

## ABOUT THE BAYLOR COLLABORATIVE ON HUNGER \& POVERTY

The Texas Hunger Initiative (THI) was founded in 2009 to develop research and implement strategies to end hunger through policy, education, community organizing, and community development. In 2019, the Baylor Collaborative on Hunger and Poverty (BCHP) was launched as the umbrella entity for THI to address the complex nature of hunger and poverty at local, state, national, and global levels.

## BACKGROUND

As part of the effort to expand and ensure food security in Texas, BCHP works to increase awareness and access to federal nutrition programs that provide meals for children and Iow-income families.

During the summer months, Summer Feeding Programs-administered by the USDA's Department of Food and Nutrition Services and the Texas Department of Agricultureact as one way to ensure that children receive healthy meals each day. The Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) was established to ensure that low-income children continue to receive nutritious meals when school is not in session. The National School Lunch Program's Seamless Summer Option (SSO) was created as an alternative for schools that already participate in school meal programs and wish to continue meal service into the summer. Schools, nonprofit organizations, and local cities serve as sponsors and typically have multiple meal sites within a county or region.

The purpose of this study is to document the perceived efficacy or inadequacy of the program by sponsor organizations in Texas that provided meals through Summer Feeding Programs during the summer of 2019. The data reported here will be used as part of BCHP's more extensive research project to help sponsors run effective summer feeding programs.

## ABOUT THE SURVEY \& METHODOLOGY

The survey was distributed via an electronic Qualtrics link and completed online during the survey period from October 28, 2019 - November 15, 2019. A list of sponsor organizations was obtained from the Texas Department of Agriculture Open Data Portal. Using this list, THI staff sent e-mail invitations to 660 sponsor organizations, resulting in 220 sponsor organizations completing the survey. School and nonprofit sponsors represented 213 of the respondents that completed the survey, of which 207 of the school and nonprofit sponsors served meals in 2019. The potential for winning one of three \$100 Walmart gift cards was offered as an incentive for filling out the survey, and THI staff sent out two reminder e-mails during the survey period time. Sponsors were asked about their 2019 experiences as well as plans to participate as a 2020 summer sponsor.

Survey participants were categorized according to the type of organization that they represented. The original question provided five selections, School, Nonprofit, Local Government, Camp, and Other, as referred to in Figure 1. Due to the low selection frequency of three of the categories, they were removed, as shown in Table 1.

Figure 1. Sponsors Affiliated Organization Type Which best describes your organization?


Table 1. Adjusted Sponsors Affiliate Organization Type

|  | Survey Respondents |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | N | Column \% |
| School | 179 | $84 \%$ |
| Nonprofit | 34 | $16 \%$ |
| Total | 213 | $100 \%$ |

The following document presents the main results from the survey and was prepared by the Center for Community Research and Development (CCRD) at Baylor University. The data shown represent valid responses where unanswered questions or respondents to whom the questions did not apply are not included in the data for the tables. Tables with the full range of responses from the collected data can be made available upon request.

For more information about the survey and analysis, please contact the CCRD by calling 254-710-3811 or e-mailing CCRD@baylor.edu.

## SURVEY RESULTS

## KEY FINDINGS

Overall, 82.4 percent of schools and 79.3 percent of nonprofits indicated that they were 'satisfied' or 'very satisfied' with their 2019 summer meals program. Additionally, 207 of the school and nonprofit sponsors indicated that they plan to be a sponsor in 2020.

Over half of the school sponsors that participated in the survey are in rural areas (55.1 percent), while 60.6 percent of nonprofits sponsors were located in urban areas.

Sponsors reported an increase in sites from 2018 to 2019. Nonprofit sponsors experienced a 53.6 percent increase, while school sponsors had a 31.9 percent increase. The average daily participation also grew for nonprofit sponsors (55.6 percent) and School sponsors ( 35.6 percent).

When sponsors were asked about challenged experienced in 2019, nearly 50 percent of respondents chose 'low participation by children' as their primary challenge to sponsors in 2019. The second choice indicated by sponsors was 'transportation' (13.4 percent).

Although many sites offer transportation, either by school bus, or transporting meals to sites, some sponsors request more assistance in transporting food to sites. 38.4 percent of sponsors reported that families often walk to sites for meals.

Most sponsors stated that if they had additional funds, they would increase the number of children served (41.3 percent) and expand their sites (20.6 percent).

More nonprofit sponsors ( 44.8 percent) are in contact with THI than school sponsors (23.4 percent). While only about 10 percent of respondents reported receiving support from THI for their 2019 summer meals program, a large majority of those that did receive support reported it helpful ( 76.7 percent of school and 80 percent of nonprofit sponsors.).

## Sponsor Descriptors

Table 2. Sponsor Status 2019 and 2020

|  | Sponsored in 2019 |  | Sponsoring in 2020 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | N |  | Column \% | N |
| Column \% |  |  |  |  |
| School | 176 | $85.0 \%$ | 176 | $85.0 \%$ |
| Nonprofit | 31 | $15.0 \%$ | 31 | $15.0 \%$ |
| Total | 207 | $100 \%$ | 207 | $100 \%$ |

In Table 2, 207 schools and nonprofits sponsors stated that they would sponsor the Summer Meals Program in 2020. One school stated that it did not sponsor the summer meals program in 2019 and that they would not sponsor the Summer Meals Program in the upcoming year. Some respondents (two schools and three nonprofits) had not yet decided if they would sponsor the summer meals program in 2020 when the survey was conducted. Respondents had the opportunity to explain why they decided not to sponsor the Summer Meals Program in 2020. One sponsor stated the following:
"We had very little turnout. No one came most days unless they were here with a worker. We had 2 weeks with more students, but they were here for summer school, or they would not have come and eaten."

School sponsors were more likely to utilize the Seamless Summer Option funding (59.2 percent) than to receive funding from the Summer Food Service Program (40.2 percent). Nonprofit sponsors primarily obtained funding through the Summer Food Service Program ( 97.0 percent), while only 3.0 percent of nonprofit sponsors utilize funding from the Seamless Summer Option.

Figure 2. Federal programs selected by respondents Which federal program do you utilize to administer the summer meals program?


Note: Valid $N=212$

Figure 3. Geographic area type
Are most of your sites located in rural or urban areas?


Note: Valid N=209

Many of the school sponsors had been sponsors of summer meals programs for 10 years or more. Nonprofit sponsors were more likely to be first year or second year sponsors, which may increase their need for support.

Figure 4. Number of years served as a sponsor How long has your organization served as a summer meals sponsor?


Note: Valid N=204

Both school and nonprofit sponsors were most likely to operate between one and six sites ( 77.5 and 51.5 percent, respectively). Sponsors that operated between one and six sites were primarily in rural areas. Nonprofit sponsors were more likely to report supporting 21 or more sites. For nonprofits that operated 21 or more sites, the locations of the sites were in urban areas.

Figure 5. Number of sites in summer 2019
How many summer meal sites did you operate during summer 2019?


Note: Valid $\mathrm{N}=211$

Figure 6. Sponsorship of the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP)
Do you also sponsor an afterschool meal program offered through the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) at some point during the year?


[^0]The Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) was another point of interest covered in the survey. Above, Figure 6 shows that 34.8 percent of school sponsors participate in the CACFP. 61.8 percent of nonprofit sponsors participate in the CACFP.

## Participation and Sites

A greater percentage of nonprofit sponsors reported running more sites (21 or more) in 2019 and they were more likely than school sponsors to report having increased the number of sites from 2018 to 2019. Less than $1 / 4$ of either schools or nonprofits reported a drop in sites from 2018 to 2019.

Figure 7. Number of meal sites
How did the number of summer meal sites in 2019 compare to 2018 ?


Note: Valid $N=211$

Respondents who reported a decrease in sites were asked to select all the potential reasons for the decline in the number of sites. The most commonly selected reason overall was ‘lack of participation’ (36.4 percent), followed by transportation issues (18.2 percent). Respondents could also select 'other,' which included a write-in option. The most common responses given in the write-in option were lack of community need and interest, as well as sponsors choosing not to sponsor the Summer Meals Program.

Table 3. What contributed to the decline in sites?

|  | Type of Organization |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | School |  | Nonprofit | Total |  |  |
|  | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ |
|  | 18 | $40.0 \%$ | 2 | $20.0 \%$ | 20 | $36.4 \%$ |
| Transportation issues | 9 | $20.0 \%$ | 1 | $10.0 \%$ | 10 | $18.2 \%$ |
| Reduced summer school sites | 7 | $15.6 \%$ | 1 | $10.0 \%$ | 8 | $14.5 \%$ |
| Construction/Facility issues | 2 | $4.4 \%$ | 2 | $20.0 \%$ | 4 | $7.3 \%$ |
| Lack of adequate funding | 1 | $2.2 \%$ | 1 | $10.0 \%$ | 3 | $3.6 \%$ |
| Lack of Staff | 1 | $2.2 \%$ | 1 | $10.0 \%$ | 2 | $3.6 \%$ |
| Other | 7 | $15.6 \%$ | 2 | $10.0 \%$ | 9 | $16.4 \%$ |

Note: Valid N=43

While most sponsors reported that the average daily participation stayed the same or increased, about 20 percent of both school and nonprofit sponsors reported a decrease in average daily attendance.

Figure 8. Average daily participation
Overall, how did your organization's ADP (average daily participation) in 2019 compare to 2018?


In total, forty respondents (34 school sponsors and 6 nonprofit sponsors) stated that their participation decreased. Sponsors that reported a drop in participation were asked to identify all factors that contributed to a decline in participation in a follow-up question; therefore, the categories in Table 4 are not exclusive as each sponsor could choose multiple categories. Respondents that chose 'other' had the option to write-in their responses, which can be found in appendix Two.

Table 4. Contributors to the decrease in participation (select all that apply)

|  | Type of Organization |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | School |  | Nonprofit |  | Total |  |
|  | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ |
| Drop in summer school enrollment | 20 | $23.5 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | 20 | $21.5 \%$ |
| Children/families are aware of the program, <br> but choose not to participate (e.g., fear of <br> deportation, aren't familiar with org/staff, <br> parents want children to stay home, etc.) |  | 14 | $16.5 \%$ | 2 | $22.2 \%$ | 16 |
| Transportation/accessibility of site |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fewer sites are opening | 14 | $16.5 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | 14 | $15.2 \%$ |
| Lack of awareness | 7 | $8.2 \%$ | 2 | $22.2 \%$ | 9 | $9.7 \%$ |
| Weather | 6 | $7.1 \%$ | 2 | $22.2 \%$ | 8 | $8.6 \%$ |
| Limited or lack of activates offered at site | 6 | $7.1 \%$ | 1 | $11.1 \%$ | 7 | $7.5 \%$ |
| Operating fewer days during the summer | 5 | $5.9 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | 5 | $5.4 \%$ |
| Meals disallowed by state agency | 5 | $5.9 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | 5 | $5.4 \%$ |
| Food Quality | 1 | $1.2 \%$ | 0 | $11.1 \%$ | 1 | $1.1 \%$ |
| Timing of meal service | 1 | $1.2 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | 1 | $1.1 \%$ |
| Other | 1 | $1.2 \%$ | 1 | $0.0 \%$ | 1 | $1.1 \%$ |

Note: Valid N=40

Seventy-two respondents ( 57 school and 15 nonprofit sponsors) indicated that they had an increase in average daily participation. Sponsors were asked to identify the factors that contributed to the increase in participation. The selections in Table 5 are not mutually exclusive.

Table 5. What contributed to the increase in participation? (select all that apply)

|  | Type of Organization |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | School |  | Nonprofit |  | Total |  |
|  | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ |
| More operating sites | 17 | $14.0 \%$ | 8 | $22.2 \%$ | 25 | $15.9 \%$ |
| Increased summer school enrollment | 22 | $18.2 \%$ | 2 | $5.6 \%$ | 24 | $15.3 \%$ |
| Effective marketing | 17 | $14.0 \%$ | 3 | $8.3 \%$ | 20 | $12.7 \%$ |
| Increased days of service | 14 | $11.6 \%$ | 5 | $13.9 \%$ | 19 | $12.1 \%$ |
| Accommodating service times | 10 | $8.1 \%$ | 6 | $16.7 \%$ | 16 | $10.2 \%$ |
| Improved programming | 10 | $8.3 \%$ | 4 | $11.1 \%$ | 14 | $8.9 \%$ |
| Improved food quality | 9 | $7.4 \%$ | 3 | $8.3 \%$ | 12 | $7.6 \%$ |
| Introduction of different delivery methods <br> (e.g. mobile meals) | 10 | $8.3 \%$ | 1 | $2.8 \%$ | 11 | $7.0 \%$ |
| Increased economies of scale (i.e. sponsor <br> fiscally able to provide more meals) | 2 | $1.7 \%$ | 1 | $2.8 \%$ | 3 | $1.9 \%$ |
| Increased Transportation | 1 | $0.8 \%$ | 1 | $2.8 \%$ | 2 | $1.3 \%$ |
| Other | 9 | $7.4 \%$ | 2 | $5.6 \%$ | 11 | $7.0 \%$ |

Note: Valid N=78

When sponsors were asked about challenged experienced in 2019, nearly 50 percent of respondents chose 'low participation by children' as their primary challenge to sponsors in 2019. The second choice indicated by sponsors was 'transportation' (13.4 percent). "Other" challenges that respondents reported were included weather-related issues, not allowing children to take meals home, staff training, and short summer school terms. See appendix two.

Table 6. Challenges for sponsors (select all that apply)

|  | Type of Organization |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | School |  | Nonprofit |  | Total |  |
|  | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ |
| Low participation by children | 92 | $56.4 \%$ | 11 | $23.9 \%$ | 103 | $49.3 \%$ |
| Transportation | 21 | $12.9 \%$ | 7 | $15.2 \%$ | 28 | $13.4 \%$ |
| Insufficient staff capacity to serve meals | 9 | $5.5 \%$ | 7 | $15.2 \%$ | 16 | $7.7 \%$ |
| Amount of reimbursement | 8 | $4.9 \%$ | 6 | $13.0 \%$ | 14 | $6.7 \%$ |
| Filing paperwork | 10 | $6.1 \%$ | 3 | $6.5 \%$ | 13 | $6.2 \%$ |
| Insufficient funds to cover costs of meals | 8 | $4.9 \%$ | 1 | $2.2 \%$ | 9 | $4.3 \%$ |
| Unable to successfully transport meals to <br> sites | 5 | $3.1 \%$ | 2 | $4.3 \%$ | 7 | $3.3 \%$ |
| Unable to get enough sites to serve meals | 2 | $1.2 \%$ | 3 | $6.5 \%$ | 5 | $2.4 \%$ |
| Unable to provide quality meals | 1 | $0.6 \%$ | 1 | $2.2 \%$ | 2 | $1.0 \%$ |
| Health Department policies | 1 | $0.6 \%$ | 2 | $4.3 \%$ | 3 | $1.4 \%$ |
| Other | 6 | $3.7 \%$ | 3 | $6.5 \%$ | 9 | $4.3 \%$ |

## Funding Sources and Utilization

Sponsors were asked a hypothetical question about what they would do if they had additional funds. Sponsors mostly selected that they would expand the number of children they served (47.3 percent) and increase their number of sites ( 20.6 percent).

Table 7. What would your organization consider expanding with additional funds? (select all that apply)

|  | Type of Organization |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | School |  | Nonprofit |  | Total |  |
|  | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ |
| Increased number of children served | 102 | $51.0 \%$ | 22 | $35.5 \%$ | 124 | $47.3 \%$ |
| Increased number of sites | 34 | $17.0 \%$ | 20 | $32.3 \%$ | 54 | $20.6 \%$ |
| Increased type of meals offered | 22 | $11.0 \%$ | 8 | $12.9 \%$ | 30 | $11.5 \%$ |
| Increased number of days current sites <br> open | 16 | $8.0 \%$ | 6 | $9.7 \%$ | 22 | $8.4 \%$ |
| Increased number of meals offered | 12 | $6.0 \%$ | 4 | $6.5 \%$ | 16 | $6.1 \%$ |
| Mobile delivery of meals | 6 | $3.0 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | 6 | $2.3 \%$ |
| Increased Transportation | 4 | $2.0 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | 4 | $1.5 \%$ |
| Other | 4 | $2.0 \%$ | 2 | $3.2 \%$ | 6 | $2.3 \%$ |

Note: Valid N=165

Figure 9. Meals reimbursed
Overall, how did your organization's total number of meals reimbursed in 2019 compare to 2018 ?


When asked about actual 2019 meals reimbursement, most schools and nonprofits reported reimbursements increasing in 2019 compared to 2018. However, most nonprofits (61.3 percent) reported needing additional funds outside of TDA to operate their 2019 summer program. Over 85 percent of school sponsors additional funding came from grants and school general funds. Nonprofits had more variety of funding, with the major sources including individual donors, and grants and other. "Other" funding sources included CACFP funding, fundraising efforts by sponsors, and enrollment fees (see appendix two). Most sponsors that reported utilizing additional funds used them toward staff and food costs. (See Table 9)

Figure 10. Were additional funds necessary In summer 2019, did your program pay for itself, or did it require additional funds outside of Texas Department of Agriculture's meal reimbursements to operate?


Note: Valid N=184

Table 8. What is the source of additional funds? (select all that apply)

|  | Type of Organization |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | School |  | Nonprofit |  | Total |  |
|  | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ |
| School General Funds | 20 | $55.6 \%$ | 2 | $9.1 \%$ | 22 | $37.9 \%$ |
| Nutrition Department Funds | 12 | $33.3 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | 12 | $20.7 \%$ |
| Individual donors | 1 | $2.8 \%$ | 8 | $36.4 \%$ | 9 | $15.5 \%$ |
| Grants | 1 | $2.8 \%$ | 5 | $22.7 \%$ | 6 | $10.3 \%$ |
| Funding from other programs within your <br> organization | 1 | $2.8 \%$ | 3 | $13.6 \%$ | 4 | $6.9 \%$ |
| Other | 1 | $5.6 \%$ | 4 | $22.7 \%$ | 5 | $8.6 \%$ |

[^1]Table 9. How did you use additional funds? (select all that apply)

|  | Type of Organization |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | School |  | Nonprofit |  | Total |  |
|  | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ |
| Support staffing costs | 25 | $41.0 \%$ | 13 | $28.9 \%$ | 38 | $35.8 \%$ |
| Cover food costs | 23 | $37.7 \%$ | 9 | $20.0 \%$ | 32 | $30.2 \%$ |
| Supplies to prepare, store, deliver food | 4 | $6.6 \%$ | 6 | $13.3 \%$ | 10 | $9.4 \%$ |
| Cover transportation costs for food | 3 | $4.9 \%$ | 7 | $15.6 \%$ | 10 | $9.4 \%$ |
| Support activities for children | 2 | $3.3 \%$ | 6 | $13.3 \%$ | 8 | $7.5 \%$ |
| Provide additional meal or snack | 2 | $3.3 \%$ | 2 | $4.4 \%$ | 4 | $3.8 \%$ |
| Provide meals to parents | 1 | $1.6 \%$ | 1 | $2.2 \%$ | 2 | $1.9 \%$ |
| Other | 1 | $1.6 \%$ | 1 | $2.2 \%$ | 2 | $1.9 \%$ |

Note: Valid N=54

Meals Served

The majority of school sponsors (72.7 percent) served meals between 11 and 39 days. Over 70 percent of nonprofit sponsors served meals on 40 or more days. Additionally, sponsors reported serving breakfast and lunch more often than the other options. Nonprofit sponsors reported serving a greater variety of meals, including PM snacks, AM snacks, or dinner (34.2 percent).

Figure 12. Days that meals were served Approximately how many days did you serve meals in summer $2019 ?$


[^2]Figure 13. Type of meals that were served What type of meals did you serve in summer 2019?


Note: Valid $\mathrm{N}=210$

The primary method of meal preparation for both school and nonprofit sponsors is selfpreparation. School sponsors ( 97.3 percent) and nonprofit sponsors ( 83.3 percent) selfprepare their meals. Sponsors who did report using a vendor expressed mixed satisfaction with their experience (see Appendix One, Table 14).

Figure 14. Meal preparation method What is your meal preparation method?


Figure 15. Centralized kitchen
Is the food prepared in a central kitchen?


Note: Valid N=193

Figure 16. Acquire food
Where do you obtain the food?


Among sponsors that prepared meals themselves, school sponsors reported most often receiving food from approved vendors ( 52.6 percent). Nonprofit sponsors reported receiving food from a variety of venues, including approved vendors (34.0 percent), grocery retailers (26.4 percent), and warehouse markets ( 24.5 percent).

## Management and Logistics

In addition to meals preparations, the survey also asked about management and logistics for carrying out summer programs including staff and transportation needs along with reporting methods. Overall, most sponsors report needing 5 or fewer staff or volunteers for meal distribution and 5 or fewer staff or volunteers for monitoring sites. Most sites and sponsors are using paper tallies or a combination of paper and electronic methods for documenting meals.

Figure 18. Number of staff or volunteers necessary for meal distribution Approximately how many staff or volunteers do you require for the following? (Delivering food)


[^3]Figure 19. Number of staff or volunteers necessary for monitory sites Approximately how many staff or volunteers do you require for the following? (Monitoring sites)


Note: Valid N=204

Figure 20. Transportation necessary to obtain meals What transportation is necessary within your organization to obtain the meals?


Figure 21. Method for daily counts at each site What is your method of documenting the daily meal count at each site?


Note: Valid $N=203$

Figure 22. Method of aggregating total meal counts at the sponsor level What is your method of aggregating each of the site total meal counts at the sponsor level?


Sponsors were asked about the types of incentives and services offered at sites (see Table 10). The most common service provided at sites were activities for children (81.0 percent at some or all sites). Sponsors also reported that transportation (65.0 percent) was a service provided at some or all the sites. Many sites also provided meals to parents at a paid rate ( 54.8 percent at some or all sites). For the complete list, please refer to Appendix One, Table 16.

Table 10. Select services provided by sites (Complete list in Appendix One, Table 16)

|  | Type of Organization |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | School |  | Nonprofit |  | Total |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Activities for Children |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 34 | 20.5\% | 3 | 10.3\% | 37 | 19.0\% |
| Some | 31 | 18.7\% | 3 | 10.3\% | 34 | 17.4\% |
| Most | 27 | 16.3\% | 5 | 17.2\% | 32 | 16.4\% |
| All | 74 | 44.6\% | 18 | 62.1\% | 92 | 47.2\% |
| Total | 166 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 195 | 100\% |
| Transportation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 52 | 31.3\% | 16 | 57.1\% | 68 | 35.1\% |
| Some | 40 | 24.1\% | 9 | 32.1\% | 49 | 25.3\% |
| Most | 20 | 12.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 20 | 10.3\% |
| All | 54 | 32.5\% | 3 | 10.7\% | 57 | 29.4\% |
| Total | 166 | 100\% | 28 | 100\% | 194 | 100\% |
| Meals offered to parents at a paid rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 58 | 36.3\% | 27 | 96.4\% | 85 | 45.2\% |
| Some | 12 | 7.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 12 | 6.4\% |
| Most | 10 | 6.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 10 | 5.3\% |
| All | 80 | 50.0\% | 1 | 3.6\% | 81 | 43.1\% |
| Total | 160 | 100\% | 28 | 100\% | 188 | 100\% |

Table 11. What specific types of support might help your program? (select all that apply)

|  | Type of Organization |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | School |  | Nonprofit |  | Total |  |
|  | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ |
| Transportation for children | 80 | $26.1 \%$ | 14 | $14.7 \%$ | 94 | $23.4 \%$ |
| Funding for activities | 66 | $21.6 \%$ | 19 | $20.0 \%$ | 85 | $21.2 \%$ |
| Promotional materials/marketing/outreach | 53 | $17.3 \%$ | 13 | $13.7 \%$ | 66 | $16.5 \%$ |
| New equipment for meal service | 35 | $11.4 \%$ | 13 | $13.7 \%$ | 48 | $12.0 \%$ |
| Transportation for meals | 31 | $10.1 \%$ | 8 | $8.4 \%$ | 39 | $9.7 \%$ |
| Increased number of volunteers | 22 | $7.2 \%$ | 17 | $17.9 \%$ | 39 | $9.7 \%$ |
| Access to facilities | 11 | $3.6 \%$ | 6 | $6.3 \%$ | 17 | $4.2 \%$ |
| Greater selection of vendors | 3 | $1.0 \%$ | 5 | $5.3 \%$ | 8 | $2.0 \%$ |
| Other | 5 | $1.6 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | 5 | $1.2 \%$ |

Note: Valid N=209

Transportation was selected by 23.4 percent of sponsors as a type of support that might help the program. Another popular choice was funding for activities at sites (21.2 percent). Other responses included expansion to local events, more community collaborations, and funds to help more students attend summer school (see appendix two).

## Family Involvement

Family involvement varied between sponsors as did how parents got their children to sites. A large portion (43.8\%) of nonprofits reported families being involved in helping with activities in their programs. For both schools and nonprofits, they reported nearly as many families walking to sites as driving in cars.

Figure 23. Family involvement How are families involved at your sites?


Note: Valid $N=188$

Figure 24. Transportation of families
What types of transportation options do families use to get to your sites? (select all that apply)


Note: Valid $N=204$

## Marketing and Advertisement

Sponsors were asked to report how they receive marketing resources. Sponsors were able to select all the sources that they utilized. The primary source for marketing material came from the Texas Department for Agriculture (TDA). For 'other' responses, please see appendix two. Of the respondents that received marketing material from the TDA, most sponsors ordered the materials online ( 66.8 percent), and over 30 percent downloaded and printed the marketing material.

Figure 25. Where does your organization obtain marketing resources? Who assisted you with your outreach and promotional materials in preparation for summer 2019? (Select all that apply.)


Note: Valid $N=176$

Among school sponsors, 80 percent or more indicated having utilized three primary methods of advertising: collaboration with schools, social media, and newspaper advertisements (Figure 26). More than 60 percent of sponsors indicated that collaboration
with schools and social media were effective; only 33.6 percent of school sponsors reported that newspaper advertisements were effective for them. For a complete table please refer to appendix one, Table 17.

Figure 26. Methods of advertisement and effectiveness Please respond to the following statements regarding your organization's advertisement of the Summer meals program in 2019. (School Sponsors)


Note: Valid N=143

Nonprofit sponsors' top three choices for advertisement (80 percent or more) were social media, neighborhood flyers, and collaboration with schools. While over 60 percent of nonprofit sponsors reported that they found social media platforms and neighborhood flyers as an effective means of advertisement, only 50 percent of nonprofit sponsors indicated that collaborations with schools were effective. Other responses for both school sponsors and nonprofit sponsors included 'word of mouth'. For a complete table please refer to appendix one, Table 17.

Figure 27. Methods of advertisement and effectiveness
Please respond to the following statements regarding your organization's advertisement of the Summer meals program in 2019. (Nonprofit Sponsors)


Note: Valid $\mathrm{N}=26$

## Satisfaction with Summer Meals Program

Sponsors were asked to indicate their experience with a number of different aspects of their 2019 summer meals program. Figure 11 represents the percent of sponsors who rated these aspects as "extremely positive." For a complete table, please refer to Appendix One, Table 13. Overall, 82.4 percent of schools and 79.3 percent of nonprofits indicated that they were 'satisfied' or 'very satisfied' with their 2019 summer meals program.

Figure 11. Aspects of your Summer Meals experience 'extremely positive.'
Please rate the following aspects of your summer meals experience during summer 2019


Note: Valid $N=193$

Figure 17. Satisfaction with the Summer Meals Program
Overall how would you rate your satisfaction using the summer meals program during summer 2019?


## Experience with assessment and partnership with the Texas Hunger Initiative

Sponsors were asked to report their experience with the Summer Meals Project review process. Most sponsors said that administrative reviews (50 percent) and site visits (56.5 percent) remained consistent with 2018. Sponsors (12.1 percent) also indicated that they had fewer disallowed meals in 2019 compared to 2018.

Table 12. Frequency of reviews in 2019 compared to 2018

|  | Type of Organization |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | School |  | Nonprofit |  | Total |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Number of administrative reviews |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fewer | 10 | 6.5\% | 2 | 6.9\% | 12 | 6.5\% |
| Same | 78 | 50.3\% | 14 | 48.3\% | 92 | 50.0\% |
| More | 20 | 12.9\% | 7 | 24.1\% | 27 | 14.7\% |
| N/A | 47 | 30.3\% | 6 | 20.7\% | 53 | 28.8\% |
| I don't know | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Total | 155 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 184 | 100\% |
| Number of site visits |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fewer | 8 | 5.2\% | 3 | 10.3\% | 11 | 6.0\% |
| Same | 91 | 58.7\% | 13 | 44.8\% | 104 | 56.5\% |
| More | 16 | 10.3\% | 7 | 24.1\% | 23 | 12.5\% |
| N/A | 40 | 25.8\% | 6 | 20.7\% | 46 | 25.0\% |
| I don't know | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Total | 155 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 184 | 100\% |
| Number of disallowed meals |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fewer | 14 | 9.5\% | 7 | 26.9\% | 21 | 12.1\% |
| Same | 21 | 14.2\% | 3 | 11.5\% | 24 | 13.8\% |
| More | 0 | 0.0\% | 5 | 19.2\% | 5 | 2.9\% |
| N/A | 113 | 76.4\% | 11 | 42.3\% | 124 | 71.3\% |
| I don't know | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Total | 148 | 100\% | 26 | 100\% | 174 | 100\% |

Figure 28. Excellence in Summer Meals
Did your organization participate in Excellence in Summer Meals Campaign (ESMC) Summer 2019?


Note: Valid $\mathrm{N}=213$

Figure 29. Texas Hunger Initiative connection
Are you connected with a Texas Hunger Initiative regional staff person?


[^4]Most sponsors reported that they did not participate in the Excellence in Summer Meals in 2019 (Figure 28). The majority of schools report not being connected to a THI regional staff person (59.6\%), while 44.8\% of the nonprofits who responded to the survey report
being currently connected to THI. Additionally, most sponsors did not receive support of any kind from a THI regional office in relation to their 2019 summer meal efforts. Of sponsors that were in contact, 75 percent were school sponsors and 25 percent were nonprofit sponsors. All respondents ( 30 school and 10 nonprofit sponsors) that reported being in contact with a THI regional staff person are receiving support from THI.

Figure 30. Texas Hunger Initiative support Did you receive support of any kind from THI Regional staff regarding your summer meal efforts in 2019?


Note: Valid $\mathrm{N}=163$

Among the 21 sponsors who received some type of support for their summer meals program, most rated the support from the THI as moderately helpful to extremely helpful.

Figure 31. Texas Hunger Initiative helpful How helpful were THI staff regarding summer meals efforts in 2019?


Note: Valid $N=40$

Final short answer question

When asked to provide any additional comments, concerns, or suggestions concerning summer meal efforts in 2019, sponsors shared various insights. A primary concern was for the accessibility of summer meals. Seven sponsors commented on meal delivery or transportation issues for meal recipients. Sponsors were aware that there were children not being reached in their communities and either desired to expand their boundaries or have more support to deliver meals to those in need. One participant describes the need for meal delivery:
"I wish we had a way to deliver to children across our railroad tracks. I know there are a lot of hungry children there."

One sponsor explained how a lack of transportation, particularly in rural areas, can be a problem for recipients:
"...We are in a very rural area with minimal resources. Some children cannot come due to transportation. That is a shame because we are a highly low socioeconomic area."

Another sponsor, whose organization has employed mobile feeding sites, still expresses frustration at problems concerning overall ease of accessibility:
"...Mobile sites have proved to be the most effective method to deliver summer meals, and the rules and regulations need to catch up. Students should be allowed to take meals home."

Other respondents shared concerns about finding additional support for their programs. Six participants explained how some sponsors felt they need assistance in various areas such as finding more volunteers, more effective promoting to potential meal recipients, and connecting with other local agencies also providing meals.

Of sponsors requesting more assistance with running their summer meal programs, one specifically addressed advertising and the need for more staff:
"Our community really benefits from this program. I only wish I had more funds to do more advertising and have more staff to help with the prep and cooking of the meals."

A different sponsor echoed with similar concerns:
"Looking for any suggestions or help in promoting the program. Also interested in coming up with activities that we can offer at each site that will not cost so much. I have tried to find volunteers, but no luck! Are there organizations out there that could connect us with volunteer groups?"
Lastly, touching on the concerns about parental participation and activity fees, one sponsor said,
"[We] need free programs for the summer so our students can participate. That way, they come and eat Breakfast \& Lunch. We used to have [a] free program for the after school, and in summer, we would have large participation for sum mer meals... The parents cannot afford the fee, so they do not participate.

APPENDIX ONE: MULTIPLE CHOICE BY ORGANIZATION

Table 13. Please rate the following aspects of your summer meals experience

|  | Type of Organization |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | School |  | Nonprofit |  | Total |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Application process |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Extremely negative | 1 | 0.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 0.6\% |
| Somewhat Negative | 12 | 8.1\% | 6 | 20.0\% | 18 | 10.1\% |
| Neither negative not positive | 31 | 20.8\% | 8 | 26.7\% | 39 | 21.8\% |
| Somewhat positive | 32 | 21.5\% | 8 | 26.7\% | 40 | 22.3\% |
| Extremely positive | 73 | 49.0\% | 8 | 26.7\% | 81 | 45.3\% |
| Total | 149 | 100\% | 30\% | 100\% | 179 | 100\% |
| Site approvals and/or inspections |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Extremely negative | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 3.3\% | 1 | 0.5\% |
| Somewhat Negative | 2 | 1.3\% | 4 | 13.3\% | 6 | 3.2\% |
| Neither negative not positive | 35 | 22.2\% | 5 | 16.7\% | 40 | 21.3\% |
| Somewhat positive | 30 | 19.0\% | 7 | 23.3\% | 37 | 19.7\% |
| Extremely positive | 91 | 57.6\% | 13 | 43.3\% | 104 | 55.3\% |
| Total | 158 | 100\% | 30 | 100\% | 188 | 100\% |
| Technical assistance by other organization |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Extremely negative | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Somewhat Negative | 1 | 0.9\% | 1 | 4.8\% | 2 | 1.6\% |
| Neither negative not positive | 32 | 30.2\% | 8 | 38.1\% | 40 | 31.5\% |
| Somewhat positive | 20 | 18.9\% | 2 | 9.5\% | 22 | 17.3\% |
| Extremely positive | 53 | 50.0\% | 10 | 47.1\% | 63 | 49.6\% |
| Total | 106 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 127 | 100\% |
| Assistance or training before application |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Extremely negative | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Somewhat Negative | 2 | 1.4\% | 2 | 7.14 | 4 | 2.3\% |
| Neither negative not positive | 40 | 27.4\% | 6 | 21.4\% | 46 | 26.4\% |
| Somewhat positive | 26 | 17.8\% | 7 | 25.0\% | 33 | 19.0\% |
| Extremely positive | 78 | 53.4\% | 13 | 46.4\% | 91 | 52.3\% |
| Total | 146 | 100\% | 28 | 100\% | 174 | 100\% |
| Technical assistance by state agency |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Extremely negative | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 3.6\% | 1 | 0.6\% |
| Somewhat Negative | 3 | 2.2\% | 1 | 3.6\% | 4 | 2.4\% |
| Neither negative not positive | 36 | 26.4\% | 5 | 17.9\% | 41 | 24.8\% |
| Somewhat positive | 28 | 20.4\% | 7 | 25.0\% | 35 | 21.2\% |
| Extremely positive | 70 | 51.1\% | 14 | 50.0\% | 84 | 50.9\% |
| Total | 137 | 100\% | 28 | 100\% | 165 | 100\% |
| Process for claim reimbursement |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Extremely negative | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Somewhat Negative | 1 | 0.6\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 0.5\% |
| Neither negative not positive | 34 | 20.7\% | 5 | 17.2\% | 39 | 20.2\% |
| Somewhat positive | 27 | 16.5\% | 6 | 20.7\% | 33 | 17.1\% |
| Extremely positive | 102 | 62.2\% | 18 | 62.1\% | 120 | 6.2\% |
| Total | 164 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 193 | 100\% |
| 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 14. Please rate your satisfaction with your vendor in the following areas.

|  | Type of Organization |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | School |  | Nonprofit |  | Total |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Overall experience |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Extremely dissatisfied | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Somewhat dissatisfied | 0 | 0.0\% | 2 | 40.0\% | 2 | 22.2\% |
| Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 1 | 25.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 11.1\% |
| Somewhat satisfied | 2 | 50.0\% | 1 | 20.0\% | 3 | 33.3\% |
| Extremely satisfied | 1 | 25.0\% | 2 | 40.0\% | 3 | 33.3\% |
| Total | 4 | 100\% | 5 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% |
| Quality of food |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Extremely dissatisfied | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Somewhat dissatisfied | 1 | 25.0\% | 1 | 20.0\% | 2 | 22.2\% |
| Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 20.0\% | 1 | 11.1\% |
| Somewhat satisfied | 2 | 50.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 2 | 22.2\% |
| Extremely satisfied | 1 | 25.0\% | 3 | 60.0\% | 4 | 44.4\% |
| Total | 4 | 100\% | 5 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% |
| Efficacy of delivery method |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Extremely dissatisfied | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 20.0\% | 1 | 11.1\% |
| Somewhat dissatisfied | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 20.0\% | 1 | 11.1\% |
| Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 1 | 25.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 11.1\% |
| Somewhat satisfied | 1 | 25.0\% | 1 | 20.0\% | 2 | 22.2\% |
| Extremely satisfied | 2 | 50.0\% | 2 | 40.0\% | 4 | 44.4\% |
| Total | 4 | 100\% | 5 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% |

Table 15. For respondents that obtain resources from the TDA, how is it received

|  | Type of Organization |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | School |  | Nonprofit |  | Total |  |
|  | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ |
| Download/print | 66 | $30.4 \%$ | 15 | $38.5 \%$ | 81 | $31.6 \%$ |
| Order (from TDA website; mailed for free) | 150 | $69.1 \%$ | 21 | $53.8 \%$ | 171 | $66.8 \%$ |
| Other | 1 | $0.5 \%$ | 3 | $7.7 \%$ | 4 | $1.6 \%$ |

[^5]Table 16. How many of your sites provide the following services.

|  | Type of Organization |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | School |  | Nonprofit |  | Total |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Activities for children |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 34 | 20.5\% | 3 | 10.3\% | 37 | 19.0\% |
| Some | 31 | 18.7\% | 3 | 10.3\% | 34 | 17.4\% |
| Most | 27 | 16.3\% | 5 | 17.2\% | 32 | 16.4\% |
| All | 74 | 44.6\% | 18 | 62.1\% | 92 | 47.2\% |
| Total | 166 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 195 | 100\% |
| Transportation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 52 | 31.3\% | 16 | 57.1\% | 68 | 35.1\% |
| Some | 40 | 24.1\% | 9 | 32.1\% | 49 | 25.3\% |
| Most | 20 | 12.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 20 | 10.3\% |
| All | 54 | 32.5\% | 3 | 10.7\% | 57 | 29.4\% |
| Total | 166 | 100\% | 28 | 100\% | 194 | 100\% |
| Incentives for participation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 90 | 65.7\% | 12 | 42.9\% | 102 | 61.8\% |
| Some | 21 | 15.3\% | 10 | 35.7\% | 31 | 18.8\% |
| Most | 8 | 5.8\% | 2 | 7.1\% | 10 | 6.1\% |
| All | 18 | 13.1\% | 4 | 14.3\% | 22 | 13.3\% |
| Total | 137 | 100\% | 28 | 100\% | 165 | 100\% |
| Outreach for services (e.g. SNAP) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 86 | 65.6\% | 15 | 60.0\% | 101 | 64.7\% |
| Some | 14 | 10.7\% | 7 | 28.0\% | 21 | 13.5\% |
| Most | 8 | 6.1\% | 1 | 4.0\% | 9 | 5.8\% |
| All | 23 | 17.6\% | 2 | 8.0\% | 25 | 16.0\% |
| Total | 131 | 100\% | 25\% | 100\% | 156 | 100\% |
| Additional food sent home |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 144 | 92.9\% | 18 | 72.0\% | 162 | 90.0\% |
| Some | 7 | 4.5\% | 3 | 12.0\% | 10 | 5.6\% |
| Most | 2 | 1.3\% | 2 | 8.0\% | 4 | 2.2\% |
| All | 2 | 1.3\% | 2 | 8.0\% | 4 | 2.2\% |
| Total | 155 | 100\% | 25 | 100\% | 180 | 100\% |
| Meals offered to parents for a fee |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 91 | 58.0\% | 24 | 82.8\% | 115 | 61.8\% |
| Some | 4 | 2.5\% | 1 | 3.4\% | 5 | 2.7\% |
| Most | 6 | 3.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 6 | 3.2\% |
| All | 56 | 35.7\% | 4 | 13.8\% | 60 | 32.3\% |
| Total | 157 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 186 | 100\% |
| Meals offered to parents at a paid rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 58 | 36.3\% | 27 | 96.4\% | 85 | 45.2\% |
| Some | 12 | 7.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 12 | 6.4\% |
| Most | 10 | 6.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 10 | 5.3\% |
| All | 80 | 50.0\% | 1 | 3.6\% | 81 | 43.1\% |
| Total | 160 | 100\% | 28 | 100\% | 188 | 100\% |

Table 17. Please respond to the following statements regarding your organization's advertisement of the summer meals program in 2019.


## APPENDIX TWO: OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS BY REGION

Figure 1.- Which best describes your organization?

- Food Bank
- Food Bank
- Non-Profit Day Camp
- Q7_5_TEXT
- Summer Educational Program

Table 3.- In your opinion, what contributed to the decline in number of sites?

- District decision
- Local economy is doing very well
- Just not a lot of interest in community
- Lack of perceived need/ Reluctance to acknowledge need
- Another sponsor indicated but did not sponsor
- Sites trying out new sponsors - looking for something different
- Weather-rain buses are not able to go and pick up students
- Too many other sites within the same area.
- Vacation Bible School dates

Table 4.- In your opinion, what contributed to the drop in participation?

- Local economy is doing well. More parents are able to stay home with children.
- Just not a lot of interest in community
- State does not allow meals to be taken home.
- Sites serving outside of approved serving times
- Inadequate staff
- Did not have a Summer School Program
- It's about the number of children in summer school programs, city program and church programs. For example Gonzales runs a summer youth program. Budget cutbacks meant for the first time the City had to charge $\$ 10$ per week per child. We would provide meals. The charge caused numbers to drop from 110 to 25
- Students attend summer school

Table 5.- In your opinion, what contributed to the increase in participation?

- Became CEP because of Harvey
- Post Hurricane Harvey, the Vidor ISD began the CEP program. This school district (2 still unbuilt flooded schools) was devastated by HH. (And with Imelda as well)
- COCISD started participating in CEP
- More advertising
- Increased supervisors
- Church VBS ; worked with City Parks \& Recreation Activities
- A program that was offered in the summer was cut but we fed athletes participating in summer workouts and that made up the difference
- Changed breakfast to snack
- Not sure, did not change advertising style or number of sites or types of food.... Just had more kids participate.
- The district did not participate in HUBS during the 2019 SFSP.

Table 6.- Were any of the following challenges for your program during summer $2019 ?$

- Heat that prohibited families to come to outside sites. Congregate feeding waiver is for heat advisory but does not help with rain or with hot windy weather that we experienced.
- Not allowing kids to take meals home for mobile sites on hot weather days
- Several nearby organizations provide summer meals.
- Get the word out quicker to kids in the area, took them a few weeks to realize where we were set up at a few locations.
- Unable to invest into marketing the program.
- Summer school is only June
- We did not have Summer School.
- TDA capacity issues.
- Training - some staff trained chose not to follow training protocol which was discovered during monitor visits. We found site staff agreeing and demonstrating understanding at training, however, did not follow despite posters printed in large print with procedures, multiple weekly follow up messages, follow up trainings, etc.

Table 7.- With additional funds or capacity, which of the following would your organization consider working on to expand the program?

- Ability to deliver meals
- Need to have sites where children are already congregating and need staff for those locations.
- Sufficient employees
- Marketing
- Getting the Summer Program Back
- Include parents
- Pay for adults that are bringing in students to eat. It is hard for sponsors to see them go hungry as well

Table 8.- What was the source of the additional funds?

- CACFP Fundings
- Fundraising
- Summer Camp Fees
- Tuition Fees
- Our organization

Table 9.- How did you use these additional funds?

- Utility costs
- Items to support site (ie. tables, chairs, canopies)

Figure 16.- Where do you obtain food?

- Farm fresh
- FFAVORS
- Restaurant Depot
- SAISD Warehouse

Figure 20.- What transportation is necessary within your organization to obtain the meals?

- Food -is prepared on site and only the food needed is transported to the site.
- Transportation for children to site.
- Transportation needed for 1 site. We have a truck and driver

Figure 24.- What types of transportation options do families use to get to your sites?

- Mobile feeding- helpful since transportation is a barrier sometimes for participants
- Program Transportation for homeless children
- Church van.
- Daycare Vans
- Ride bicycles
- Bikes
- We pick up on a bus
- Students typically take the bus to school for summer school/summer programs at school; the apartment deliveries - kids walked to the community center where served. Transpiration not a problem for us.
- The students are attending other programs that we are providing the food for

Table 11.- What specific types of support might help your program?

- Any events we can serve at or if we could serve at Leonard Park which was not approved by the city
- More local programs for us to partner with
- Maybe State or Federal grant moneys to allow more children to attend summer school.
- Allowing kids to take meals home
- Subsidize adult meals

Figure 25.- Where does your organization obtain marketing resources?

- Online

Figure 25.- How did your organization receive TDA marketing materials?

- ESC Region 19
- Received at Summer and Supper Council meeting
- Mail
- Mailed from Betty Teston
- Ordered and picked up from printer.

Figure 26 \& 27.- Please respond to the following statements regarding your organization's advertisement of the summer meals program in 2019.

- Children enrolled in child care options and us bringing food to them
- Word of mouth
- Word of mouth
- Unknown

Final short answer question.- Any additional comments, concerns, or suggestions concerning summer meal efforts in 2019.

- We will be most successful if distance between locations is not an issue. We simply need to bring meals to any location where children are already enrolled in a program.
- We use both central kitchen and site based preparation, depending on the number of children attending a site.
- We only have the summer feeding program every few years to see if we really have a need in our area. We do not feel like we do. We are a rural area and a small town who look out for families in need. Thankfully there is not a need for summer meals.
- We have expanded our summer outreach to include various church vacation bible study. This has helped reach out to children who are our students for 1 week at a time. Any expansion is limited by the sites and how many children attend and how many of our employees are willing to work. Unless there is an active program going on, parents and children in my opinion are either too lazy to bother to go to a site and get a free meal or they simply are not under pressure from lack of available food. Like most summer programs even with extensive advertising, we have few walk-ins. Also, a lot of our children may leave the country during the summer so they would not be available for any program.
- We have been serving meals to children for over 10 years and I cannot be more pleased. The look on the children faces, the request for seconds because they not only love our meals but is a need for many of the areas we serve. So grateful to be a partner with Texas Department of Agriculture
- We are very happy to participate in Summer school. We have many happy families and we appreciate all the help they give us.
- We are looking at what we can do to deliver the meals to the students.
- This is an important thing for our community especially post HH and recently Imelda. We are lucky to have sufficient Child Nutrition funds to cover expenses. We will continue to do this as long as possible. Will be CEP until end of SY 2122.
- There are none to limited resources, when it comes to mobile feeding sites. Mobile sites have proved to be the most effective method to deliver summer meals and the rules and regulations need to catch up. Students should be allowed to take meals home.
- "Thanks for everything y'all do to make this program easier on Sponsor. We appreciate your help and guidance.
- *We wanted to participate in the campaign- but were told last year we needed to procure a a vendor who provides ""better quality of meals"" and we would be ""gold standard"". Yet a sponsor who was given the gold stamp of approval last year utilizes the same vendor we do-all year round (; All in all, we wish the Excellence in Summer Meals Campaign would be judged fairly and accurately."
- Thanks for caring, sharing, and providing resources (human and financial).
- Thank you and see you summer 2020!
- Schools do \& try their very best to feed the students that are in need. The only ones we get are captive: either in summer school or enrolled in the boy's \& girls club. If the government programs would cover the meals if we dropped off to homes or if we could go to neighborhoods, and drive from corner to corner, like the ice-cream truck, then we might could make an impact that way.
- "Proud that Terrell ISD can provide meals for students during Summer School session and some sites beyond that.
- The application process is a bear, however we have learned to move through it with help from Region 10 ESC.
- I would love for more students to take advantage."
- Our Community really benefits from this program, I only wish I had more funds to do more advertising and have more staff to help with the prep and cooking of the meals.
- Not at this time, thank you.
- Nope, all good.
- Need free programs for the summer so our students can participate. That way they come and eat Breakfast \& Lunch. We use to have free program for the after school and in summer we would have large participation for summer meals. The activities we have in the summer they charge a fee we have students that the parents can not afford the fee so they don't participate.
- Most of the students that attend our program are enrolled in summer school. Transportation seems to be an issue but also students just don't want to come to the school. We have changed the location of our program from our old elem/hs cafe to just the elementary cafe and the location is farther from the center of town. This area will also be the new location of the hs cafe starting with the 20-21 school year.
- Looking for any suggestions or help in promoting the program. Also interested in coming up with activities that we can offer at each site that will not cost so much. I have tried to find volunteers but no luck! Are there organizations out there that could connect us with volunteer groups?
- I would love to speak to a contact person to gain additional support for this program. In 2020, we will be participating in SFSP.
- I would like to see us get more help from agencies that are available. We are in a very rural area with very limited resources. Some children cannot come due to
transportation. That is a shame because we are a highly low socio-economic area.
- I would like to know who else in the area is planning meal programs at the time we submit our application
- I wish we had a way to deliver to children across our railroad tracks. I know there are alot of hungry children there.
- "Food offered.
- Parents think it is better to stay homeland sleep late. Students can eat a hot breakfast and as much as they want at home.
- All of the sponsor staff were new for 2019 which caused such a change from previous years, we were also reviewed/monitored this year. We took everything, as a learning opportunity and will be sure to engage and produce more stringent policies this coming year.
- A majority of our participation are the summers.


## APPENDIX THREE: MULTIPLE CHOICE BY TDA REGION

Appendix Three includes the survey questions broken out by TDA Regions. Region 1 is West Texas Region; Region 2 is North Texas Region; Region 3 is Gulf Coast Region; Region 4 is South Central Region; Region 5 is Valley Region.

Table A. Does your organization plan to serve as a summer meals sponsor in summer 2020?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 45 | 75 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 213 |  |  |
|  | $95.7 \%$ | $96.2 \%$ | $97.2 \%$ | $97.2 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $96.8 \%$ |  |  |
| No | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | $2.1 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ |  |  |
| I don't know | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 |  |  |
|  | $2.1 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ |  |  |
| Count | 47 | 78 | 36 | 36 | 23 | 220 |  |  |
| Total | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |  |

Table B. Which best describes your organization?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| School | 37 | 62 | 31 | 28 | 21 | 179 |
|  | 78.72\% | 80.52\% | 86.11\% | 77.78\% | 91.30\% | 81.7\% |
| Nonprofit | 9 | 13 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 34 |
|  | 19.15\% | 16.88\% | 13.89\% | 13.89\% | 8.70\% | 16\% |
| Local government | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 0.00\% | 1.30\% | 0.00\% | 2.78\% | 0.00\% | 1\% |
| Camp | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 0.00\% | 1.30\% | 0.00\% | 2.78\% | 0.00\% | 1\% |
| Other | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 2.13\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 2.78\% | 0.00\% | 1\% |
| Count | 47 | 77 | 36 | 36 | 23 | 219 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table C. Which federal program do you utilize to administer the summer meals program?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Seamless <br> Summer Op- <br> tion (SSO) | 12 | 45 | 21 | 12 | 17 | 107 |
|  | 26.1\% | 58.4\% | 58.3\% | 33.3\% | 73.9\% | 49.1\% |
| Summer Food Service Program (SESP) | 34 | 31 | 15 | 24 | 6 | 110 |
|  | 73.9\% | 40.3\% | 41.7\% | 66.7\% | 26.1\% | 50\% |
| I don't Know | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 0.0\% | 1.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0\% |
| Count | 46 | 77 | 36 | 36 | 23 | 218 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table D. Are most of your sites located in rural or urban areas?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Most sites located in rural areas | 30 | 31 | 16 | 20 | 9 | 106 |
|  | 65.2\% | 40.3\% | 44.4\% | 57.1\% | 42.9\% | 49\% |
| Most sites located in urban areas | 14 | 38 | 18 | 11 | 10 | 91 |
|  | 30.4\% | 49.4\% | 50.0\% | 31.4\% | 47.6\% | 42\% |
| An even mix of sites in both rural and urban areas | 2 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 18 |
|  | 4.3\% | 10.4\% | 5.6\% | 11.4\% | 9.5\% | 8\% |
| Count | 46 | 77 | 36 | 35 | 21 | 215 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table E. How long has your organization served as a summer meals sponsor?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| 1 year | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10 |
|  | 4.3\% | 4.2\% | 5.7\% | 2.9\% | 9.5\% | 5\% |
| 2-3 years | 1 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
|  | 2.1\% | 0.1\% | 5.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 5\% |
| 4-5 years | 3 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 21 |
|  | 6.4\% | 13.9\% | 11.4\% | 11.4\% | 0.0\% | 10\% |
| 6-10 years | 8 | 18 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 41 |
|  | 17.0\% | \% | 17.1\% | 17.1\% | 14.3\% | 20\% |
| More than 10 years | 29 | 29 | 21 | 21 | 16 | 116 |
|  | 61.7\% | 40.3\% | 60.0\% | 60.0\% | 76.2\% | 55\% |
| I don't know | 4 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 11 |
|  | 8.5\% | 5.6\% | 0.0\% | 8.6\% | 0.0\% | 5\% |
| Count | 47 | 72 | 35 | 35 | 21 | 210 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 64.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table F. Do you also sponsor an afterschool meal program offered through the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) at some point during the year?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Yes | 10 | 36 | 13 | 15 | 13 | 87 |
|  | 21.3\% | 46.8\% | 36.1\% | 42.9\% | 56.5\% | 40\% |
| No | 35 | 41 | 23 | 17 | 10 | 126 |
|  | 74.5\% | 53.2\% | 63.9\% | 48.6\% | 43.5\% | 58\% |
| I don't know | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
|  | 4.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 8.6\% | 0.0\% | 2\% |
| Count | 47 | 77 | 36 | 35 | 23 | 218 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table G. How many Summer Meals sites did you operate during the summer 2019?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| 1 to 6 | 38 | 57 | 24 | 25 | 15 | 159 |
|  | 80.4\% | 67.9\% | 66.7\% | 68.6\% | 60.9\% | 69.7\% |
| 7 to 12 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 13 |
|  | 4.3\% | 5.1\% | 8.3\% | 8.6\% | 4.3\% | 6\% |
| 131 to 20 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
|  | 4.3\% | 5.1\% | 8.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 4\% |
| I don't know | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 0.0\% | 1.3\% | 0.0\% | 2.9\% | 0.0\% | 1\% |
| Count | 47 | 77 | 36 | 35 | 23 | 218 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table H. How did the number of summer meals sites in 2019 compare to 2018 ?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Increased | 12 | 27 | 12 | 8 | 10 | 69 |
|  | 27.3\% | 36.0\% | 33.3\% | 25.8\% | 45.5\% | 33\% |
| Decreased | 6 | 21 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 45 |
|  | 13.6\% | 28.0\% | 19.4\% | 16.1\% | 27.3\% | 22\% |
| Stayed the same | 22 | 22 | 16 | 17 | 4 | 81 |
|  | 50.0\% | 29.3\% | 44.4\% | 54.8\% | 18.2\% | 39\% |
| Did not sponsor in 2018 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 13 |
|  | 9.1\% | 6.7\% | 2.8\% | 3.2\% | 9.1\% | 6\% |
| Count | 44 | 75 | 36 | 31 | 22 | 208 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table I. In your opinion, what contributed to the decline in number of sites

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Lack of participation at sites | 3 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 21 |
|  | 75.00\% | 40.00\% | 75.00\% | 36.36\% | 75.00\% | 49\% |
| Lack of adequate funding | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
|  | 0.00\% | 5.00\% | 0.00\% | 18.18\% | 0.00\% | 7\% |
| Lack of Staff | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 6 |
|  | 0.00\% | 10.00\% | 0.00\% | 36.36\% | 0.00\% | 14\% |
| Transportation issues | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 11 |
|  | 25.00\% | 35.00\% | 25.00\% | 9.09\% | 25.00\% | 26\% |
| Construc-tion/Facility issues | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 0.00\% | 10.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 5\% |
| Other | 4 | 20 | 4 | 11 | 4 | 43 |
|  | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100\% |

Table I. In your opinion, what contributed to the decline in number of sites

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Increased | 12 | 31 | 13 | 11 | 7 | 74 |
|  | 30.8\% | 46.3\% | 37.1\% | 35.5\% | 36.8\% | 39\% |
| Stayed the same | 17 | 18 | 18 | 14 | 8 | 75 |
|  | 43.6\% | 26.9\% | 51.4\% | 45.2\% | 42.1\% | 39\% |
| Decreased | 10 | 18 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 42 |
|  | 25.6\% | 26.9\% | 11.4\% | 19.4\% | 21.1\% | 22\% |
| Count | 39 | 67 | 35 | 31 | 19 | 191 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table J. Overall, how did your organization's total number of meals reimbursed in 2019 compare to 2018?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Increased | 14 | 31 | 16 | 12 | 8 | 81 |
|  | 35.9\% | 46.3\% | 45.7\% | 40.0\% | 40.0\% | 42.4\% |
| Stayed the same | 15 | 18 | 14 | 13 | 5 | 65 |
|  | 38.5\% | 26.9\% | 40.0\% | 43.3\% | 25.0\% | 34\% |
| Decreased | 10 | 18 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 45 |
|  | 25.6\% | 26.9\% | 14.3\% | 16.7\% | 35.0\% | 24\% |
| Count | 39 | 67 | 35 | 30 | 20 | 191 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table K. In your opinion, what contributed to the drop in participation?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Children/families are aware of program, but choose not to participate (e.g. fear of deportation, aren't familiar with org/staff, parents want children to stay home, etc.) | 1 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 16 |
|  | 4.2\% | 23.1\% | 10.0\% | 22.2\% | 17.6\% | 16\% |
| Drop in summer school enrollment | 6 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 21 |
|  | 25.0\% | 17.9\% | 30.0\% | 22.2\% | 17.6\% | 21\% |
| Transportation/accessibility of site (12) | 3 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 14 |
|  | 12.5\% | 15.4\% | 0.0\% | 11.1\% | 23.5\% | 14\% |
| Other | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
|  | 8.3\% | 5.1\% | 20.0\% | 22.2\% | 5.9\% | 9\% |
| Lack of awareness | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
|  | 4.2\% | 7.7\% | 10.0\% | 0.0\% | 11.8\% | 7\% |
| Weather | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 7 |
|  | 4.2\% | 5.1\% | 10.0\% | 0.0\% | 17.6\% | 7\% |
| Limited or lack of activates offered at site | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
|  | 8.3\% | 2.6\% | 20.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 5\% |
| Fewer sites are opening | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 |
|  | 12.5\% | 10.3\% | 0.0\% | 11.1\% | 0.0\% | 8\% |
| Operating fewer days during the summer | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
|  | 8.3\% | 5.1\% | 0.0\% | 11.1\% | 5.9\% | 6\% |
| Food Quality | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |


|  | $4.2 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Meals disallowed by <br> state agency | 1 |  |  |  | 0 | 2 |
|  | $4.2 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Timing of meal service | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | $4.2 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Count | 24 | 39 | 10 | 9 | 17 | 99 |
| Total | $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

Table L. In your opinion, what contributed to the increase in participation? (Select all the apply.)

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| More Operating Sites | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
|  | 3 | 10 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 27 |
|  | 13.0\% | 16.7\% | 18.2\% | 8.3\% | 28.6\% | 17\% |
| Introduction of different delivery methods | 1 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 11 |
|  | 4.3\% | 10.0\% | 6.1\% | 4.2\% | 4.8\% | 7\% |
| Increased days of service | 2 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 20 |
|  | 8.7\% | 13.3\% | 15.2\% | 8.3\% | 14.3\% | 12\% |
| Increased summer school enrollment | 5 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 24 |
|  | 21.7\% | 13.3\% | 18.2\% | 12.5\% | 9.5\% | 15\% |
| Effective marketing | 3 | 8 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 21 |
|  | 13.0\% | 13.3\% | 6.1\% | 20.8\% | 14.3\% | 13\% |
| Improved food quality | 1 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 12 |
|  | 4.3\% | 10.0\% | 6.1\% | 8.3\% | 4.8\% | 7\% |
| Improved programming | 2 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 14 |
|  | 8.7\% | 8.3\% | 6.1\% | 16.7\% | 4.8\% | 9\% |
| Accommodating service times | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 16 |
|  | 8.7\% | 6.7\% | 12.1\% | 12.5\% | 14.3\% | 10\% |
| Other | 4 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 16 |
|  | 17.39\% | 8.33\% | 12.12\% | 8.33\% | 4.76\% | 10\% |
| Count | 23 | 60 | 33 | 24 | 21 | 161 |
| Total | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100\% |

Table M. Were any of the following challenges for your program during summer 2019 ?
(Select all that apply.)

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Other | 2 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 14 |
|  | 4.4\% | 7.1\% | 9.4\% | 0.0\% | 12.5\% | 7\% |
| Amount of reimbursement | 5 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 14 |
|  | 11.1\% | 4.7\% | 6.3\% | 3.4\% | 8.3\% | 7\% |
| Low child participation | 23 | 43 | 18 | 13 | 9 | 106 |
|  | 51.1\% | 50.6\% | 56.3\% | 44.8\% | 37.5\% | 49\% |
| Transportation | 4 | 12 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 29 |
|  | 8.9\% | 14.1\% | 15.6\% | 10.3\% | 20.8\% | 13\% |
| Insufficient Funds to cover costs of meals | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
|  | 6.7\% | 2.4\% | 3.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 3\% |
| Unable to successfully transport meals to site | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 7 |
|  | 2.2\% | 2.4\% | 0.0\% | 10.3\% | 4.2\% | 3\% |
| Filing paperwork | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 14 |
|  | 6.7\% | 3.5\% | 3.1\% | 10.3\% | 16.7\% | 7\% |
| Health Department Policies | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
|  | 0.0\% | 3.5\% | 0.0\% | 6.9\% | 0.0\% | 2\% |
| Insufficient staff to capacity to serve meals | 4 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 14 |
|  | 8.9\% | 8.2\% | 6.3\% | 3.4\% | 0.0\% | 7\% |
| Unable to provide quality meals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 3.4\% | 0.0\% | 0\% |
| Unable to get enough sites to serve meals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
|  | 0.0\% | 3.5\% | 0.0\% | 6.9\% | 0.0\% | 2\% |
| Count | 45 | 85 | 32 | 29 | 24 | 215 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table N. With additional funds or capacity, which of the following would your organization consider working on to expand the program?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Increased number of children served | 28 | 50 | 22 | 18 | 13 | 131 |
|  | 49.1\% | 54.3\% | 46.8\% | 46.2\% | 35.1\% | 48\% |
| Increased number of sites | 11 | 19 | 10 | 10 | 6 | 56 |
|  | 19.3\% | 20.7\% | 21.3\% | 25.6\% | 16.2\% | 21\% |
| Increased number of days current sites open | 4 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 22 |
|  | 7.0\% | 7.6\% | 10.6\% | 2.6\% | 13.5\% | 8\% |
| Increased number of meals offered | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 16 |
|  | 5.3\% | 3.3\% | 8.5\% | 5.1\% | 10.8\% | 6\% |
| Increased type of meals offered | 8 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 28 |
|  | 14.0\% | 5.4\% | 10.6\% | 12.8\% | 13.5\% | 10\% |
| Other | 3 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 19 |
|  | 5.3\% | 8.7\% | 2.1\% | 7.7\% | 10.8\% | 7\% |
| Count | 57 | 92 | 47 | 39 | 37 | 272 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table O. In summer 2019, did your program pay for itself or did it require additional funds outside of Texas Department of Agriculture's meal reimbursements to operate?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Paid for itself | 24 | 49 | 24 | 19 | 15 | 131 |
|  | 55.8\% | 73.1\% | 72.7\% | 67.9\% | 88.2\% | 70\% |
| Required additional funds | 19 | 18 | 9 | 9 | 2 | 57 |
|  | 44.2\% | 26.9\% | 27.3\% | 32.1\% | 11.8\% | 30\% |
| I don't know | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0\% |
| Count | 43 | 67 | 33 | 28 | 17 | 188 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table P. What was the source of the additional funds?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Individual donors | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 10 |
|  | $17.4 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ | $30.0 \%$ | $20.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $16 \%$ |
| Grants | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 8 |
|  | $13.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $20.0 \%$ | $20.0 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| School General <br> Funds | 10 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 20 |
|  | $43.5 \%$ | $27.8 \%$ | $20.0 \%$ | $20.0 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ | $32 \%$ |
| Funding from other <br> programs within <br> your organization | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |
|  | $4.3 \%$ | $11.1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Nutrition Depart- <br> ment Funds | 1 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 13 |
|  | $4.3 \%$ | $44.4 \%$ | $20.0 \%$ | $20.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $21 \%$ |
| Other | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8 |
|  | $17.4 \%$ | $11.1 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
|  | 23 | 18 | 10 | 10 | 2 | 63 |
| Count | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |

Table Q. How did you use these additional funds?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Cover food costs | 15 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 35 |
|  | 35.7\% | 35.7\% | 21.7\% | 30.8\% | 16.7\% | 31\% |
| Support staffing costs | 14 | 12 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 40 |
|  | 33.3\% | 42.9\% | 30.4\% | 38.5\% | 33.3\% | 36\% |
| Other | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
|  | 2.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 16.7\% | 2\% |
| Supplies to prepare, store, deliver food | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 10 |
|  | 9.5\% | 7.1\% | 8.7\% | 7.7\% | 16.7\% | 9\% |
| Cover transport cost for food | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 10 |
|  | 4.8\% | 10.7\% | 17.4\% | 7.7\% | 0.0\% | 9\% |
| Support activities for children | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
|  | 7.1\% | 0.0\% | 13.0\% | 7.7\% | 16.7\% | 7\% |
| Provide meal to parents | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
|  | 4.8\% | 0.0\% | 4.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 3\% |
| Provide additional meal or snack | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
|  | 2.4\% | 3.6\% | 4.3\% | 7.7\% | 0.0\% | 4\% |
| Count | 42 | 28 | 23 | 13 | 6 | 112 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table R.1. Please rate the following aspects of your summer meals experience during summer 2019.

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Process for claim <br> reimbursement | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Extremely negative | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Somewhat Nega- <br> tive | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
|  | $0.0 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Neither negative <br> not positive | 8 | 17 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 40 |
|  | $18.2 \%$ | $25.8 \%$ | $25.0 \%$ | $18.8 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| Somewhat positive | 10 | 9 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 35 |
|  | $22.7 \%$ | $13.6 \%$ | $19.4 \%$ | $18.8 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| Extremely positive | 26 | 39 | 20 | 19 | 17 | 121 |
|  | $59.1 \%$ | $59.1 \%$ | $55.6 \%$ | $59.4 \%$ | $85.0 \%$ | $61 \%$ |
| Count | 44 | 66 | 36 | 32 | 20 | 198 |
| Total | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

Table R.2. Please rate the following aspects of your summer meals experience during summer 2019.

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Technical assis- <br> tance by state <br> agency |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Extremely negative | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |

Table R.3. Please rate the following aspects of your summer meals experience during summer 2019.

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Assistance or train- <br> ing before applica- <br> tion | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Extremely Negative | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Somewhat nega- <br> tive | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
|  | $0.0 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Neither positive nor <br> negative | 8 | 21 | 8 | 10 | 2 | 49 |
|  | $18.6 \%$ | $33.9 \%$ | $25.0 \%$ | $40.0 \%$ | $11.8 \%$ | $27 \%$ |
| Somewhat positive | 11 | 10 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 34 |
|  | $25.6 \%$ | $16.1 \%$ | $21.9 \%$ | $16.0 \%$ | $11.8 \%$ | $19 \%$ |
| Extremely negative | 24 | 29 | 15 | 11 | 13 | 92 |
|  | $55.8 \%$ | $46.8 \%$ | $46.9 \%$ | $44.0 \%$ | $76.5 \%$ | $51 \%$ |
| Count | 43 | 62 | 32 | 25 | 17 | 179 |
| Total | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

Table R.4. Please rate the following aspects of your summer meals experience during summer 2019.

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Application process | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Extremely negative | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 2.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 1\% |
| Somewhat negative | 1 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 20 |
|  | 2.4\% | 9.7\% | 24.2\% | 6.9\% | 16.7\% | 11\% |
| Neither positive nor negative | 8 | 17 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 39 |
|  | 19.0\% | 27.4\% | 21.2\% | 24.1\% | 0.0\% | 21\% |
| Somewhat positive | 13 | 14 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 41 |
|  | 31.0\% | 22.6\% | 15.2\% | 20.7\% | 16.7\% | 22\% |
| Extremely positive | 19 | 25 | 13 | 14 | 12 | 83 |
|  | 45.2\% | 40.3\% | 39.4\% | 48.3\% | 66.7\% | 45\% |
| Count | 42 | 62 | 33 | 29 | 18 | 184 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table R.5. Please rate the following aspects of your summer meals experience during summer 2019.

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Site approvals and/or inspections | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Extremely negative | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
|  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 5.0\% | 1\% |
| Somewhat negative | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 7 |
|  | 4.5\% | 3.0\% | 3.0\% | 6.7\% | 0.0\% | 4\% |
| Neither positive nor negative | 7 | 17 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 40 |
|  | 15.9\% | 25.8\% | 30.3\% | 20.0\% | 0.0\% | 21\% |
| Somewhat positive | 9 | 13 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 40 |
|  | 20.5\% | 19.7\% | 21.2\% | 20.0\% | 25.0\% | 21\% |
| Extremely positive | 26 | 34 | 15 | 16 | 14 | 105 |
|  | 59.1\% | 51.5\% | 45.5\% | 53.3\% | 70.0\% | 54\% |
| Count | 44 | 66 | 33 | 30 | 20 | 193 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table R.6. Please rate the following aspects of your summer meals experience during summer 2019.

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Technical assistance by other organization | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Extremely negative | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0\% |
| Somewhat negative | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 2.9\% | 0.0\% | 4.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 2\% |
| Neither positive nor negative | 13 | 17 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 41 |
|  | 38.2\% | 38.6\% | 26.1\% | 11.8\% | 25.0\% | 32\% |
| Somewhat positive | 3 | 9 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 24 |
|  | 8.8\% | 20.5\% | 17.4\% | 41.2\% | 8.3\% | 18\% |
| Extremely positive | 17 | 18 | 12 | 8 | 8 | 63 |
|  | 50.0\% | 40.9\% | 52.2\% | 47.1\% | 66.7\% | 48\% |
| Count | 34 | 44 | 23 | 17 | 12 | 130 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table S. Approximately how many days did you serve meals in summer 2019?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| 10 or fewer | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 2.2\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0\% |
| 11-25 | 15 | 23 | 9 | 13 | 5 | 65 |
|  | 33.3\% | 31.5\% | 25.0\% | 39.4\% | 25.0\% | 31\% |
| 26-39 | 20 | 18 | 14 | 8 | 6 | 66 |
|  | 44.4\% | 24.7\% | 38.9\% | 24.2\% | 30.0\% | 32\% |
| 40-55 | 5 | 19 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 41 |
|  | 11.1\% | 26.0\% | 22.2\% | 15.2\% | 20.0\% | 20\% |
| 56-69 | 2 | 9 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 24 |
|  | 4.4\% | 12.3\% | 11.1\% | 15.2\% | 20.0\% | 12\% |
| 70 or more | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 10 |
|  | 4.4\% | 5.5\% | 2.8\% | 6.1\% | 5.0\% | 5\% |
| Count | 45 | 73 | 36 | 33 | 20 | 207 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table T. What type of meals did you serve in summer 2019?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 4 | Total |
| Breakfast | 29 | 69 | 34 | 30 | 21 | 183 |
|  | $17.7 \%$ | $23.0 \%$ | $22.1 \%$ | $21.1 \%$ | $25.0 \%$ | $22 \%$ |
| Lunch | 44 | 68 | 36 | 34 | 18 | 200 |
|  | $26.8 \%$ | $22.7 \%$ | $23.4 \%$ | $23.9 \%$ | $21.4 \%$ | $47 \%$ |
| PM Snack | 3 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 24 |
|  | $1.8 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Am snack | 6 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 15 |
|  | $3.7 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| Dinner | 82 | 150 | 77 | 71 | 42 | 422 |
|  | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Count | 164 | 300 | 154 | 142 | 84 | 844 |
| Total | $100 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

Table U. What is your meal preparation method?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Vended | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 10 |
|  | $2.2 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ | $18.2 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| Self prep | 44 | 73 | 34 | 27 | 20 | 198 |
|  | $97.8 \%$ | $98.6 \%$ | $94.4 \%$ | $81.8 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $95 \%$ |
| Count | 45 | 74 | 36 | 33 | 20 | 208 |
| Total | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

Table V.1. Please rate your satisfaction with your vendor in the following areas:

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Overall experience | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Extremely dissatisfied | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Somewhat dissatisfied | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 33.30\% | 0.00\% | 33.30\% |
| Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 16.70\% | 0.00\% | 10.00\% |
| Somewhat satisfied | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
|  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% | 16.70\% | 0.00\% | 30.00\% |
| Extremely satisfied | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
|  | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 33.30\% | 0.00\% | 40.00\% |
| Count | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 10 |
| Total | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% |

Table V.2. Please rate your satisfaction with your vendor in the following areas:

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Quality of food | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Extremely dissatisfied | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Somewhat dissatisfied | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 33.3\% | 0.0\% | 20.0\% |
| Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 16.7\% | 0.0\% | 10.0\% |
| Somewhat satisfied | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
|  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 16.7\% | 0.0\% | 30.0\% |
| Extremely satisfied | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
|  | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 33.3\% | 0.0\% | 40.0\% |
| Count | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 10 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |

Table V.3. Please rate your satisfaction with your vendor in the following areas:

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Efficacy of delivery method | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Extremely dissatisfied | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 16.7\% | 0.0\% | 10.0\% |
| Somewhat dissatisfied | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 16.7\% | 0.0\% | 10.0\% |
| Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 16.7\% | 0.0\% | 10.0\% |
| Somewhat satisfied | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 50.0\% | 16.7\% | 0.0\% | 20.0\% |
| Extremely satisfied | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
|  | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 50.0\% | 33.3\% | 0.0\% | 50.0\% |
| Count | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 10 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |

Table W. Where do you obtain the food?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Co-op | 15 | 23 | 10 | 12 | 7 | 67 |
|  | 20.3\% | 18.3\% | 19.6\% | 23.1\% | 23.3\% | 20\% |
| School leftovers | 12 | 22 | 8 | 11 | 2 | 55 |
|  | 16.2\% | 17.5\% | 15.7\% | 21.2\% | 6.7\% | 17\% |
| Approved vendors Labtt,Sysco,etc. | 36 | 64 | 27 | 24 | 17 | 168 |
|  | 48.6\% | 50.8\% | 52.9\% | 46.2\% | 56.7\% | 50\% |
| Warehouse markets | 5 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 16 |
|  | 6.8\% | 5.6\% | 3.9\% | 0.0\% | 6.7\% | 5\% |
| Other grocery retailers | 6 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 19 |
|  | 8.1\% | 5.6\% | 5.9\% | 1.9\% | 6.7\% | 6\% |
| Other | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 8 |
|  | 0.0\% | 2.4\% | 2.0\% | 7.7\% | 0.0\% | 2\% |
| Count | 74 | 126 | 51 | 52 | 30 | 333 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table X. Is the food prepared in a central kitchen?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Yes | 31 | 36 | 18 | 13 | 11 | 109 |
|  | 70.5\% | 49.3\% | 52.9\% | 50.0\% | 55.0\% | 52\% |
| No | 13 | 37 | 16 | 13 | 9 | 88 |
|  | 29.5\% | 50.7\% | 47.1\% | 50.0\% | 45.0\% | 42\% |
| I don't know | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Count | 44 | 73 | 34 | 26 | 20 | 197 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table Y.1. Approximately how many staff or volunteers do you require for the following?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Delivering food | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| 0-5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 39 | 57 | 31 | 24 | 13 | 164 |
|  | 46.4\% | 41.9\% | 43.1\% | 40.0\% | 32.5\% | 42\% |
| 6-10 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 14 |
|  | 3.6\% | 4.4\% | 1.4\% | 1.7\% | 7.5\% | 4\% |
| More than 10 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 18 |
|  | 0.0\% | 3.7\% | 5.6\% | 8.3\% | 10.0\% | 5\% |
| I don't know | 42 | 68 | 36 | 30 | 20 | 196 |
|  | 50.0\% | 50.0\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% |
| Count | 84 | 136 | 72 | 60 | 40 | 392 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table Y.2. Approximately how many staff or volunteers do you require for the follow-ing?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{\text { Monitoring sites }}{0-5}$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
|  | 40 | 58 | 29 | 22 | 19 | 168 |
|  | 88.9\% | 78.4\% | 80.6\% | 66.7\% | 90.5\% | 40\% |
| 6-10 | 2 | 10 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 21 |
|  | 4.4\% | 13.5\% | 11.1\% | 15.2\% | 0.0\% | 5\% |
| More than 10 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 20 |
|  | 6.7\% | 8.1\% | 8.3\% | 18.2\% | 9.5\% | 5\% |
| I don't know | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 209 |
|  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 50\% |
| Count | 45 | 74 | 36 | 33 | 21 | 418 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table Z. What transportation is necessary within your organization to obtain the meals?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| No transportation needed (prep on site) | 29 | 43 | 18 | 17 | 6 | 113 |
|  | 59.2\% | 49.4\% | 37.5\% | 34.7\% | 28.6\% | 44\% |
| Sponsor prepares and delivers to sites | 9 | 22 | 14 | 11 | 10 | 66 |
|  | 18.4\% | 25.3\% | 29.2\% | 22.4\% | 47.6\% | 26\% |
| Vendor delivery to a central kitchen then pick up by sites | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 2.0\% | 0.0\% | 0\% |
| Vendor delivery to a central kitchen then distribution by sponsor | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 15 |
|  | 8.2\% | 3.4\% | 6.3\% | 8.2\% | 4.8\% | 0 |
| Sponsor prepares meals and sites pick up | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 12 |
|  | 2.0\% | 2.3\% | 8.3\% | 10.2\% | 0.0\% | 5\% |
| Other | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 8 |
|  | 4.1\% | 3.4\% | 4.2\% | 0.0\% | 4.8\% | 3\% |
| Vendor delivers directly to site | 4 | 14 | 7 | 11 | 3 | 39 |
|  | 8.2\% | 16.1\% | 14.6\% | 22.4\% | 14.3\% | 15\% |
| Count | 49 | 87 | 48 | 49 | 21 | 254 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.A. What types of transportation options do families use to get to your sites?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Public transportation | 12 | 14 | 7 | 10 | 4 | 47 |
|  | 5.4\% | 4.2\% | 4.1\% | 6.2\% | 3.9\% | 4.7\% |
| Walk | 40 | 58 | 29 | 27 | 19 | 173 |
|  | 17.9\% | 17.4\% | 17.0\% | 16.7\% | 18.6\% | 17.4\% |
| Transport in car | 40 | 65 | 29 | 28 | 19 | 181 |
|  | 17.9\% | 19.5\% | 17.0\% | 17.3\% | 18.6\% | 18.2\% |
| School bus | 17 | 29 | 20 | 16 | 9 | 91 |
|  | 7.6\% | 8.7\% | 11.7\% | 9.9\% | 8.8\% | 9.2\% |
| Bus | 109 | 166 | 85 | 81 | 51 | 492 |
|  | 48.9\% | 49.7\% | 49.7\% | 50.0\% | 50.0\% | 49.6\% |
| Other | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
|  | 2.2\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.8\% |
| Count | 223 | 334 | 171 | 162 | 102 | 992 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.B. What is your method of documenting the daily meal count at each site?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Sites record it by filling out a paper form | 37 | 49 | 14 | 21 | 12 | 133 |
|  | 82.2\% | 67.1\% | 38.9\% | 63.6\% | 57.1\% | 32\% |
| Sites record it via an app | 4 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 20 |
|  | 8.9\% | 8.2\% | 16.7\% | 6.1\% | 9.5\% | 5\% |
| Sites use a combination of online and paper methods | 4 | 18 | 16 | 10 | 7 | 55 |
|  | 8.9\% | 24.7\% | 44.4\% | 30.3\% | 33.3\% | 13\% |
| I don't know | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 208 |
|  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 50\% |
| Count | 45 | 73 | 36 | 33 | 21 | 416 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.C. What is your method of aggregating each of the site total meal counts at the sponsor level?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| We use an electronic record manager | 5 | 14 | 12 | 8 | 4 | 43 |
|  | 5.6\% | 9.6\% | 16.7\% | 12.1\% | 9.5\% | 10\% |
| The counts are tallied on paper | 29 | 35 | 14 | 12 | 8 | 98 |
|  | 32.2\% | 24.0\% | 19.4\% | 18.2\% | 19.0\% | 24\% |
| We use a combination of electronic and paper records | 11 | 24 | 10 | 13 | 9 | 67 |
|  | 12.2\% | 16.4\% | 13.9\% | 19.7\% | 21.4\% | 16\% |
| I don't know | 45 | 73 | 36 | 33 | 21 | 208 |
|  | 50.0\% | 50.0\% | 50.0\% | 50.0\% | 50.0\% | 50\% |
| Count | 90 | 146 | 72 | 66 | 42 | 416 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.D.1. How many of your sites provide the following services?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Activities for children | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| None | 11 | 14 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 38 |
|  | 24.4\% | 20.9\% | 22.2\% | 12.9\% | 4.8\% | 19\% |
| Some | 3 | 12 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 34 |
|  | 6.7\% | 17.9\% | 27.8\% | 16.1\% | 19.0\% | 17\% |
| Most | 6 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 33 |
|  | 13.3\% | 14.9\% | 16.7\% | 16.1\% | 28.6\% | 17\% |
| All | 25 | 31 | 12 | 17 | 10 | 95 |
|  | 55.6\% | 46.3\% | 33.3\% | 54.8\% | 47.6\% | 48\% |
| Count | 45 | 67 | 36 | 31 | 21 | 200 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.D.2. How many of your sites provide the following services?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Transportation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| None | 17 | 27 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 71 |
|  | 39.5\% | 38.6\% | 28.6\% | 29.0\% | 40.0\% | 36\% |
| Some | 9 | 18 | 10 | 10 | 4 | 51 |
|  | 20.9\% | 25.7\% | 28.6\% | 32.3\% | 20.0\% | 26\% |
| Most | 4 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 20 |
|  | 9.3\% | 10.0\% | 11.4\% | 6.5\% | 15.0\% | 10\% |
| All | 13 | 18 | 11 | 10 | 5 | 57 |
|  | 30.2\% | 25.7\% | 31.4\% | 32.3\% | 25.0\% | 29\% |
| Count | 43 | 70 | 35 | 31 | 20 | 199 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.D.3. How many of your sites provide the following services?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Incentives for participation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| None | 25 | 39 | 21 | 15 | 5 | 105 |
|  | 62.5\% | 69.6\% | 63.6\% | 55.6\% | 38.5\% | 62\% |
| Some | 4 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 4 | 32 |
|  | 10.0\% | 14.3\% | 27.3\% | 25.9\% | 30.8\% | 19\% |
| Most | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 10 |
|  | 7.5\% | 5.4\% | 3.0\% | 7.4\% | 7.7\% | 6\% |
| All | 8 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 22 |
|  | 20.0\% | 10.7\% | 6.1\% | 11.1\% | 23.1\% | 13\% |
| Count | 43 | 57 | 35 | 28 | 23 | 169 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.D.4. How many of your sites provide the following services?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Outreach for services (e.g. SNAP) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| None | 24 | 36 | 21 | 17 | 6 | 104 |
|  | 63.2\% | 67.9\% | 72.4\% | 70.8\% | 35.3\% | 65\% |
| Some | 6 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 23 |
|  | 15.8\% | 9.4\% | 13.8\% | 20.8\% | 17.6\% | 14\% |
| Most | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 9 |
|  | 0.0\% | 3.8\% | 3.4\% | 4.2\% | 29.4\% | 6\% |
| All | 8 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 25 |
|  | 21.1\% | 18.9\% | 10.3\% | 4.2\% | 17.6\% | 16\% |
| Count | 38 | 53 | 29 | 24 | 17 | 161 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.D.5. How many of your sites provide the following services?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Additional food sent home | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| None | 38 | 53 | 31 | 26 | 18 | 166 |
|  | 90.5\% | 88.3\% | 91.2\% | 86.7\% | 94.7\% | 90\% |
| Some | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 11 |
|  | 7.1\% | 6.7\% | 5.9\% | 6.7\% | 0.0\% | 6\% |
| Most | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
|  | 0.0\% | 1.7\% | 2.9\% | 3.3\% | 5.3\% | 2\% |
| All | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
|  | 2.4\% | 3.3\% | 0.0\% | 3.3\% | 0.0\% | 2\% |
| Count | 42 | 60 | 34 | 30 | 19 | 185 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.D.6. How many of your sites provide the following services?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Meals offered to parents for a fee | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| None | 21 | 49 | 25 | 14 | 11 | 120 |
|  | 48.8\% | 75.4\% | 73.5\% | 46.7\% | 57.9\% | 63\% |
| Some | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
|  | 2.3\% | 3.1\% | 2.9\% | 0.0\% | 5.3\% | 3\% |
| Most | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
|  | 2.3\% | 3.1\% | 0.0\% | 6.7\% | 5.3\% | 3\% |
| All | 20 | 12 | 8 | 14 | 6 | 60 |
|  | 46.5\% | 18.5\% | 23.5\% | 46.7\% | 31.6\% | 31\% |
| Count | 43 | 65 | 34 | 30 | 19 | 191 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.D.7. How many of your sites provide the following services?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Meals offered to parents at a paid rate | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| None | 19 | 33 | 18 | 13 | 6 | 89 |
|  | 46.3\% | 49.3\% | 52.9\% | 41.9\% | 30.0\% | 46\% |
| Some | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 13 |
|  | 4.9\% | 6.0\% | 5.9\% | 0.0\% | 25.0\% | 7\% |
| Most | 2 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 |
|  | 4.9\% | 9.0\% | 0.0\% | 3.2\% | 5.0\% | 5\% |
| All | 18 | 24 | 14 | 17 | 8 | 81 |
|  | 43.9\% | 35.8\% | 41.2\% | 54.8\% | 40.0\% | 42\% |
| Count | 41 | 67 | 34 | 31 | 20 | 193 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.E.1. How are families involved at your sites?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Provide transportation | 20 | 26 | 9 | 11 | 10 | 76 |
|  | 38.5\% | 41.9\% | 33.3\% | 34.4\% | 41.7\% | 39\% |
| Eat with the children | 25 | 28 | 12 | 14 | 7 | 86 |
|  | 48.1\% | 45.2\% | 44.4\% | 43.8\% | 29.2\% | 44\% |
| Help with activities | 6 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 30 |
|  | 11.5\% | 11.3\% | 18.5\% | 18.8\% | 25.0\% | 15\% |
| Other | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
|  | 1.9\% | 1.6\% | 3.7\% | 3.1\% | 4.2\% | 3\% |
| Count | 52 | 62 | 27 | 32 | 24 | 197 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.E.2. How are families involved at your sites?

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Total |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Families are not in- <br> volved | 13 | 22 | 13 | 7 | 2 | 57 |
| Total | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

Table A.F. What specific types of support might help your program?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Funding for activities | 18 | 26 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 86 |
|  | 21.2\% | 18.7\% | 17.9\% | 23.0\% | 28.0\% | 21\% |
| Other | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 6 |
|  | 1.2\% | 1.4\% | 2.6\% | 0.0\% | 2.0\% | 1\% |
| Transportation for children | 21 | 38 | 15 | 11 | 11 | 96 |
|  | 24.7\% | 27.3\% | 19.2\% | 18.0\% | 22.0\% | 23\% |
| Transportation for meals | 6 | 17 | 10 | 5 | 3 | 41 |
|  | 7.1\% | 12.2\% | 12.8\% | 8.2\% | 6.0\% | 10\% |
| Increased \# of volunteers | 10 | 12 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 41 |
|  | 11.8\% | 8.6\% | 10.3\% | 11.5\% | 8.0\% | 10\% |
| Access to facilities | 3 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 18 |
|  | 3.5\% | 5.0\% | 5.1\% | 1.6\% | 6.0\% | 4\% |
| New equipment for meal service | 12 | 14 | 10 | 8 | 5 | 49 |
|  | 14.1\% | 10.1\% | 12.8\% | 13.1\% | 10.0\% | 12\% |
| Greater selection of vendors | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 8 |
|  | 1.2\% | 1.4\% | 1.3\% | 4.9\% | 2.0\% | 2\% |
| Promotional materi-als/marketing/outreach | 13 | 21 | 14 | 12 | 8 | 68 |
|  | 15.3\% | 15.1\% | 17.9\% | 19.7\% | 16.0\% | 16\% |
| Count | 85 | 139 | 78 | 61 | 50 | 413 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.G. Where does your organization obtain marketing resources?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Texas Department of Agriculture (TDA state agency) | 42 | 67 | 34 | 32 | 18 | 193 |
|  | 57.5\% | 56.8\% | 52.3\% | 55.2\% | 69.2\% | 57\% |
| Create materials inhouse (at sponsor level) ( | 12 | 17 | 13 | 11 | 1 | 54 |
|  | 16.4\% | 14.4\% | 20.0\% | 19.0\% | 3.8\% | 16\% |
| Texas Hunger Initiative Regional Office | 6 | 9 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 24 |
|  | 8.2\% | 7.6\% | 7.7\% | 6.9\% | 0.0\% | 7\% |
| Create materials inhouse (at site level) | 11 | 23 | 12 | 9 | 6 | 61 |
|  | 15.1\% | 19.5\% | 18.5\% | 15.5\% | 23.1\% | 18\% |
| External partnership | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 6 |
|  | 2.7\% | 0.8\% | 1.5\% | 3.4\% | 0.0\% | 2\% |
| Other | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
|  | 0.0\% | 0.8\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 3.8\% | 1\% |
| Count | 73 | 118 | 65 | 58 | 26 | 340 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.H. How did your organization receive TDA marketing materials?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Download/print | 21 | 24 | 15 | 13 | 11 | 84 |
|  | 34.4\% | 27.3\% | 33.3\% | 32.5\% | 40.7\% | 32\% |
| Order (from TDA website; mailed for free) | 39 | 62 | 30 | 26 | 16 | 173 |
|  | 63.9\% | 70.5\% | 66.7\% | 65.0\% | 59.3\% | 66\% |
| Other | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
|  | 1.6\% | 2.3\% | 0.0\% | 2.5\% | 0.0\% | 2\% |
| Count | 61 | 88 | 45 | 40 | 27 | 261 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.I.1. Please respond to the following statements regarding your organization's advertisement of the summer meals program in 2019.

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Television | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Select method(s) you utilized. | 5 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 17 |
|  | 83.3\% | 100.0\% | 62.5\% | 100.0\% | 66.7\% | 77\% |
| Select which method(s) seemed to be most effective in getting children to sites. | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
|  | 16.7\% | 0.0\% | 37.5\% | 0.0\% | 33.3\% | 23\% |
| Count | 6 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 22 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.I.2. Please respond to the following statements regarding your organization's advertisement of the summer meals program in 2019.

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Radio | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Select method(s) you utilized. | 15 | 9 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 40 |
|  | 62.5\% | 69.2\% | 75.0\% | 88.9\% | 66.7\% | 70\% |
| Select which method(s) seemed to be most effective in getting children to sites. | 9 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 17 |
|  | 37.5\% | 30.8\% | 25.0\% | 11.1\% | 33.3\% | 30\% |
| Count | 24 | 13 | 8 | 9 | 3 | 57 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.I.3. Please respond to the following statements regarding your organization's advertisement of the summer meals program in 2019.

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Newspaper | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Select method(s) you utilized. | 32 | 34 | 23 | 19 | 12 | 120 |
|  | 71.1\% | 72.3\% | 82.1\% | 76.0\% | 70.6\% | 74\% |
| Select which method(s) seemed to be most effective in getting children to sites. | 13 | 13 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 42 |
|  | 28.9\% | 27.7\% | 17.9\% | 24.0\% | 29.4\% | 26\% |
| Count | 45 | 47 | 28 | 25 | 17 | 162 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.I.4. Please respond to the following statements regarding your organization's advertisement of the summer meals program in 2019.

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Social Media | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Select method(s) you utilized. | 33 | 59 | 24 | 21 | 13 | 150 |
|  | 58.9\% | 61.5\% | 61.5\% | 63.6\% | 61.9\% | 61\% |
| Select which method(s) seemed to be most effective in getting children to sites. | 23 | 37 | 15 | 12 | 8 | 95 |
|  | 41.1\% | 38.5\% | 38.5\% | 36.4\% | 38.1\% | 39\% |
| Count | 56 | 96 | 39 | 33 | 21 | 245 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.I.5. Please respond to the following statements regarding your organization's advertisement of the summer meals program in 2019.

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Neighborhood flyers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Select method(s) you utilized. | 20 | 44 | 23 | 21 | 14 | 122 |
|  | 58.8\% | 71.0\% | 63.9\% | 63.6\% | 66.7\% | 66\% |
| Select which method(s) seemed to be most effective in getting children to sites. | 14 | 18 | 13 | 12 | 7 | 64 |
|  | 41.2\% | 29.0\% | 36.1\% | 36.4\% | 33.3\% | 34\% |
| Count | 34 | 62 | 36 | 33 | 21 | 186 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.I.6. Please respond to the following statements regarding your organization's advertisement of the summer meals program in 2019.

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Door hangers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Select method(s) you utilized. | 15 | 14 | 11 | 4 | 5 | 49 |
|  | 65.2\% | 77.8\% | 61.1\% | 57.1\% | 71.4\% | 67\% |
| Select which method(s) seemed to be most effective in getting children to sites. | 8 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 24 |
|  | 34.8\% | 22.2\% | 38.9\% | 42.9\% | 28.6\% | 33\% |
| Count | 23 | 18 | 18 | 7 | 7 | 73 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.I.7. Please respond to the following statements regarding your organization's advertisement of the summer meals program in 2019.

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Direct mail | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  | Total |  |
| Select method(s) you <br> utilized. | 7 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 20 | 40 |  |
|  | $63.6 \%$ | $83.3 \%$ | $83.3 \%$ | $75.0 \%$ | $74.1 \%$ | $74 \%$ |  |
| Select which <br> method(s) seemed to <br> be most effective in <br> getting children to <br> sites. | 4 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Count | $36.4 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ | $25.0 \%$ | $25.9 \%$ | $26 \%$ |  |


| Total | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Table A.I.8. Please respond to the following statements regarding your organization's advertisement of the summer meals program in 2019.

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Billboards | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Select method(s) you utilized. | 3 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 14 |
|  | 60.0\% | 87.5\% | 33.3\% | 66.7\% | 50.0\% | 67\% |
| Select which method(s) seemed to be most effective in getting children to sites. | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
|  | 40.0\% | 12.5\% | 66.7\% | 33.3\% | 50.0\% | 33\% |
| Count | 5 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 21 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.I.9. Please respond to the following statements regarding your organization's advertisement of the summer meals program in 2019.

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Collaboration with schools (e.g., robocalls, flyers) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Select method(s) you utilized. | 37 | 56 | 22 | 25 | 12 | 152 |
|  | 59.7\% | 62.9\% | 75.9\% | 62.5\% | 57.1\% | 63\% |
| Select which method(s) seemed to be most effective in getting children to sites. | 25 | 33 | 7 | 15 | 9 | 89 |
|  | 40.3\% | 37.1\% | 24.1\% | 37.5\% | 42.9\% | 37\% |
| Count | 62 | 89 | 29 | 40 | 21 | 241 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.l.10. Please respond to the following statements regarding your organization's advertisement of the summer meals program in 2019.

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Telephone recruit- <br> ment of parents | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |  |
| Select method(s) you <br> utilized. | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 11 |  |
|  | $66.7 \%$ | $80.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $33.3 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $65 \%$ |  |
| Select which <br> method(s) seemed to <br> be most effective in <br> getting children to <br> sites. | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 |  |

Table A.I.11. Please respond to the following statements regarding your organization's advertisement of the summer meals program in 2019.

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Other | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Select method(s) you utilized. | 6 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 29 |
|  | 60.0\% | 53.3\% | 53.8\% | 66.7\% | 50.0\% | 57\% |
| Select which method(s) seemed to be most effective in getting children to sites. | 4 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 22 |
|  | 40.0\% | 46.7\% | 46.2\% | 33.3\% | 50.0\% | 43\% |
| Count | 10 | 15 | 13 | 9 | 4 | 51 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.J. Who assisted you with your outreach and promotional materials in preparation for summer 2019?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Texas Department of Agriculture (TDA state agency) | 35 | 55 | 26 | 25 | 14 | 155 |
|  | 47.9\% | 55.0\% | 100.0\% | 54.3\% | 43.8\% | 50\% |
| Schools | 25 | 24 | 16 | 14 | 9 | 88 |
|  | 34.2\% | 24.0\% | 100.0\% | 30.4\% | 28.1\% | 29\% |
| Other government agency | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 |
|  | 2.7\% | 1.0\% | 100.0\% | 2.2\% | 9.4\% | 3\% |
| Other non-profit | 3 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 17 |
|  | 4.1\% | 6.0\% | 100.0\% | 6.5\% | 3.1\% | 6\% |
| Faith-based organization | 4 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 17 |
|  | 5.5\% | 6.0\% | 100.0\% | 2.2\% | 6.3\% | 6\% |
| Anti-hunger organization | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 14 |
|  | 4.1\% | 3.0\% | 100.0\% | 2.2\% | 9.4\% | 5\% |
| Child advocacy organization | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 1.4\% | 1.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 1\% |
| Healthcare provider | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 0.0\% | 1.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0\% |
| Other | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
|  | 0.0\% | 2.0\% | 0.0\% | 2.2\% | 0.0\% | 1\% |
| For-profit organization | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 0.0\% | 1.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 1\% |
| Count | 73 | 100 | 56 | 46 | 32 | 307 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 700.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.K.1. Who assisted you with your outreach and promotional materials in preparation for summer 2019?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Number of adminis- <br> trative reviews |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fewer | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |

Table A.K.2. Who assisted you with your outreach and promotional materials in preparation for summer 2019?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of site visits Fewer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
|  | 4 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 11 |
|  | 10.5\% | 2.9\% | 8.3\% | 0.0\% | 10.5\% | 6\% |
| Same | 23 | 38 | 19 | 17 | 9 | 106 |
|  | 60.5\% | 55.9\% | 52.8\% | 60.7\% | 47.4\% | 56\% |
| More | 5 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 23 |
|  | 13.2\% | 5.9\% | 22.2\% | 10.7\% | 15.8\% | 12\% |
| N/A | 6 | 24 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 49 |
| I don't know | 15.8\% | 35.3\% | 16.7\% | 28.6\% | 26.3\% | 26\% |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
|  | 38 | 68 | 36 | 28 | 19 | 189 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.K.3. Who assisted you with your outreach and promotional materials in preparation for summer 2019?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of disallowed meals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Fewer | 7 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 21 |
|  | 19.4\% | 4.5\% | 17.6\% | 15.4\% | 5.9\% | 12\% |
| Same | 6 | 9 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 25 |
|  | 16.7\% | 13.6\% | 20.6\% | 7.7\% | 5.9\% | 14\% |
| More | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 |
|  | 2.8\% | 4.5\% | 0.0\% | 3.8\% | 0.0\% | 3\% |
| N/A | 22 | 51 | 21 | 19 | 15 | 128 |
|  | 61.1\% | 77.3\% | 61.8\% | 73.1\% | 88.2\% | 72\% |
| I don't know | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Count | 36 | 66 | 34 | 26 | 17 | 179 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.L. Overall how would you rate your satisfaction using the summer meals program during summer 2019?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Very Unsatisfied | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | $0.0 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Unsatisfied | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
|  | $6.7 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Neither satisfied nor <br> unsatisfied | 5 | 13 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 30 |
|  | $11.1 \%$ | $17.8 \%$ | $11.1 \%$ | $15.6 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| Satisfied | 19 | 31 | 19 | 16 | 7 | 92 |
|  | $42.2 \%$ | $42.5 \%$ | $52.8 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ | $36.8 \%$ | $45 \%$ |
| Very satisfied | 18 | 25 | 13 | 11 | 9 | 76 |
|  | $40.0 \%$ | $34.2 \%$ | $36.1 \%$ | $34.4 \%$ | $47.4 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
| Count | 45 | 73 | 36 | 32 | 19 | 205 |
| Total | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

Table A.M. Are you currently connected with a Texas Hunger Initiative regional staff person?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Yes | 12 | 16 | 9 | 14 | 3 | 54 |
|  | 26.7\% | 21.9\% | 25.0\% | 43.8\% | 15.8\% | 26\% |
| No | 25 | 46 | 22 | 12 | 11 | 116 |
|  | 55.6\% | 63.0\% | 61.1\% | 37.5\% | 57.9\% | 55\% |
| We are not currently, but have communicated with THI staff in the past | 8 | 11 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 35 |
|  | 17.8\% | 15.1\% | 13.9\% | 18.8\% | 26.3\% | 17\% |
| Count | 46 | 74 | 37 | 33 | 20 | 210 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.M. Did you receive support of any kind from THI Regional staff regarding your summer meal efforts in 2019?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Yes | 6 | 15 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 40 |
|  | 16.7\% | 25.0\% | 25.8\% | 21.7\% | 37.5\% | 12\% |
| No | 30 | 45 | 23 | 18 | 10 | 126 |
|  | 83.3\% | 75.0\% | 74.2\% | 78.3\% | 62.5\% | 38\% |
| I don't know | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 166 |
|  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 50\% |
| Count | 36 | 60 | 31 | 23 | 16 | 332 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.N. How helpful were THI staff regarding Summer Meals efforts in 2019?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| Extremely unhelpful | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0\% |
| Moderately helpful | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0\% |
| Neutral | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0\% |
| Moderately unhelpful | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 10 |
|  | 80.0\% | 30.0\% | 28.6\% | 0.0\% | 20.0\% | 32\% |
| Extremely helpful | 1 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 21 |
|  | 20.0\% | 70.0\% | 71.4\% | 100.0\% | 80.0\% | 67.7\% |
| Count | 5 | 10 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 31 |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Table A.O. Did your organization participate in Excellence in Summer Meals Campaign (ESMC) Summer 2019?

| TDA Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 1 |  | Total <br> Yes |  | 0 | 3 |


[^0]:    Note: Valid $\mathrm{N}=212$

[^1]:    Note: Valid N=52

[^2]:    Note: Valid N=184

[^3]:    Note: Valid N=192

[^4]:    Note: Valid N=200

[^5]:    Note: Valid $\mathrm{N}=196$

