
		Impact on loss of o	other benefits	/services for ed	conomically di	sadvantaged :	students
		Need to continue	to collect stud	lent-level data	for other fund	ling sources	
		Rate of participation	on in school m	neals programs			
	☐ Logistics or difficulty implementing						
		Considerations are	ound schools b	peing labeled a	s low income		
		Consideration arou	und students l	being labeled a	s low income		
		Availability of CEP	for the long to	erm			
		Eligibility of individ	lual schools a	nd/or entire di	strict to partic	ipate	
		Other (Specify):					
		Don't know					

1.13	How like (Select o	ely is your LEA to increase the number of schools that participate in CEP in the next year? Inner
		Very likely Somewhat likely Somewhat unlikely Very unlikely Don't know
1.14		anges could be made to CEP that would make it appealing for your LEA to increase the of schools that participate in the future? (Select all that apply. Add additional changes if d)
		Increase the multiplier Elimination of SBP requirement More training provided Available to all schools in an LEA and not just schools that are eligible Allow ISP data in qualifying for other State and Federal funds (for example, Title 1 funds other Child Nutrition programs, assistance programs, education funding and/or benefits
		to low-income students, etc.) Other (Specify):
		Other (2) - (Specify):
		Other (3) - (Specify):
		Other (4) - (Specify):
		Other (5) - (Specify):
		Don't Know (go to 1.17)

were made. (Select all that apply)			
LEA would elect to increase the number of schools in CEP next year if change were made	Yes	Mayb e	No
Increase the multiplier			
Elimination of SBP requirement			
More training provided			
Available to all schools in an LEA and not just schools that are eligible			
Using ISP data to qualify for other assistance programs			
Other			
Two or more of these changes must be made			
Three or more of these changes must be made			
All changes must be made			
I would not elect CEP (Specify):			

1.15 Below are the changes that you indicated would make CEP more appealing to your LEA. Please

indicate whether your LEA would elect to increase the number of schools in CEP if each change

reimbursement systems before CEP?	
Reimbursement Systems	Number of Schools
Traditional	
Provision 1	
Provision 2	
Provision 3	
Other systems where free meals are provided to all students (Specify):	
Total:	
to 1.20.) Reimbursement Systems	ement systems? <mark>(enter NA if all schools in CEP and skip</mark> Number of Schools
Traditional	
Provision 1	
Provision 2	
Provision 3	
Other systems where free meals are provided to all students (<i>Specify</i>):	
Total:	

1.16 Of the eligible schools in your LEA that participate in CEP, how many used the following

1.18 Of the schools in your LEA that once participated in CEP and then decided to discontinue the program, how many currently use the following reimbursement systems?				
☐ Not applicable—none of our participating scho	ols have quit operating under CEP (go to 1.20)			
Reimbursement Systems	Number of Schools			
Traditional				
Provision 1				
Provision 2				
Provision 3				
Other systems where free meals are provided to all students (<i>Specify</i>):				
Total:				
1.19 You have [number from 1.1] schools participating in the School Breakfast Progra	pating in CEP. How many of these schools were m (SBP) before CEP was implemented?			
(type in number of schools)				
If the number of schools in 1.20 is less than the number of schools in 1.20.11 otherwise go to 1.21.	umber of schools participating in CEP, answer 1.20.1 –			

1.19.1 In the table below, please indicate the number of schools by school type (e.g., elementary, middle, high, and other school) that did not participate in SBP before CEP.

Please record your responses separately for:

- Elementary schools (i.e., schools composed of any span of grades from kindergarten through 6th grade; K-4, 4-6, K-5);
- Middle or junior high schools (i.e., schools that have no grade lower than 6 and no grade higher than 9; 6-8, 6-7, 7-8, 6-9); or
- High schools (i.e., schools that have no grade lower than 9 and continue through 12th grade).
- Other schools include any school that does not meet the elementary, middle or junior high, or high school definition; (6-12, K-8, K-12).

School Type	Number of Schools that did not participate in SBP before CEP
Elementary Schools	
Middle or Junior High Schools	
High Schools	
Other Schools	
Total:	

1.19.2 In the table below, please indicate the locations where breakfast is served in the schools **that did not have breakfast before CEP**. (Check all that apply)

Breakfast Location	Elementary Schools	Middle Schools	High Schools	Other Schools
Cafeteria or other indoor/outdoor food service area				
School buses				
Classrooms				
Outdoors (other than a food service area)				
Grab-and-go				
Other (Specify):				
Don't Know				

1.19.3 In the table below, please indicate the times when breakfast is served in the schools **that did not have breakfast before CEP**. (Check all that apply)

Breakfast Time	Elementary Schools	Middle Schools	High Schools	Other Schools
Before school doors open				
After school doors open but before the first class				
During the first class				
After the first class				
All day				
Other (Specify):				
Don't Know				

1.19.4 In the elementary schools now participating in CEP <i>that did serve breakfast before CEP</i> , which locations did elementary schools serve breakfast? (Check all that apply)					
•	e indicate the locations wh uring the first year of CEP, a	•			
☐ Check here if thi	s is your LEA's first year of p	participation <mark>(ignore third</mark>	<mark>column)</mark>		
☐ Check here if you first column)	ur LEA did not serve breakfa	ast in any elementary scho	ools prior to CEP <mark>(ignore</mark>		
Breakfast Location	1-Before Implementation of CEP	2-First Year of CEP Implementation	3-After First Year of CEP Implementation		
Cafeteria or other indoor/outdoor food service area					
School buses					
Classrooms					
Outdoors (other than a food service area)					
Grab-and-go					
Other (Specify):					
Don't Know					

1.19.5	In the middle schools now participating in CEP that did serve breakfast before CEP, which
	locations did middle schools serve breakfast?

In the table below, please indicate the locations where middle schools served breakfast (1) before implementing CEP, (2) during the first year of CEP, and (3) after the first year of CEP.

(if 1.20.4 check is checked for LEA's first year of participation, ignore third column)

	Check here if your LEA did not serve breakfast in any middle schools prior to CEP	(ignore first
<mark>column</mark>)		

Breakfast Location	1-Before Implementation of CEP	2-First Year of CEP Implementation	3-After First Year of CEP Implementation
Cafeteria or other indoor/outdoor food service area			
School buses			
Classrooms			
Outdoors (other than a food service area)			
Grab-and-go			
Other (Specify):			
Don't Know			

1.19.6	In the high schools now participating in CEP that did serve breakfast before CEP, which location
	did high schools serve breakfast?

In the table below, please indicate the locations where high schools served breakfast (1) before implementing CEP, (2) during the first year of CEP, and (3) after the first year of CEP.

(if 1.20.4 check is checked for LEA's first year of participation, ignore third column)

	Check here if your LEA did not serve breakfast in any high schools prior to CEP	(ignore first
<mark>column</mark>)		

Breakfast Location	1-Before Implementation of CEP	2-First Year of CEP Implementation	3-After First Year of CEP Implementation
Cafeteria or other indoor/outdoor food service area			
School buses			
Classrooms			
Outdoors (other than a food service area)			
Grab-and-go			
Other (Specify):			
Don't Know			

1.19.7	In the other schools now participating in CEP that did serve breakfast before CEP, which
	locations did other schools serve breakfast?

In the table below, please indicate the locations where other schools served breakfast (1) before implementing CEP, (2) during the first year of CEP, and (3) after the first year of CEP.

(if 1.20.4 check is checked for LEA's first year of participation, ignore third column)

	Check here if your LEA did not serve breakfast in any other schools prior to CEP	(ignore first
<mark>column</mark>)		

Breakfast Location	1-Before Implementation of CEP	2-First Year of CEP Implementation	3-After First Year of CEP Implementation
Cafeteria or other indoor/outdoor food service area			
School buses			
Classrooms			
Outdoors (other than a food service area)			
Grab-and-go			
Other (Specify):			
Don't Know			

1.19.8 In the elementary schools now participating in CEP **that did serve breakfast before CEP**, during which time periods did elementary schools serve breakfast?

In the table below, please indicate the times that elementary schools served breakfast (1) before implementing CEP, (2) during the first year of CEP, and (3) after the first year of CEP.

(if 1.20.4 check is checked for LEA's first year of participation, ignore third column)

(if 1.20.4 check is checked indicating the LEA did not serve breakfast prior to CEP, ignore first column)

Breakfast Time	1-Before Implementation of CEP	2-First Year of CEP Implementation	3-After First Year of CEP Implementation
Before school doors open			
After school doors open but before the first class			
During the first class			
After the first class			
All day			
Other (Specify):			
Don't Know			

1.19.9 In the middle schools now participating in CEP **that did serve breakfast before CEP**, during which time periods did middle schools serve breakfast?

In the table below, please indicate the times that middle schools served breakfast (1) before implementing CEP, (2) during the first year of CEP, and (3) after the first year of CEP.

(if 1.20.4 check is checked for LEA's first year of participation, ignore third column)

(if 1.20.5 check is checked indicating the LEA did not serve breakfast prior to CEP, ignore first column)

Breakfast Time	1-Before Implementation of CEP	2-First Year of CEP Implementation	3-After First Year of CEP Implementation
Before school doors open			
After school doors open but before the first class			
During the first class			
After the first class			
All day			
Other (Specify):			
Don't Know			

1.19.10 In the high schools now participating in CEP **that did serve breakfast before CEP**, during which time periods did high schools serve breakfast?

In the table below, please indicate the times that high schools served breakfast (1) before implementing CEP, (2) during the first year of CEP, and (3) after the first year of CEP.

(if 1.20.4 check is checked for LEA's first year of participation, ignore third column)

(if 1.20.6 check is checked indicating the LEA did not serve breakfast prior to CEP, ignore first column)

Breakfast Time	1-Before Implementation of CEP	2-First Year of CEP Implementation	3-After First Year of CEP Implementation
Before school doors open			
After school doors open but before the first class			
During the first class			
After the first class			
All day			
Other (Specify):			
Don't Know			

1.19.11 In the other schools now participating in CEP *that did serve breakfast before CEP*, during which time periods did other schools serve breakfast?

In the table below, please indicate the times that other schools served breakfast (1) before implementing CEP, (2) during the first year of CEP, and (3) after the first year of CEP.

(if 1.20.4 check is checked for LEA's first year of participation, ignore third column)

(if 1.20.7 check is checked indicating the LEA did not serve breakfast prior to CEP, ignore first column)

Breakfast Time	1-Before Implementation of CEP	2-First Year of CEP Implementation	3-After First Year of CEP Implementation
Before school doors open			
After school doors open but before the first class			
During the first class			
After the first class			
All day			
Other (Specify):			
Don't Know			

(go to section 2)

implementing CEP, (2) during the first year of CEP, and (3) after the first year of CEP.				
☐ Check here if this is your LEA's first year of participation (ignore third column)				
Breakfast Location	1-Before Implementation of CEP	2-First Year of CEP Implementation	3-After First Year of CEP Implementation	
Cafeteria or other indoor/outdoor food service area				
School buses				
Classrooms				
Outdoors (other than a food service area)				
Grab-and-go				
Other (Specify):				
Don't Know				

1.20 In the elementary schools now participating in CEP, which locations did elementary schools serve

In the table below, please indicate the locations where elementary schools served breakfast (1) before

breakfast?

1.21	In the middle schools now participating in CEP, which locations did middle schools serve
	hreakfast?

In the table below, please indicate the locations where middle schools served breakfast (1) before implementing CEP, (2) during the first year of CEP, and (3) after the first year of CEP.

(if 1.21 check is checked for LEA's first year of participation, ignore third column)

Breakfast Location	1-Before Implementation of CEP	2-First Year of CEP Implementation	3-After First Year of CEP Implementation
Cafeteria or other indoor/outdoor food service area			
School buses			
Classrooms			
Outdoors (other than a food service area)			
Grab-and-go			
Other (Specify):			
Don't Know			

1.22 In the high schools now participating in CEP, which locations did high schools serve breakfast?

In the table below, please indicate the locations where high schools served breakfast (1) before implementing CEP, (2) during the first year of CEP, and (3) after the first year of CEP.

(if 1.21 check is checked for LEA's first year of participation, ignore third column)

Breakfast Location	1-Before Implementation of CEP	2-First Year of CEP Implementation	3-After First Year of CEP Implementation
Cafeteria or other indoor/outdoor food service area			
School buses			
Classrooms			
Outdoors (other than a food service area)			
Grab-and-go			
Other (Specify):			
Don't Know			

1.23 In the other schools now participating in CEP, which locations did other schools serve breakfast?

In the table below, please indicate the locations where other schools served breakfast (1) before implementing CEP, (2) during the first year of CEP, and (3) after the first year of CEP.

(if 1.21 check is checked for LEA's first year of participation, ignore third column)

Breakfast Location	1-Before Implementation of CEP	2-First Year of CEP Implementation	3-After First Year of CEP Implementation
Cafeteria or other indoor/outdoor food service area			
School buses			
Classrooms			
Outdoors (other than a food service area)			
Grab-and-go			
Other (Specify):			
Don't Know			

1.24 In the elementary schools now participating in CEP, during which time periods did elementary schools serve breakfast?

In the table below, please indicate the times that elementary schools served breakfast (1) before implementing CEP, (2) during the first year of CEP, and (3) after the first year of CEP.

(if 1.21 check is checked for LEA's first year of participation, ignore third column)

Breakfast Time	1-Before Implementation of CEP	2-First Year of CEP Implementation	3-After First Year of CEP Implementation
Before school doors open			
After school doors open but before the first class			
During the first class			
After the first class			
All day			
Other (Specify):			
Don't Know			

1.25 In the middle schools now participating in CEP, during which time periods did middle schools serve breakfast?

In the table below, please indicate the times that middle schools served breakfast (1) before implementing CEP, (2) during the first year of CEP, and (3) after the first year of CEP.

(if 1.21 check is checked for LEA's first year of participation, ignore third column)

Breakfast Time	1-Before Implementation of CEP	2-First Year of CEP Implementation	3-After First Year of CEP Implementation
Before school doors open			
After school doors open but before the first class			
During the first class			
After the first class			
All day			
Other (Specify):			
Don't Know			

1.26 In the high schools now participating in CEP, during which time periods did high schools serve breakfast?

In the table below, please indicate the times that high schools served breakfast (1) before implementing CEP, (2) during the first year of CEP, and (3) after the first year of CEP.

(if 1.21 check is checked for LEA's first year of participation, ignore third column)

Breakfast Time	1-Before Implementation of CEP	2-First Year of CEP Implementation	3-After First Year of CEP Implementation
Before school doors open			
After school doors open but before the first class			
During the first class			
After the first class			
All day			
Other (Specify):			
Don't Know			

1.27 In the other schools now participating in CEP, during which time periods did other schools serve breakfast?

In the table below, please indicate the times that other schools served breakfast (1) before implementing CEP, (2) during the first year of CEP, and (3) after the first year of CEP.

(if 1.21 check is checked for LEA's first year of participation, ignore third column)

Breakfast Time	1-Before Implementation of CEP	2-First Year of CEP Implementation	3-After First Year of CEP Implementation
Before school doors open			
After school doors open but before the first class			
During the first class			
After the first class			
All day			
Other (Specify):			
Don't Know			

2 Calculation of the Identified Student Percentage (ISP)

The Identified Student Percentage (ISP) is the number of students directly certified plus the number of students identified as eligible for free meals through other agency lists (such as, runaway, homeless, migrant, foster children) divided by the number of students enrolled, multiplied by 100. To be eligible for CEP, a LEA or school or group of schools must have an ISP of 40% or more.

2.1	What is	the <u>district-wide</u> ISP that was most recently calculated for your LEA?
		Select here to enter district-wide ISP
		LEA only has ISPs for individual schools or groups of schools
		Don't know
2.2	When w	ras the most recent <u>district-wide</u> ISP calculated for your LEA?
I VIOII	tii / i cai.	
		Don't Know
2.3	Who cal	culated the most recent <u>district-wide</u> ISP for your LEA? (Select one)
		The State calculated the ISP without input from the LEA (go to 2.7)
		The LEA provided information to the State to calculate the ISP
		The LEA calculated the ISP using its own data
		Both the LEA and State calculated the ISP
		Other (Specify):
		Don't know (go to 2.7)

2.4	apply)	ta were used to calculate the most recent district-wide ispiror your LEA: (select all that
		Directly Certified Based on data from: SNAP TANF FDPIR Extended eligibility benefits for other children in the household Medicaid in pilot States only Identified from other agency lists Homeless Runaway Migrant Head Start Foster children Approved by local authorities
2.5	Approxi	nately, what percentage of identified students came from direct certification with:
		SNAP TANF FDPIR Medicaid in pilot States only
2.6	As of the	POS or other electronic system Match conducted by LEA Direct Certification list provided by State Other agency list School enrollment file Other (Specify):

2.7	Who calculated the most recent ISP for <u>individual schools</u> or <u>groups of schools</u> in your LEA? (Select one)			
		The State calculated the ISPs without input from the LEA (go to 2.15) The LEA provided information to the State to calculate the ISPs The LEA calculated the ISPs using its own data		
		Both the LEA and State calculated the ISP		
		Other (Specify):		
		Don't know (go to 2.15)		
2.8		ata were used to calculate the most recent ISP for your <u>individual schools</u> ? (Select all that apply)	or groups of	
		Directly Certified Based on data from:		
		SNAP		
		☐ TANF ☐ FDPIR		
		Extended eligibility benefits for other children in the household		
		Medicaid in pilot States only		
		Identified from other agency lists:		
		☐ Homeless		
		Runaway		
		☐ Migrant☐ Head Start children		
		Foster children		
		☐ Approved by local authorities		
2.9		mately, what percentage of identified students for your <u>individual schoo</u> came from direct certification with:	ls or groups of	
	SNAP	_	%	
	TANF	_	%	
	FDPIR	aid in pilot States only	<u>%</u> %	
		aid in pilot States only led eligibility benefits for other children in the household	70	
	k all that			
(Cricc		SNAP		
		TANF		
		FDPIR		
	∐ Da:-''-'	Medicaid in pilot States only		
Ш	Don't l	KIIOW		

2.10	LEA?	ere the most recent isps calculated for <u>individual schools</u> or <u>groups of schools</u> in your
<mark>Mont</mark>	th /Year:	
		Various times, depending on when CEP was implemented in school or group of schools. Please indicate the time period for the majority of your schools:
Mont	th /Year:	
		Don't Know
2.11	•	ur LEA use the most recently calculated ISPs (as indicated in 2.10) for all participating for its claims for NSLP and SBP reimbursement in the current School Year (2016-17)?
		Yes (go to 2.15) No Don't know (go to 2.15)
2.12	For how	many schools does your LEA use the most recently calculated ISP (as indicated in 2.10)?:
2.13	For how	many schools does your LEA use a previously calculated ISP?:

2.14	For scho	ols that use a previously calculated ISP, when was this ISP calculated?
<mark>Mont</mark>	:h/Year: :	
		Multiple dates, depending on when CEP was implemented in schools or group of schools. Please indicate the time period for the majority of your schools:
<mark>Mont</mark>	h /Year: _	
		Don't Know
2.15	participa	if you indicated using recently calculated ISPs (as indicated in 2.10) in at least one ating school Please indicate which of the following considerations your LEA took into in deciding to use a recently calculated ISP for participating schools. (Select all that
		Changed grouping arrangements due to school consolidations, requiring a recalculated ISP
		Changed grouping arrangements due to school closings, requiring a recalculated ISP
		ISP increased in participating schools
		Needed recently calculated ISP to qualify for State or local education funding
		Other (Specify):
		None of the above

2.16	Household applications and direct certification with SNAP were required to determine eligibility for FRP meals in your LEA prior to implementing CEP. For your CEP schools, what additional sources did your LEA use prior to electing CEP for determining eligibility for FRP meals? If you have non-participating schools now, please also select the additional sources being used for determining eligibility for FRP meals in those schools. (Select all that apply)		
		Direct certification using TANF	
		Direct certification using FDPIR	
		Direct certification using Medicaid in pilot States only	
		Extended eligibility benefits for other children in household of directly certified child	
		Identified as homeless	
		Identified as runaway	
		Identified as migrant youth	
		Identified as foster child	
		Identified as Head Start	
		Identified as Even Start	
		Identified in state-funded pre-kindergarten programs	
		Other (Specify):	
		Don't Know	

3 Other Programs Affected by the Community Eligibility Provision

3.1	Prior to implementing CEP, did your LEA use FRP meals eligibility data for any purpose other than for school meals eligibility (such as, for other funding eligibility, allocating funds among schools, o identifying economically disadvantaged students)? (Select one)	
		Yes
		No (go to 3.3)
		Don't know (go to 3.3)
Aside from school meals eligibility, for what other purpose did your LEA use FRP meals elig data for prior to implementing CEP? (Select all that apply)		
		Title 1 Funds
		National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP)
		No Child Left Behind (NCLB) (measurement of adequate yearly progress)
		Other Food Service programs (Summer Feeding Program, Afterschool Snack Program,
		etc.)
		E-rate initiatives
		Early childhood education programs
		Vocational and technical education
		Literacy and reading programs
		State or local education funding
		Student loan forgiveness programs (for teachers)
		Waivers (Advance Placement or other test fees, sports fee, transportation, etc.)
		Reduced fees/free programs (such as, for summer school, tutoring programs, text
		books) Other (Specify):
		Other (Specify).
	_	
		Don't Know
3.3	example	uplementing CEP, does your LEA still collect student-level household income data (for e with alternative income forms) similar to what was previously collected using the old Application for FRP meals?
		Yes
		No (go to 3.6)
		Don't know (go to 3.6)

3.4		programs does your LEA collect household income data using alternate income forms?
	П	Title 1 Funds
		National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP)
		No Child Left Behind (NCLB) (measurement of adequate yearly progress)
		Other Food Service programs (Summer Feeding Program, Afterschool Snack Program,
	_	etc.)
	П	E-rate initiatives
		Early childhood education programs
		Vocational and technical education
		Literacy and reading programs
		State education funding
		Student loan forgiveness programs (for teachers)
		Waivers (AP or other test fees, sports fee, transportation, etc.)
		Reduced fees/free programs (such as, for summer school, tutoring programs, text
		books)
		Other (Specify):
		Don't Know
3.5	-	rts of your LEA are involved with collecting and processing this household income data?
	(Select a	II that apply)
		Schools
		Food Service department
		Other LEA department
		Other (Specify):
	П	L Don't Know
	Ш	Don't know

3.6	om the SBP and NSLP, in what other food assistance or USDA Food and Nutrition Service as or initiatives does your LEA participate? (Select all that apply)
	Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program Child and Adult Care Food Program Special Milk Program Summer Feeding Program After School Snack Program Farm to School Healthier US School Challenge Team Nutrition Other (Specify):
	Don't Know

4 Communication and Implementation of Community Eligibility Provision

4.1	_	back to before CEP implementation, how did your LEA initially inform your LEA's school (e.g. principals) about the process of implementing CEP? (Select all that apply)
		In-person meeting/presentation
		In-person training
		Letter/mail
		Email
		School website
		Phone call to principal or other senior manager
		Webinar
		Press release
		Other
		Does not apply – did not inform schools (go to 5.1)
		Don't know
4.2		s responsible at the LEA-level for initially communicating with individual schools regarding elect one)
		Superintendent
		Food Service Director
		Food Service Contract Management Company
		Other LEA administrator
		Other (Specify):
		Don't know
4.3	the local implement which pi	Resource Center website provides resources for parents, teachers, and school officials at l, State, and Federal level to better understand CEP, along with tools to help facilitate entation of the Provision. Examples of the available resources include a CEP webinar series rovide guidance on topics such as outreach, administrative reviews, and direct tion and reporting, among others. Were you aware of the CEP Resource Center?
		Yes No (go to 5.1)

4.4	How did your LEA become aware of the CEP Resource Center Website?				
		Superintendent			
		Food Service Director			
		Food Service Contract Management Company			
		Other LEA administrator			
		Other (Specify):			
		Don't know			
4.5	Did your	LEA use the CEP Resource Center website?			
		Yes			
		No (go to 5.1)			
		Don't Know (go to 5.1)			
4.6	Which o	f the following resources did your LEA use? (Select all that apply)			
٦.٠	VVIIICITO	The following resources and your EEA ase. (Select all that apply)			
		CEP Fact Sheet			
		CEP Perceived Barriers to Implementation Info Sheet			
		CEP Webinar Series - Please specify:			
		CBPP Eligibility Status Searchable Database			
		USDA State List of Eligible Schools/LEAs			
		CEP Estimator			
		ISP Worksheet			
		CEP Memos and Policy Guidance			
		USDA Blog			
		Partner Websites and Resources			
		Other - Please specify:			
		Don't know			
4.7	How use	eful was the CEP Resource Center when considering whether to implement CEP in your			
	eligible s	schools?			
		Very useful			
		Moderately useful			
		Not very useful			
		Not at all useful			
		Don't know			

4.8	Overall, how important was the information that your LEA gained from CEP Resource Center to your LEA's decision to implement CEP in eligible schools?			
		Very important Moderately important Not very important Not at all important Don't know		

5 Benefits and Challenges of Community Eligibility **Provision**

Now,	we'd like	e to understand your LEA's experience in o	operating CEP.		
5.1	Thinking back to the time that your LEA decided to participate in CEP, how much lead time d have to prepare for the implementation? (Select one)				
		Less than 2 weeks			
		2 weeks to 1 month			
		1 to 2 months			
		2 to 3 months			
		More than 3 months			
		Don't know			
5.2	Do you t	feel that this was enough time? (Select or	ne)		
		Yes (go to 5.4)			
		No			
		Don't know (go to 5.4)			
5.3	How much lead time do you feel would be enough to prepare for the implementation of CEP? (Enter number of weeks or months)				
(Indic	ate Num	ber of Weeks or Months)	Weeks	Months	

As result of operating under CEP in your LEA, in your opinion, what benefits has your LEA 5.4 experienced? (Select all that apply) **Benefits of Implementing CEP** Increased revenue Decreased administrative burden Decreased costs Decreased stigma for students in need Improved academic performance Reduced the wait in lunch and/or breakfast lines More schools offering breakfast More students participating in breakfast Increase in number of breakfasts served per week Increased school meal participation Improved nutritional quality of meals Relief for families under financial burden Improved student behavior (such as fewer disciplinary incidents) Improved student health (such as fewer sick days or visits to school nurse) Increased attendance **Reduced tardiness** No unpaid meal charges Shorter wait time to get breakfast Shorter wait time to get lunch Other (Specify): Other (2)- (Specify):

Other (3) - (Specify):
Other (4) - (Specify):
Other (5) - (Specify):
Don't know (go to 5.6) <mark>(exclusive choice)</mark>

5.5 Shown below are the benefits of CEP that you indicated your LEA has experienced. Rate the importance of each of these benefits.

Benefits of Implementing the Community Eligibility Provision	Very Important	Moderately Important	Not Very Important	Not at All Important	Don't Know
Increased revenue					
Decreased administrative burden					
Decreased costs					
Decreased stigma for students in need					
Improved academic performance (such as improved test scores)					
Reduced the wait in lunch and/or breakfast lines					
More schools offering breakfast					
More students participating in breakfast					
Increase in number of breakfasts served per week					
Increased school meal participation					
Improved nutritional quality of meals					
Relief for families under financial burden					
Improved student behavior (such as fewer disciplinary incidents)					
Improved student health (such as fewer sick days or visits to school nurse)					
Increased attendance					
Reduced tardiness					
No unpaid meal charges					
Shorter wait time to get breakfast					
Shorter wait time to get lunch					
Other (Specify):					
Other 2 - (Specify):					
Other 3 - (Specify):					
Other 4 - (Specify):					

Other 5 - (Specify):							
		5.5.3 if indicated Very ecreased administrative			o <mark>r "decreased</mark>	administrati	ve burden"; if
☐ LEA Food Service ac☐ Other LEA administ☐ Cafeteria Managers		School Administrator School Administrator LEA Food Service adm Other LEA administra Cafeteria Managers School Food Service v	I that apply) s (such as, Pri ninistrative sta tive staff	ncipal, admini aff (such as, Di	strative assist	tants, etc.)	
□ 5.5.2	Don't know What activities are you or your Food Service staff able to spend more time on now that your LEA is operating under CEP? (Select all that apply) (If select "None – not able to spend more time on any activities" go to 5.5.3; otherwise go to 5.6) Conducting professional development or training Conducting other administrative tasks Implementing new School Breakfast Program Planning nutrition/meal services Overseeing Food Service operations Developing recipes						-
		Researching purchasi Developing nutrition Assessing student nut Other (Specify): None – not able to sp Don't know	education ma tritional need	terials/activiti s and/or food	es preferences	5.3) <mark>(exclusiv</mark>	<mark>e choice)</mark>

Answer 5.5.3 if respondent selected "None" in 5.5.2

5.5.3	Why have you and your staff been unable to spend more time on other activities?				
Answe	r 5 5 1 <u>-</u>	5.5.5. if indicate Very or Moderate importance for "decreased cost"; if missing for			
		t" continue to 5.6.			
5.5.4	In wha	t ways have your costs been reduced? (Select all that apply)			
		In meeting meal pattern requirements			
		In meeting nutrition requirements			
		Reduced foodservice staff			
		Reduced technology costs associated with meal counting			
		Other (Specify):			
		Other (Specify):			
		Don't know			
5.5.5	Have y	ou been able to employ these cost savings?			
		Yes (Specify):			
		No			
		Don't Know			

(Select all that apply) **Problems Implementing CEP:** CEP is not cost effective Less total revenue from foodservice No decrease in administrative burden Negative impact of CEP on funding for educational programs More time than expected to implement the Provision and train staff LEAs/schools participating in the Provision are treated differently than other LEAs/schools LEAs/schools participating in CEP are viewed as low-income Difficulty establishing the School Breakfast Program Confusion over how to submit claims Increased meal participation strains the capacity to serve meals Community not supportive Other - (Specify) Other (2) - (Specify): Other (3) - (Specify): Other (4) - (Specify): Other (5) - (Specify): No problems encountered (go to 5.8) (exclusive choice) Don't know (go to 5.8)

Now that CEP has been operating in your LEA, what (if any) problems has your LEA experienced?

5.6

5.7 Shown below are the problems with CEP that you indicated in question 5.6. Rate the importance of each of these in operating under CEP.

Problems Implementing CEP	Very Important	Moderately Important	Not Very Important	Not at All Important	Don't Know
CEP is not cost effective					
Less total revenue from foodservice					
No decrease in administrative burden					
Negative impact of CEP on funding for educational programs					
More time than expected to implement the Provision and train staff					
LEAs/schools participating in the Provision are treated differently than other LEAs/schools					
LEAs/schools participating in CEP are viewed as low-income					
Difficulty establishing a SBP					
Confusion over how to submit claims					
Increased meal participation strains the capacity to serve meals					
Community not supportive					
Other (Specify):					
Other (2) - (Specify):					
Other (3) - (Specify):					
Other (4) - (Specify):					
Other (5) - (Specify):					

5.8	Has your LEA changed its meal service in any of the participating schools due to CEP? NOTE: This question refers to changes from CEP, and not changes from other new school meal regulations and rules.				
		Yes			
		No (go to 5.10)			
		Don't know (go to 5.10)			
5.9	In gener	al, due to CEP, our LEA has: (Select all that apply)			
		Implemented or expanded the school breakfast program			
		Increased the variety of foods served at school breakfast and lunch			
		Decreased the variety of foods served at school breakfast and lunch			
		Increased the use of pre-prepared foods			
		Decreased the use of pre-prepared foods			
		Increased nutrition education activities throughout the food service department			
		Decreased nutrition education activities throughout the food service department			
		Other (Specify):			
		Don't know			
5.10	_	about the schools that implemented CEP, how does the total meal reimbursement under pare with the total meal reimbursement in prior years?			
CEP p	orovides (Select one)			
		Much more reimbursement			
		Moderately more reimbursement			
		The same amount of reimbursement			
		Moderately less reimbursement			
		Much less reimbursement			
		ask about your LEA's experience transitioning schools from Provision 1, 2 or 3 to CEP. (If 2, and 3 schools detailed in question 1.17; go to 6.1)			
IIO FI	OVISIOIT 1,	2, and 3 schools detailed in question 1.17, go to 0.1)			
5.11		le of 1 to 5, with 1 being very easy and 5 being very difficult, how easy or difficult was it ols that used Provision 1, 2 or 3 to implement CEP? (Select one)			
		1 (Very easy)			
		2			
		3			
		4			
		5 (Very difficult)			

5.12	-	Why did your LEA choose to adopt CEP for schools that previously used Provision 1, 2 or 3? (Select all that apply)				
		Eliminate household application				
		Eliminate the need to count meals by free, reduced price, or paid category in base year				
		Possibility of changing claiming percentage every year rather than every 4 years				
		Other (Specify):				
		Don't know				
5.13	What difficulties were encountered when switching from Provision 1, 2 or 3 to CEP? (Select all that apply).					
		Calculating the ISP				
		Communicating changes to school Food Service staff				
		Losing application data				
		Other (Specify):				
		No problems were encountered				
		Don't know				

6 Continuing Participation in Community Eligibility Provision

6.1	Have any schools that implemented CEP gone back to the previous reimbursement method? (Select one)				
		Yes No (go to 6.5) Don't Know (go to 6.5)			
6.2	How ma	any schools have gone back to the previous reimbursement method?			
Numl	ber of sch	nools:			
		Don't know			

6.3	For wha	t reasons did the schools counted in question 6.2 end participation in CEP?
		CEP is not cost effective
		No decrease in administrative burden
		Negative impact of the Provision on funding for educational programs
		LEAs/schools participating in CEP are treated differently than other LEAs/schools
		Difficulty establishing the School Breakfast Program
		Too difficult to meet demands of increased meal participation
		Community not supportive
		Key LEA and/or school officials not supportive
		School closed or consolidated with another school (answer 6.4.1)
		Increased meal participation strains the capacity to serve meals
		Other (1)- (Specify):
		Other (2) – (Specify):
		Other (3) - (Specify):
		Other (4) (Specify):
		Other (5) – (Specify):
		Don't know (go to 6.5)

6.4 Shown below are the Reasons for Ending Participation in CEP indicated in question 6.3. Rate the importance of each of these reasons for discontinuing participation in your LEA.

Shown in the table below are some of the Reasons for Ending Participation in CEP. Rate the importance of each of these reasons for schools discontinuing their participation in CEP in your LEA. (Select all that apply)

Reasons for Ending CEP	Very Important	Moderately Important	Not Very Important	Not at All Important	Don't Know
CEP is not cost effective					
No decrease in administrative burden					
Negative impact of the Provision on funding for educational programs					
LEAs/schools participating in CEP are treated differently than other LEAs/schools					
Difficulty establishing the School Breakfast Program					
Too difficult to meet demands of increased meal participation					
Community not supportive					
Key LEA and/or school officials not supportive					
School closed or consolidated with another school					
Increased meal participation strains the capacity to serve meals					
Other (Specify):					
Other (2) - (Specify):					
Other (3) - (Specify):					
Other (4) - (Specify):					

Other (5) - (Specify):							
		f LEA indicat I". Otherwis		importance in 6	.4 for "School c	losed or consol	idated with
6.4.1	How n	nany school:	s closed or cons	olidated?			
NUM	BER OF S	CHOOLS:					
				7			
6.5			CEP been impler n? (Select one)	mented in any s	chools that wer	e eligible in SY	2015-16 but did
		Yes					
		No (go to					
		Don't Kno	w (go to 6.9)				
6.6	How many eligible schools did not participate in CEP during School Year 2015-16, but are now participating in School Year 2016-17?						
NUM	BER OF S	CHOOLS:					
6.7	Why did	I these scho	ols implement (□ CEP? (Select all	that apply)		
_			-	·	,.		
Reaso	on for No	w Impleme	nting CEP:				
			o phase in CEP g	·			
		_	d the success ir				
			d the costs and				
			nd community u	•	do so		
			ed by the State	Agency			
		Other (Spe	есіту):				
		Don't kno	w (go to 6.8)				

SY 2016-17, although they were eligible in SY 2015-16. Rate the importance of each of these reasons for now implementing CEP. Reasons for now Very Moderately **Not Very** Not at All Don't Implementing in CEP **Important Important Important Important** Know Wanted to phase in CEP gradually Recognized the success in other schools Considered the costs and benefits in more detail Parents and community urged school to do so Encouraged by the State Agency Other (Specify): Base your answer on the other listed in 6.7 6.9 How likely is your LEA to continue participating in CEP in the next year? (Select one) Very likely Somewhat likely Somewhat unlikely Very unlikely Don't know **6.10** How likely is your LEA to expand participation in CEP in the next year? (Select one) [Skip if districtwide] Very likely Somewhat likely Somewhat unlikely Very unlikely Don't know

Shown below are the reasons you indicated that some schools first implemented CEP beginning in

6.8

7 Impacts of the Community Eligibility Provision

7.1 In your opinion, did CEP affect average labor costs <u>per meal</u> for meal production an		opinion, did CEP affect average labor costs <u>per meal</u> for meal production and service?
		Yes
		No (go to 7.3)
		Don't know (go to 7.3)
7.2	How dic	I CEP affect average labor costs per meal for meal production and service? (Select any that
		Increased labor costs per meal for preparing and serving breakfast
		Decreased labor costs per meal for preparing and serving breakfast
		Increased labor costs per meal for preparing and serving lunch
		Decreased labor costs per meal for preparing and serving lunch
		Don't know
7.3 In your opinion, did CEP affect average food costs <u>per meal</u> ?		opinion, did CEP affect average food costs <u>per meal</u> ?
		Yes
		No (go to 7.5)
		Don't know (go to 7.5)
7.4	How did	I CEP affect average food costs per meal? (Select any that apply)
		Increased food costs per meal of school breakfast
		Decreased food costs per meal of school breakfast
		Increased food costs per meal of school lunch
		Decreased food costs per meal of school lunch
		Don't know
7.5	-	opinion, did CEP affect the average quality of foods (food that is fresher and/or more us) offered for reimbursable school meals?
		Yes
		No (go to 7.7)
		Don't know (go to 7.7)

/.6	How did	CEP affect the average quality of foods offered? (Select any that apply)
		Increased quality of foods offered at breakfast Decreased quality of foods offered at breakfast Increased quality of foods offered at lunch Decreased quality of foods offered at lunch Don't know
7.7	In your o	pinion, did CEP affect the average variety of foods offered for reimbursable school
		Yes No (go to 7.9)
		Don't know (go to 7.9)
7.8	How did	CEP affect the average variety of foods offered? (Select any that apply)
		Increased variety of foods offered at breakfast Decreased variety of foods offered at breakfast Increased variety of foods offered at lunch Decreased variety of foods offered at lunch Don't know
7.9	In your o	pinion, did CEP affect the average pay per hour for cafeteria workers?
		Yes No (go to 7.11) Don't know (go to 7.11)
7.10	How did	CEP affect the average pay per hour of cafeteria workers?
		Increased pay per hour Decreased pay per hour Don't know
7.11	_	about average daily attendance in your LEA, in your opinion, how would you say the nce in your LEA during SY 2013-14 compares to the attendance during SY 2016-17?
		Average daily attendance has increased (go to 7.12) Average daily attendance has decreased (go to 7.14) Average daily attendance has not changed (go to 7.16) Don't know (go to 7.16)

7.12	In your opinion, was CEP a factor in the increase in attendance?		
		Yes	
		No	
		Don't know	
7.13	3 In general, which type of school experienced the greatest increase in average daily attendan (Select one)		
		Elementary school Middle school High school Other school No difference by school type Don't know	
(go to	7.16)		
7.14	In your o	pinion, was CEP a factor in the decrease in attendance?	
		Yes No	
		Don't know	
7.15	In general, which type of school experienced the greatest decrease in average daily attendance (Select one)		
		Elementary school Middle school High school Other school No difference by school type Don't know	
7.16	_	about average daily participation in SBP, in your opinion, how would you say SBP tion in your LEA during SY 2015-16 compares to participation during SY 2016-17?	
		Average daily participation in school breakfast has increased (go to 7.17) Average daily participation in school breakfast has decreased (go to 7.20) Average daily participation in school breakfast has stayed the same (go to 7.23) Don't know (go to 7.23)	

/.1/		oreakfast? (Select one)
		More schools offering school breakfast
		More students enrolled in school
		More students participating in school breakfast at least once in the school year
		More breakfasts per year taken by students that participate in school breakfast at least
		once a year
		Don't know
7.18	In your	opinion, was CEP a factor in the increase in school breakfast participation?
		Yes
		No
		Don't know
7.19	In gener	ral, which type of school experienced the greatest increase in school breakfast
	participa	ation? (Select one)
		Elementary school
		Middle school
		High school
		Other school
		No difference by school type
		Don't know
(go to	7.23)	
7.20		of the following was the biggest factor for the decrease in average daily participation in preakfast? (Select one)
		Fewer schools offering school breakfast
		Fewer students enrolled in school
		Fewer students participating in school breakfast at least once in the school year
		Fewer breakfasts per year taken by students that participate in school breakfast at least
		once a year
		Don't know
7.21	In your	opinion, was CEP a factor in the decrease in school breakfast participation?
		Yes
		No
		Don't know

7.22	_	al, which type of school experienced the greatest decrease in school breakfast ation? (Select one)
		Elementary school Middle school High school Other school No difference by school type Don't know
7.23	would yo	about average daily participation in the school lunch program, in your opinion, how ou say the NSLP participation in your LEA during SY 2013-14 compares to participation Y 2016-17?
		Average daily participation in school lunch has increased (go to 7.24) Average daily participation in school lunch has decreased (go to 7.27) Average daily participation in school lunch has stayed the same (go to 7.30) Don't know (go to 7.30)
7.24		f the following was the biggest factor for the increase in average daily participation in unch? (Select one)
		More students enrolled in school More students participating in school lunch at least once in the school year More lunches per year taken by students that participate in school lunch at least once a year Don't know
7.25	In your o	ppinion, was CEP a factor in the increase in school lunch participation?
		Yes No Don't know

7.26	In general, which type of school experienced the greatest increase in school lunch participation? (Select one)				
		Elementary school			
		Middle school			
		High school			
		Other school			
		No difference by school type			
		Don't know			
(go to	<mark>o 7.30)</mark>				
7.27		of the following was the biggest factor for the decrease in average daily participation in unch? (Select one)			
		Fewer students enrolled in school			
		Fewer students participating in school lunch at least once in the school year			
		Fewer lunches per year taken by students that participate in school lunches at least once a year ☐ Don't know			
7.28	In your o	opinion, was CEP a factor in the decrease in school lunch participation?			
		Yes			
		No			
		Don't know			
7.29	In gener	ral, which type of school experienced the greatest decrease in school lunch participation?			
	(Select o				
		Elementary school			
		Middle school			
		High school			
		Other school			
		No difference by school type			
		Don't know			
7.30		g about total revenues from <u>non-federal sources</u> (which may include student payments			
	from reimbursable meals, other food sales, and local funds), in your opinion, how would you say				
		s from non-federal sources during SY 2015-16 compare to revenues from non-federal during SY 2016-17?			
		Increased (go to 7.31)			
		Decreased (go to 7.33)			
		Stayed the same (go to 7.35)			
		Don't know (go to 7.35)			

7.31		? (Select one)
		Increase in student payments for reimbursable meals (Do not select this option for districtwide schools)
		Increase in revenues from food sales outside of school meals, including a la carte, vending machine, snack bar, and school store sales
		Increase in State funding
		Increase in local funding
		Don't know
7.32	In your o	opinion, was CEP a factor in the increase in total revenues from non-federal sources?
		Yes
		No
		Don't know
(go to	<mark>7.35)</mark>	
7.33		f the following was the biggest factor for the decrease in total revenues from non-federa? (Select one)
		Decrease in student payments for reimbursable meals Decrease in revenues from food sales outside of school meals, including a la carte, vending machine, snack bar, and school store sales
	П	Decrease in State funding
		Decrease in local funding
		Don't know
7.34	In your o	opinion, was CEP a factor in the decrease in total revenues from non-federal sources?
		Yes
		No
		Don't know
7.35	from all	g about whether your LEA Food Service is able to break even, that is, whether revenues sources are at least equal to costs, in your opinion, how does your ability to break even Y 2013-14 compare to your ability to break even during SY 2016-17?
		It has become easier to break even (go to 7.36) It has become harder to break even (go to 7.38) No change in ability to break even (go to end of survey)
		Don't know (go to end of survey)

7.36	Which of	the following was the biggest factor that made it easier to break even? (Select one)
		Increase in revenues from federal reimbursements
		Increase in student payments for reimbursable meals (Do not select this option for
	_	districtwide schools)
		Increase in revenues from food sales outside of school meals, including a la carte,
		vending machine, snack bar, and school store sales
		Increase in State funding
		Increase in local funding
		Decrease in food and labor costs
		Decrease in administrative costs
		Don't know
7.37	In your o	pinion, was CEP a factor in making it easier to break even?
		Yes
		No
		Don't know
(go to	end of su	urvev)
7.38	Which of	the following was the biggest factor that made it harder to break even? (Select one)
		Decrease in revenues from federal reimbursements
		Decrease in student payments for reimbursable meals
		Decrease in revenues from food sales outside of school meals, including a la carte,
		vending machine, snack bar, and school store sales
		Decrease in State funding
		Decrease in local funding
		Increase in food and labor costs
		Increase in administrative costs
		Don't know
7.39	In your o	pinion, was CEP a factor in making it harder to break even?
		Yes
		No
		Don't know
That o	=	s the survey. Thank you so much for taking the time to participate. Your input is very
		THANK YOU!

LEA Participating Web Survey