

2016-2017
EDITION



Texas School Breakfast
REPORT CARD

Acknowledgments

Erin Nolen, Grace Norman, and Kasey Ashenfelter prepared the report on a foundation built by nine years of Texas Hunger Initiative breakfast outreach and research. Kasey Ashenfelter designed the report.

Akshay Krishna assisted data processing.

WELCOME

Welcome to the fourth edition of the Texas School Breakfast Report Card. We hope that as you read this report you are inspired to increase participation in school breakfast in your community and feel equipped with the resources to do so. In this edition, we take a step back to examine the progress we have made as a state. First, we provide a refresher on the benefits of school breakfast, spanning health and academic outcomes among students and an overview of alternative breakfast service models. Next, we review the progress in participation in school breakfast and provide statistics that speak to the current state of participation. We wrap up with recommendations for how we might continue to see school breakfast gains at both local and state levels. Finally, the last section provides a county and district snapshot of breakfast eligibility and participation figures.

We are grateful for the partnership of Dairy MAX and Children at Risk together with whom we consult with school districts and advocate for program improvements. We look forward to continuing to work with advocates across the state to ensure Texans have access to three nutritious meals a day, seven days a week.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

6

School Breakfast Program 101

Benefits of Breakfast
Free and Reduced-Price Meals
Community Eligibility Provision

10

Where Have We Been?

Breakfast in the Legislature
Participation in School Breakfast on the Rise

12

Where Are We Now?

14

Where do we go From Here?

What can a school district do to maximize school breakfast?
Breakfast Service Models
Steps to Implementing a New Model

24

Texas School Breakfast Participation

Technical Notes
Participation By District
Participation By County

51

Endnotes

INTRODUCTION

The School Breakfast Program (SBP) is the second largest child nutrition program in Texas, providing 314 million meals and drawing in \$558 million for the state in the 2016-17 school year.¹ Texas is a national leader in school breakfast participation, ranking 10th in the nation. In fact, Texas continues to have a higher breakfast participation rate (63%) than the national average (57%).² State and local innovations, including the passage of Texas Senate Bill 376, the “Universal Breakfast Bill,” and implementation of alternative service models have facilitated school breakfast gains. Since school year 2008-09, Texas has experienced an eight percentage-point increase in breakfast participation.

The Food Research and Action Center (FRAC) sets a national goal of serving breakfast to 70 free and reduced-price eligible students for every 100 participating in school lunch.³ In Texas, more than 1.6 million students eating free or reduced-price lunch are also eating school breakfast.⁴ While Texas boasts a participation rate of 63 percent, the state has potential for even larger gains. More than 955,000 students who are eating a free or reduced-price school lunch are not eating a school breakfast.⁵

In other words, if Texas reached 100 percent of all eligible students eating lunch, nearly 1 million additional students would be participating in school breakfast!

Why does improving participation in breakfast matter? Empirical studies continue show the role school breakfast can play in improving nutrient intake, increasing attendance, and improving test scores among students, and a new study suggests that state policies requiring school breakfast reduces food insecurity among elementary students.⁶ There are tools available to make school breakfast cost efficient and wide reaching. Schools with a high percentage of students eligible for free and reduced-price meals can take advantage of the Community Eligibility Provision (CEP) and after-the-bell service models to streamline program administration and improve participation.

The School Breakfast Program has the potential to systematically improve Texas schools across an array of outcomes, including food security and academic performance. Maximizing program reach is something all legislators, school districts, local campuses, parents and students can—and should—rally around! This School Breakfast Report Card gives clear ways to do so and points toward a better, food-secure Texas.

SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAM 101

The National School Breakfast Program is available to any public or private nonprofit school or licensed residential child care institution. School districts and residential child care institutions may receive reimbursement for breakfasts served at the free, reduced-price, or paid rate each fiscal year. For those families who struggle to regularly access food, eating breakfast at school can help by providing nutritious food for their students. Texas requires that schools with 10 percent or more of students eligible for free or reduced-price meals offer school breakfast, and these schools are eligible for federal reimbursement for each breakfast meal served. Additionally, schools with 80 percent or more of students eligible for free or reduced-price meals must offer breakfast free to all students.

Studies show that eating school breakfast can improve attendance, decrease tardiness and lead to fewer visits to the school nurse, among other benefits.

Benefits of Breakfast

EDUCATION

Regular consumption of breakfast is associated with:

- improved school performance;¹
- higher attendance rates;²
- better concentration and alertness;³
- more energy and better attention;⁴ and
- short-term benefits in improving selected learning skills, particularly memory.⁵

HEALTH

School breakfast participation is linked to:

- lower BMI and lower probability of obesity and being overweight;⁶
- fewer visits to the school nurse;⁷
- improvements in children's mental health, including reducing behavior problems, anxiety, and depression;⁸
- better eating habits among children;⁹
- fewer vitamin deficiencies; and
- decreased likelihood of experiencing chronic illnesses.¹⁰



Free and Reduced-Priced Meals

Students that live in households with incomes between 130 and 185 percent of the federal poverty threshold are eligible for reduced-price meals, and students that live in households at or below 130 percent of the federal poverty threshold are eligible for free meals. And, although these numbers are not an exact measure of child poverty, they serve as a proxy to identify high-need schools that may be appropriate targets of intervention.

In the 2016-17 school year, 59 percent of Texas students qualified for free or reduced-price meals. As the low-income student population grows, school meals are more important than ever. **Between 2006-07 and 2016-17, the percentage increase in the number of students identified as economically disadvantaged (24.1%) outpaced the increase in Texas' enrolled student population (16.6%).**¹ Additionally, students participating in other federal assistance programs are categorically eligible for free school meals. This includes children in households participating in programs such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), as well as children who are homeless, migrant, in foster care, or enrolled in Head Start.



Community Eligibility Provision (CEP)

The Community Eligibility Provision (CEP), introduced by the Healthy Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010, enables high-poverty schools to provide breakfast and lunch free to all students without the burden of meal applications. Instead, schools are reimbursed based on the number of identified students—those eligible for free school meals through direct certification because of their enrollment in other programs, including the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), or Head Start.

To determine the number of students reimbursed at the free rate, the percentage of identified students is multiplied by 1.6, and meals served to students that are not identified are reimbursed at the paid rate. For schools with 62.5 percent or more identified students, 100 percent of meals are reimbursed at the free rate.² There are also configurations

that can allow a public, private, or charter school to participate in CEP, as long as the percent of identified students is 40 percent or more. A school's new claiming percentage is locked in for four years, but if a school's number of identified students increases, it can recalculate its claiming percentage for an improved rate (i.e., greater reimbursement for the school). Additionally, the new free claiming percentage is used to determine supplemental funds (like E-Rate and State Compensatory Education funding) for CEP schools.¹

CEP simplifies and improves the reimbursement rates for high-poverty schools and can result in increased revenue that can be used to buy equipment for nutrition programs, pay food service staff, and improve food quality—just as long as the funds stay within the nutrition department's budget.


WHERE HAVE WE BEEN?

During the 79th session of the Texas Legislature in 2005, lawmakers started discussing measures to improve access to and participation in the School Breakfast Program. The following chart summarizes proposed legislative measures from 2005 to 2013, culminating in the passage of Senate Bill (SB) 376 during the 83rd session. Of the seven bills listed, only SB 376 from the 83rd Legislature passed and was signed into law by the governor. Advocates and lawmakers alike worked for several years to lay the groundwork for successful bill passage. Ultimately, a high free or reduced-price eligibility threshold, a waiver option, and testimony tying greater participation in school breakfast to improved dairy consumption, ensured the success of Senate Bill 376.

Proposed				Passed
2005	2007	2009	2011	2013
<p>HB 2578¹ 79th Session</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The state would encourage districts that could provide breakfast for free to all students without incurring additional costs to do so. 	<p>SB 417² 80th Session</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Schools with 60% or more students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch should serve breakfast free to all students. •Schools can waive out due to financial hardship. •Would Breakfast Fund to accept donations for the Department of Agriculture to grant to schools. <p>HB 454³ 80th Session</p> <p>The state would study opportunities to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •improve participation in the School Breakfast Program. 	<p>SB 275⁴ 81st Session</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •School Health Advisory Councils (SHACs) should recommend opportunities to improve breakfast participation. •The state would encourage districts that could provide breakfast for free to all students without incurring additional costs to do so. <p>SB 910⁵ 81th Session</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Schools participating in the School Breakfast Program should eliminate the reduced-price category and instead offer free meals to students qualifying for either the free or reduced-price rate. 	<p>SB 88⁶ HB 642 82nd Session</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Schools with 80% or more students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch should serve breakfast free to all students. 	<p>SB 376⁷ 83rd Session</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Schools with 80% or more students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch should serve breakfast free to all students. •Schools can waive out if the board votes to request waiver.

Participation in School Breakfast on the Rise



Since school year 2008-09, Texas has seen an overall steady increase in school breakfast participation. Texas has seen a 4 percent increase in the number of students participating in free and reduced-price breakfast since the breakfast bill passed.



As a result of SB 376, Texas has seen a four percent increase in school breakfast participation, serving an additional 10.5 million meals.

WHERE WE ARE NOW?

Over the last several years, Texas has seen significant growth in school breakfast participation. We are approaching the statewide goal of reaching 70 percent of students eating free or reduced-price lunch with school breakfast. Several districts have already met the benchmark due to serving breakfast free to all students through creative service delivery.



...of public districts and charters have met the 70% benchmark.²

Texas could reach an additional

184,000

students³ & accrue⁴

\$51,000,000

if it met the 70% benchmark

34%

of Texas's eligible or near eligible schools are utilizing the Community Eligibility Provision.⁵

Four of the Top 20 Largest School Districts in Texas are Meeting the 70% Breakfast Benchmark

School District	Enrollment	FR Eligible Students	FR Eligible Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	Delivery Method	% increase in FR Breakfast Students over School Years 2010-2017
Houston ISD	212,029	100,026	85%	BIC districtwide	48%
Dallas ISD	157,306	93,872	82%	Mix of models districtwide	135%
El Paso ISD	59,767	23,209	73%	Mix of models at all elementary schools	59%
San Antonio ISD	52,878	38,354	94%	BIC at all elementary schools	26%



WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Improvements in school breakfast participation in Texas—and consequently academic achievements—happen one campus and one district at a time. Now that you know why breakfast is so important, and where Texas has opportunities to grow—what next? This section offers practical ways your district or campus can increase participation in school breakfast and improve the operation of current programs.

What can a school district do to maximize school breakfast?

There are numerous ways for school districts to improve breakfast options and meal accessibility at their campuses—especially those with high rates of free and reduced-price lunch eligibility. Here are specific things your school can implement:

PHASE IN ALTERNATIVE SERVICE MODELS

Changing where or how breakfast is served can help increase participation in the program. Schools can pilot serving breakfast after the bell for a week or two or implement an innovative service model during a grading period. Consider different service models across grade levels. For example, Breakfast in the Classroom is popular with elementary students, while Grab and Go breakfast is popular in secondary schools. Campuses should try out what might work best for them. Remember, changes do not need to happen overnight and they don't need to happen simultaneously at all campuses within a district. Ahead of implementing a new service model, leadership should consult with teachers, custodial staff, support staff, and parents to make them aware of upcoming changes and address any concerns. For ideas on which models may best serve certain campuses, refer to the Breakfast Service Models section.


INVOLVE STUDENTS IN A FUN WAY

Letting students help shape the menu can be a good way to get them on board from the beginning. School nutrition departments can reexamine breakfast menus and test new items with students. Nutrition departments can also host taste tests with the entire student body or select students to participate in a focus group on school breakfast options. Once students identify well-liked items, schools can capitalize on the star power of school athletes or student leaders to promote the new breakfast items on the menu.





Pilot alternative service models at different campuses.



Improve meal quality with taste tests, focus groups, and new menus.



Commit to breakfast after the bell in district policies.

UPDATE DISTRICT POLICIES & PLANS

As districts determine which service models best suit their students, they can update district policies to support continued implementation. Several of the state's largest districts have incorporated a requirement that breakfast be served after the bell in all campuses. For example, Houston ISD required all elementary and middle schools to implement the district's First Class Breakfast Program in 2010. Houston ISD found that attendance rates increased, disciplinary rates decreased, and passing rates on standardized math tests improved in 2010-11, compared to school year 2009-10.¹ Whether school districts issue a district-wide mandate regarding school breakfast service models or leave the decision up to individual campuses, buy-in from top-level administration is crucial.^{2,3,4}

ADOPT THE COMMUNITY ELIGIBILITY PROVISION

Schools with a high percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price meals can utilize the Community Eligibility Provision (CEP) when operating the School Breakfast Program. CEP enables schools to provide breakfast and lunch free to all students without the hassle of meal applications. CEP streamlines the administrative process, making it easier on parents and administrative staff. Adopting CEP can begin a productive cycle for schools. As they serve more breakfasts, they collect more reimbursements that can be used to improve breakfast service, which will in turn bring in even more reimbursements.

Breakfast Service Models

TRADITIONAL BREAKFAST

A large cafeteria can allow breakfast in the cafeteria to be successful, but it is important that students arrive to school with enough time to eat. Offering breakfast free to all students can also aid participation in traditional breakfast.

BREAKFAST ON THE BUS

For schools with a long commute, this model serves students during the bus ride before they arrive to school. Breakfasts are stored in cooled or heated containers and picked up by students as they load the bus.

BREAKFAST IN THE CLASSROOM

Breakfast is brought into the classroom to ensure that all students have the opportunity to eat. There are options to tailor this model to individual campuses, which makes it one of the most popular service models.

SECOND CHANCE BREAKFAST

Sometimes older students are not hungry when they first arrive at school. This model allows students to get breakfast when they are hungry, often after first or second period. Meals are usually served via kiosk or cart.

GRAB AND GO BREAKFAST

This model is usually offered to older students that can carry their meals from a cart or kiosk. Some schools provide meals pre-assembled and others offer individual items to allow for student choice.

VENDING MACHINES

Especially popular in high schools, vending machines are a convenient method for serving breakfast. Students can enter an ID or PIN number to retrieve the meal, and the machine tracks the meals served.


Steps to Implementing a New Model

1 Meet with Stakeholders: The first step to beginning a new program is to bring together all stakeholders. Including everyone—cafeteria staff, custodial staff, educators, etc.—in the process of creating a new program brings important insight and feedback unique to their respective roles. Students and parents should not be left out; their input identifies the needs and perspectives of the school's families.

2 Assess the Current Program: Once all involved are at the table, the second step is to assess the current breakfast program. Determining the efficiency and effectiveness of the current program is critical to understanding the needs and challenges. It is equally important that staff are educated on the benefits of breakfast. When staff members understand why breakfast is important for students and educators, they see the value in their support and input.

3 Create a Plan: After completing the assessment, make a plan. Define goals, outcomes, and strategies, and assign tasks for maximum organization and preparedness.

4 Put the Plan into Action: Training all staff involved in the breakfast program is a critical step to ensure the plan has a successful start. Training can involve a practice run and time for questions and concerns to be shared. For some schools, a best practice is training before a program begins and re-training during the year.



5 Evaluate the Program: It usually takes about three months for new breakfast models to become routine. At that time, or at the end of a semester, evaluate the program to identify strengths and areas for growth to improve programming, increase participation, and refine procedures. It is important to check in with all involved staff as well as students and parents. Some schools prefer to evaluate continuously throughout the year or evaluate at multiple checkpoints.

6 Share Success Strategies: Finally, sharing your success with other schools has a significant impact on the expansion of school breakfast programs and participation across the state. Mentoring beginner schools or partnering with similar schools can strengthen and improve the breakfast programs of both schools. Educating others on best practices and challenges can encourage others to advocate that their school implement alternative breakfast service models.

How can Texas better track campus improvements and effectively steward financial resources?

The Texas Department of Agriculture (TDA) could track service model utilization in the Texas Unified Nutrition Programs System (TX-UNPS), the reporting system School Food Authorities use to submit applications and claims to the state agency.

Since the passage of Senate Bill 376 during the 83rd Legislative Session, Texas has seen a four percent increase in school breakfast participation, serving an additional 10.5 million meals.⁵ Advocacy groups encourage districts to improve accessibility of school breakfast by serving it after the start of the school day. By making this move, many school districts have seen participation in school breakfast increase. At the time of this publication, TDA does not ask districts what service models they utilize to serve breakfast to students. That means there is not a comprehensive record of service

model implementation for the state. Without such records, outreach advocates must rely on anecdotal, school-by-school conversations to determine a baseline of the accessibility of school breakfast and what areas of improvement districts should prioritize. Ultimately, participation data, as listed in the Texas School Breakfast Participation section, is important but it only paints part of the picture.

Statewide tracking of service models will establish a baseline of how breakfast is served and empower districts to make local decisions about how best to improve breakfast service to students. With more comprehensive data, advocacy groups can better assess trends in school breakfast access and participation. Better data leads to better evaluation of programs, better use of resources and funds, and a more accurate picture of school breakfast access.



How can we ensure the school breakfast program is established as a best practice for academic intervention?

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) could incorporate better access to school meals as a way to achieve the goals of the TEA Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) consolidated state plan and long-range education plans.

Texas has the opportunity to commit to strong child nutrition programs as key interventions by incorporating goals into the ESSA consolidated state plan. The state can capitalize on existing program infrastructure and funding to prioritize campus improvements and student health and well-being. Child nutrition programs, especially school breakfast, are critical interventions proven to improve nutrient intake and positively impact classroom behavior and academic performance.^{6,7,8} Not only do child nutrition programs help students, but schools stand to gain financially for operating excellent programs. Schools are reimbursed per meal for implementing strong interventions, and better participation means schools receive more overall reimbursement.

These programs not only support students at high-need schools, but they also crucially support at-risk populations such as students experiencing homelessness or in foster care. Research shows that a nutritious breakfast sets a child up for success. While nearly a quarter (23.8%) of Texas children live in food-insecure households, Texas has the tools it needs to ensure students have access to healthy meals and are equipped to excel.⁹ Other states, including Oklahoma, committed to removing barriers to participation in child nutrition programs throughout the ESSA plan.¹⁰

At the time of publication, Texas' ESSA plan did not include nutrition programs as academic interventions.

Top 15 Texas School Districts with the Highest Potential for Breakfast Gains

Texas has potential to reach even more students with breakfast. Below (or above or following) is a list of the 15 districts that stand the most to gain in terms of additional students reached if the district met the 70 percent benchmark.

District Name	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	Additional Students Daily if 70% Reached
FORT WORTH ISD	53.2%	9,437
NORTHSIDE ISD - SAN ANTONIO	46.3%	9,273
NORTH EAST ISD	38.3%	7,996
CYPRESS-FAIRBANKS ISD	53.2%	7,588
MESQUITE ISD	38.3%	7,483
ARLINGTON ISD	49.8%	6,656
PASADENA ISD	51.5%	6,578
ALIEF ISD	48.4%	6,534
FORT BEND ISD	34.1%	6,375
GARLAND ISD	48.6%	6,255
KATY ISD	34.0%	5,978
RICHARDSON ISD	38.5%	4,964
CARROLLTON - FARMERS BRANCH	30.9%	4,622
KLEIN ISD	41.4%	4,411
KILLEEN ISD	48.1%	4,371

How can Texas be a national leader in school breakfast participation?

Texas could follow the lead of other states and implement breakfast after-the-bell statewide legislation.

Research suggests that a state requiring districts to implement the School Breakfast Program “reduce[s] the likelihood of indicating low food security by over 15 percentage points.”¹¹ Therefore, state lawmakers have the unique opportunity to impact food insecurity rates statewide by enacting policies that improve the accessibility of the School Breakfast Program for students, especially those at high-need schools.

In addition to universal-free school breakfast mandates, legislation requiring breakfast be served after the start of the school day through alternative service models is a best practice. The Food Research and Action Center (FRAC) noted that Colorado experienced a nearly 10 percent increase in the number of low-income students eating breakfast at school once schools began serving breakfast after the bell following the enactment of House Bill 13-1006.^{12,13} A few states add incentives, such as a small, state reimbursement to accompany the federal reimbursement, to encourage implementation of alternative service. For example, the 2017 state budget in Virginia provided an additional \$0.05 per meal served at eligible schools implementing an alternative, after-the-bell, breakfast service model.¹⁴

While some states, including Texas, have requirements that schools provide meals free to all students, Texas does not currently provide incentives or parameters for how schools should serve meals. The passage of Texas’ bill on universal free school breakfast was significant, but Texas has the opportunity to take it one step further—to require best practice implementation through alternative service models.

TEXAS SCHOOL BREAKFAST PARTICIPATION

Technical notes

School Breakfast Participation Tables

The next section of the School Breakfast Report Card provides breakfast participation data for Texas counties and school districts. This data set represents school years 2013-2014 and 2016-2017 and lists public and charter schools. Data was retrieved from the Texas Department of Agriculture (TDA) through Public Information Requests. Below, you will find descriptions of the data indicators in the table, including how we define them and how they were calculated.

FR Eligible (%)

Free and Reduced-Price Eligible. This is the percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price (FR) meals. This data is based on district-level October enrollment figures.

FR Breakfast ADP (#)

Free and Reduced-Price Breakfast Average Daily Participation. This indicator is the number of students participating in FR school breakfast during a given school year. This was calculated by dividing the total number of FR breakfasts served per district by the total number of operating days. County-level cells sum up district-level FR Breakfast ADP.

FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP (%)

Free and Reduced-Price Students in the School Breakfast Program (SBP) per 100 in the National School Lunch Program (NSLP). The Food Research and Action Center sets a national goal of reaching 70 FR eligible students with breakfast for every 100 participating in FR school lunch. Put another way, this is the ratio of FR breakfast students to FR lunch students (FR breakfast ADP / FR lunch ADP).

Additional Students Served if 70 percent Reached (#)

The number of additional students the district or county could reach with breakfast if 70 percent of students participating in free or reduced-price (FR) lunch were served breakfast. A "-" in this column indicates the district or county has already met the 70 percent benchmark.

Additional Dollars if 70 percent Reached (\$)

Additional reimbursements the district or county would accrue if 70 percent of students participating in free or reduced-price (FR) lunch also participate in breakfast. A "-" in this column indicates the district or county has already met the 80 percent benchmark. We use "the breakfast calculator method," which applies the current (2017) percentage of free students and percentage of reduced students to the total number of Additional Students Reached. We take the number of "additional" students eligible for free meals and the number of "additional" students eligible for reduced-price meals and multiply each by respective reimbursement rates and total operating days.

Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation

The year on year change in the ratio of FR SBP Students to FR NSLP Students. An increase in this percentage indicates improved breakfast participation.

Technical Note

Data represented here were collected from TDA and include enrollment and claim data for the months of June through July for years 2013-2014 and 2016-2017. Additional information can be made available upon request. An asterisk * indicates missing data from the state agency (and/or indicates an inability to make a calculation due to missing data).

BREAKFAST PARTICIPATION BY DISTRICT

District	2013-2014			2016-2017			Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Additional Students if 70% Met	Additional Dollars if 70% Met
	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP			
A PLUS CHARTER SCHOOLS, Inc. DBA A +	92.4%	205	27.7%	93.7%	271	35.0%	7.3%	271	\$ 87,005
A PLUS CHARTER SCHOOLS, Inc. DBA INS	89.3%	272	32.7%	89.3%	285	35.7%	3.0%	273	\$ 87,618
A.W. BROWN-FELLOWSHIP	83.4%	676	47.5%	77.7%	658	50.8%	3.3%	249	\$ 71,818
ABBOTT ISD	27.0%	30	64.6%	25.8%	35	71.8%	7.3%	-	\$ -
ABERNATHY ISD	58.4%	144	52.8%	53.6%	253	93.3%	40.6%	-	\$ -
ABILENE ISD	65.9%	5,035	53.6%	67.9%	4,876	52.6%	-1.0%	1,616	\$ 474,979
ACADEMY ISD	46.7%	180	50.0%	48.2%	251	59.1%	9.1%	46	\$ 13,215
ACADEMY OF ACCELERATED LEARNING II	98.5%	371	62.0%	100.0%	374	64.2%	2.2%	34	\$ 10,070
ACADEMY OF AMERICA DBA ACADEMY C	80.0%	391	106.9%	100.0%	326	84.5%	-22.4%	-	\$ -
ACADEMY OF AMERICA DBA BEXAR COUI	93.0%	200	59.3%	100.0%	214	61.2%	1.9%	31	\$ 9,441
ACADEMY OF CAREERS & TECHNOLOGIE!	47.9%	15	65.9%	*	*	*	*	*	*
ACADEMY OF SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE	38.2%	74	36.0%	35.2%	104	31.1%	-4.9%	130	\$ 36,897
ACCELERATED INTERMEDIATE ACADEMY	95.4%	160	78.6%	95.1%	148	67.2%	-11.4%	6	\$ 1,847
ADRIAN ISD	63.7%	49	81.1%	77.5%	39	68.5%	-12.5%	1	\$ 229
ADVANTAGE ACADEMY	72.9%	246	28.0%	74.0%	227	26.0%	-2.0%	382	\$ 109,850
AGUA DULCE ISD	59.5%	65	40.2%	67.6%	200	105.6%	65.4%	-	\$ -
ALAMO HEIGHTS ISD	23.5%	278	46.1%	20.5%	325	49.9%	3.8%	131	\$ 38,406
ALBA-GOLDEN ISD	58.2%	174	54.8%	53.5%	186	61.9%	7.1%	24	\$ 6,822
ALBANY ISD	43.8%	76	52.0%	42.1%	60	42.6%	-9.4%	38	\$ 11,252
ALDINE ISD	84.9%	31,483	62.1%	82.3%	30,518	61.6%	-0.5%	4,143	\$ 1,224,893
ALEDO ISD	13.4%	184	39.4%	13.4%	211	41.6%	2.1%	144	\$ 41,767
ALICE ISD	72.9%	2,938	90.2%	87.6%	2,674	70.0%	-20.2%	1	\$ 261
ALIEF ISD	81.0%	14,953	49.3%	82.6%	14,593	48.4%	-1.0%	6,534	\$ 1,993,196
ALIEF MONTESSORI COMMUNITY SCHOC	54.0%	10	7.1%	63.3%	17	16.8%	9.6%	53	\$ 15,463
ALLEN ISD	16.4%	538	30.5%	15.9%	475	26.7%	-3.9%	772	\$ 225,197
ALPHA CHARTER SCHOOL	59.8%	18	35.6%	88.3%	43	48.5%	12.9%	19	\$ 2,146
ALPINE ISD	55.0%	165	42.0%	51.3%	158	39.8%	-2.2%	120	\$ 34,178
ALTO ISD	71.7%	193	53.0%	73.6%	156	52.1%	-0.9%	54	\$ 16,279
ALVARADO ISD	63.9%	705	43.6%	65.8%	827	47.2%	3.6%	399	\$ 114,776
ALVIN ISD	51.1%	4,207	52.8%	52.0%	4,368	49.7%	-3.1%	1,788	\$ 520,008
ALVORD ISD	30.1%	125	68.6%	36.2%	120	58.6%	-9.9%	23	\$ 6,584
AMARILLO ISD	67.0%	11,975	72.9%	70.1%	12,872	75.6%	2.7%	-	\$ -
AMBASSADORS PREPARATORY ACADEM!	87.4%	101	40.8%	84.8%	83	41.0%	0.2%	59	\$ 17,418
AMERICAN YOUTH WORKS CHS-AUSTIN	55.7%	5	40.5%	*	*	*	*	*	*
AMHERST ISD	78.8%	62	60.0%	79.5%	51	52.4%	-7.6%	17	\$ 4,924
AMIGOS POR VIDA-"FRIENDS FOR LIFE"	97.5%	170	36.3%	100.0%	144	30.1%	-6.2%	190	\$ 56,892
ANAHUAC ISD	53.7%	375	72.7%	54.1%	263	49.3%	-23.3%	111	\$ 31,639
ANDERSON-SHIRO CONS ISD	50.9%	164	54.8%	42.8%	154	58.3%	3.5%	31	\$ 8,843
ANDREWS ISD	48.2%	497	44.9%	42.9%	517	42.7%	-2.2%	331	\$ 94,643
ANGLETON ISD	60.7%	1,875	59.2%	63.1%	1,843	58.2%	-1.0%	373	\$ 108,513
ANNA ISD	47.7%	424	46.9%	42.9%	427	44.4%	-2.5%	246	\$ 73,208
ANSON ISD	68.2%	329	95.5%	66.1%	277	81.8%	-13.7%	-	\$ -
ANTHONY ISD	91.7%	645	101.0%	91.9%	738	104.3%	3.4%	-	\$ -
ANTON ISD	86.4%	234	114.2%	73.3%	171	106.0%	-8.2%	-	\$ -
APPLE SPRINGS ISD	58.2%	49	55.6%	56.9%	61	79.3%	23.7%	-	\$ -
AQUILLA ISD	47.2%	61	64.7%	47.8%	64	66.4%	1.7%	3	\$ 952
ARANSAS COUNTY ISD	62.1%	913	58.1%	61.4%	899	55.1%	-3.0%	244	\$ 71,104
ARANSAS PASS ISD	75.2%	490	43.9%	76.7%	448	41.7%	-2.2%	305	\$ 89,941
ARCHER CITY ISD	40.0%	90	63.2%	46.9%	100	79.4%	16.2%	-	\$ -
ARGYLE ISD	13.5%	88	47.6%	12.2%	48	54.3%	6.7%	14	\$ 4,006
ARLINGTON CLASSIC ACADEMY	19.8%	60	40.4%	18.8%	109	58.9%	18.5%	21	\$ 5,872
ARLINGTON ISD	67.9%	16,300	46.9%	68.2%	16,387	49.8%	2.9%	6,656	\$ 1,961,721
ARP ISD	55.5%	180	51.4%	59.8%	185	51.6%	0.3%	66	\$ 18,910
ARROW ACADEMY-LEADERSHIP EDUCATI	83.8%	385	65.6%	81.3%	165	55.1%	-10.5%	45	\$ 13,173
ASPERMONT ISD	56.8%	78	88.0%	63.1%	52	72.3%	-15.7%	-	\$ -
ASSN. FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF MEXI	93.1%	76	22.3%	79.1%	155	34.2%	11.9%	162	\$ 45,946
ATHENS ISD	72.5%	947	49.3%	77.2%	917	50.8%	1.6%	345	\$ 102,431

District	2013-2014			2016-2017			Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Additional Students if 70% Met	Additional Dollars if 70% Met
	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP			
ATLANTA ISD	66.8%	611	65.6%	68.4%	608	67.8%	2.2%	20	\$ 5,556
AUBREY ISD	32.0%	232	53.5%	31.6%	206	52.6%	-0.9%	69	\$ 20,028
AUSTIN ACHIEVE PUBLIC SCHOOLS	81.2%	80	44.9%	88.5%	186	39.7%	-5.2%	142	\$ 45,764
AUSTIN ISD	63.3%	18,063	44.6%	55.4%	20,742	61.1%	16.5%	3,031	\$ 901,453
AUSTWELL-TIVOLI ISD	49.7%	45	81.5%	61.2%	42	71.6%	-9.9%	-	\$ -
AVALON ISD	63.4%	86	58.5%	54.3%	63	44.0%	-14.5%	37	\$ 10,467
AVERY ISD	60.2%	111	71.5%	54.9%	101	73.5%	2.0%	-	\$ -
AVINGER ISD	89.5%	78	68.3%	79.5%	59	68.6%	0.3%	1	\$ 343
AXTELL ISD	52.9%	181	61.7%	51.3%	150	51.2%	-10.5%	55	\$ 15,780
AZLE ISD	47.9%	1,427	63.4%	50.6%	1,519	68.8%	5.4%	27	\$ 8,013
AZLEWAY, INC.	94.9%	84	97.9%	*	*	*	*	*	*
BAIRD ISD	67.2%	150	86.6%	67.2%	139	91.4%	4.9%	-	\$ -
BALLINGER ISD	60.8%	224	53.4%	59.8%	220	53.9%	0.4%	66	\$ 19,036
BALMORHEA ISD	80.5%	120	111.8%	80.5%	108	103.7%	-8.1%	-	\$ -
BANDERA ISD	54.2%	467	49.9%	53.7%	429	49.6%	-0.3%	176	\$ 51,697
BANGS ISD	55.6%	237	56.0%	55.0%	184	49.5%	-6.6%	76	\$ 22,240
BANQUETE ISD	71.1%	390	86.0%	74.1%	431	84.4%	-1.6%	-	\$ -
BARBERS HILL ISD	22.0%	340	65.9%	22.8%	249	63.7%	-2.2%	25	\$ 7,185
BARTLETT ISD	85.6%	220	85.9%	74.2%	171	72.0%	-14.0%	-	\$ -
BASTROP ISD	71.0%	2,021	38.9%	70.0%	2,111	40.3%	1.4%	1,555	\$ 448,599
BAY AREA CHARTER SCHOOL	37.9%	58	51.7%	*	*	*	*	*	*
BAY CITY ISD	71.5%	1,711	86.5%	78.6%	1,781	85.9%	-0.6%	-	\$ -
Beacon Academies of Texas	87.7%	30	30.0%	*	*	*	*	*	*
BEAUMONT ISD	74.2%	7,333	60.1%	74.2%	7,025	61.8%	1.6%	937	\$ 276,258
BECKVILLE ISD	35.9%	82	48.6%	36.0%	59	45.0%	-3.6%	32	\$ 9,526
BEEVILLE ISD	77.6%	1,216	67.3%	79.9%	763	38.9%	-28.4%	610	\$ 180,654
BELLEVUE ISD	47.2%	24	70.1%	55.7%	27	48.7%	-21.3%	12	\$ 3,181
BELLS ISD	44.0%	150	66.6%	42.3%	152	64.1%	-2.5%	14	\$ 3,984
BELLVILLE ISD	47.9%	380	47.3%	49.4%	391	45.1%	-2.2%	216	\$ 60,824
BELTON ISD	47.9%	2,282	56.7%	46.8%	2,243	53.3%	-3.4%	705	\$ 203,073
BEN BOLT-PALITO BLANCO ISD	70.6%	173	55.7%	67.0%	269	84.4%	28.7%	-	\$ -
BEN YEHUDA ACADEMY	*	12	*	12.3%	14	*	*	*	*
BENAVIDES ISD	92.8%	242	82.8%	92.9%	272	97.6%	14.9%	-	\$ -
BENJAMIN ISD	77.9%	55	86.7%	65.0%	49	99.6%	12.9%	-	\$ -
BIG SANDY ISD-BIG SANDY	70.4%	157	47.2%	71.1%	195	54.5%	7.3%	55	\$ 16,280
BIG SANDY ISD-DALLARDSVILLE	50.3%	166	85.0%	47.0%	143	79.4%	-5.6%	-	\$ -
BIG SPRING ISD	68.8%	1,918	89.7%	69.0%	1,725	81.6%	-8.1%	-	\$ -
BIRDVILLE ISD	56.5%	4,241	39.5%	56.0%	3,884	38.6%	-0.9%	3,161	\$ 920,627
BISHOP CONS ISD	56.9%	537	86.9%	60.0%	619	78.2%	-8.7%	-	\$ -
BLACKWELL CONS ISD	44.8%	32	65.9%	*	*	*	*	*	*
BLANCO ISD	52.3%	186	47.0%	48.5%	178	47.0%	0.0%	87	\$ 24,727
BLAND ISD	56.1%	163	62.9%	55.3%	184	64.1%	1.2%	17	\$ 4,838
BLANKET ISD	71.0%	100	70.6%	100.0%	102	66.4%	-4.2%	5	\$ 1,632
BLOOMING GROVE ISD	61.6%	179	45.8%	67.5%	172	46.0%	0.2%	90	\$ 25,565
BLOOMINGTON ISD	76.9%	436	76.9%	81.5%	425	74.7%	-2.2%	-	\$ -
BLUE RIDGE ISD	58.0%	138	51.2%	57.3%	171	54.4%	3.1%	49	\$ 13,787
BLUFF DALE ISD	21.2%	7	47.4%	36.9%	16	58.5%	11.2%	3	\$ 922
BLUM ISD	65.7%	87	53.0%	62.2%	95	52.9%	-0.1%	31	\$ 8,778
BOB HOPE SCHOOL	89.0%	34	18.9%	93.3%	149	23.9%	5.0%	287	\$ 83,271
BOERNE ISD	21.1%	320	36.0%	18.8%	281	29.5%	-6.5%	384	\$ 111,179
BOLES ISD	50.3%	67	34.9%	55.7%	100	47.3%	12.4%	48	\$ 13,850
BOLING ISD	19.8%	234	57.8%	53.6%	236	64.3%	6.6%	21	\$ 5,913
BONHAM ISD	68.4%	913	80.8%	71.2%	881	77.0%	-3.8%	-	\$ -
BOOKER ISD	61.8%	38	19.4%	65.6%	41	20.6%	1.2%	98	\$ 26,701
BORDEN COUNTY ISD	36.2%	37	48.4%	36.6%	27	43.2%	-5.3%	17	\$ 4,671
BORGER ISD	59.6%	468	48.7%	53.2%	387	43.3%	-5.4%	239	\$ 68,506
BOSQUEVILLE ISD	41.9%	127	61.1%	36.3%	98	55.0%	-6.1%	27	\$ 7,615

District	2013-2014			2016-2017			Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Additional Students if 70% Met	Additional Dollars if 70% Met
	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP			
BOVINA ISD	81.4%	183	51.8%	86.6%	363	96.7%	45.0%	-	\$ -
BOWIE ISD	46.7%	319	63.3%	53.9%	479	86.5%	23.2%	-	\$ -
BOYD ISD	62.8%	255	59.4%	49.4%	230	56.6%	-2.8%	55	\$ 15,447
BOYS & GIRLS CLUBS OF SOUTH CENTRAL	67.5%	59	54.7%	87.9%	98	53.5%	-1.1%	30	\$ 8,881
BRACKETT ISD	58.3%	131	44.9%	58.2%	117	43.2%	-1.7%	73	\$ 20,446
BRADY ISD	64.3%	441	76.8%	68.5%	462	84.6%	7.7%	-	\$ -
BRAZOS ISD	58.5%	202	54.2%	63.5%	218	54.1%	0.0%	64	\$ 18,538
BRAZOSPORT ISD	55.8%	2,636	45.5%	59.3%	2,413	47.3%	1.8%	1,159	\$ 326,248
BRECKENRIDGE ISD	64.2%	632	91.1%	68.6%	449	70.5%	-20.7%	-	\$ -
BREMOND ISD	49.5%	86	47.1%	51.2%	88	44.3%	-2.8%	51	\$ 14,266
BRENHAM ISD	59.8%	1,178	54.4%	60.9%	1,233	56.1%	1.7%	307	\$ 89,658
BRIDGE CITY ISD	43.4%	425	51.9%	38.9%	437	58.2%	6.3%	89	\$ 25,226
BRIDGEPORT ISD	62.0%	813	85.9%	62.6%	412	39.4%	-46.5%	319	\$ 91,315
BRIGHT IDEAS CHARTER	52.0%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
BROADDUS ISD	83.3%	173	64.4%	78.4%	186	71.8%	7.3%	-	\$ -
BROCK ISD	13.7%	53	57.5%	11.3%	31	45.2%	-12.3%	17	\$ 4,699
BRONTE ISD	52.2%	81	79.7%	47.7%	72	79.7%	0.0%	-	\$ -
BROOKELAND ISD	58.2%	92	51.7%	63.8%	97	48.1%	-3.7%	44	\$ 12,980
BROOKESMITH ISD	63.8%	92	85.7%	71.1%	70	76.0%	-9.6%	-	\$ -
BROOKS ACADEMY OF SCIENCE AND ENC	57.3%	246	38.9%	80.2%	152	21.6%	-17.3%	341	\$ 87,612
BROOKS ISD	78.0%	590	56.5%	97.5%	1,296	100.0%	43.4%	-	\$ -
BROWNFIELD ISD	73.1%	874	78.8%	82.3%	1,304	111.0%	32.2%	-	\$ -
BROWNSBORO ISD	59.3%	630	53.5%	58.1%	650	58.3%	4.8%	130	\$ 37,525
BROWNSVILLE ISD	90.6%	38,464	108.5%	90.5%	31,496	91.3%	-17.2%	-	\$ -
BROWNWOOD ISD	64.5%	1,169	68.2%	66.7%	1,071	64.2%	-4.1%	97	\$ 27,758
BRUCEVILLE-EDDY ISD	56.1%	146	45.1%	61.5%	181	53.8%	8.7%	54	\$ 15,969
BRYAN ISD	74.1%	5,434	55.7%	74.2%	5,624	56.9%	1.2%	1,299	\$ 377,512
BRYSON ISD	49.6%	111	98.2%	58.7%	98	96.9%	-1.3%	-	\$ -
BUCKHOLTS ISD	81.3%	95	84.6%	87.1%	66	71.1%	-13.5%	-	\$ -
BUENA VISTA ISD	66.9%	45	57.0%	61.3%	72	69.8%	12.7%	0	\$ 70
BUFFALO ISD	65.2%	288	60.1%	63.7%	319	67.6%	7.5%	11	\$ 3,505
BULLARD ISD	37.5%	320	50.1%	34.9%	280	47.4%	-2.7%	134	\$ 38,181
BUNA ISD	47.4%	279	59.5%	44.6%	250	59.4%	-0.2%	45	\$ 12,650
BURKBURNETT ISD	53.4%	707	54.2%	56.6%	721	53.9%	-0.3%	215	\$ 60,588
BURKEVILLE ISD	70.8%	125	69.8%	72.8%	111	62.9%	-6.9%	13	\$ 3,523
BURLESON ISD	35.9%	1,211	41.2%	36.2%	1,250	37.3%	-4.0%	1,098	\$ 298,961
BURNET CONS ISD	62.0%	947	62.4%	56.5%	895	62.8%	0.4%	102	\$ 29,088
BURTON ISD	50.6%	93	59.0%	56.9%	107	55.4%	-3.6%	28	\$ 7,992
BUSHLAND ISD	24.8%	83	42.4%	22.1%	97	50.1%	7.7%	39	\$ 11,036
BYNUM ISD	65.2%	56	65.0%	70.3%	52	61.3%	-3.6%	7	\$ 2,169
CADDO MILLS ISD	40.2%	235	50.5%	32.5%	190	45.5%	-5.0%	102	\$ 28,695
CALALLEN ISD	45.8%	587	47.9%	47.9%	570	42.4%	-5.4%	370	\$ 109,390
CALDWELL ISD	60.4%	343	44.7%	59.1%	306	40.8%	-3.9%	219	\$ 61,909
CALHOUN CO ISD	62.8%	822	43.4%	65.1%	1,157	64.4%	21.0%	100	\$ 28,076
CALLISBURG ISD	60.3%	206	49.5%	48.9%	318	79.2%	29.7%	-	\$ -
CALVERT ISD	80.6%	89	77.4%	100.0%	94	78.5%	1.1%	-	\$ -
CAMERON ISD	74.6%	828	85.3%	76.8%	909	89.1%	3.9%	-	\$ -
CAMPBELL ISD	71.5%	140	79.3%	63.8%	141	83.5%	4.2%	-	\$ -
CANADIAN ISD	40.8%	106	35.1%	40.3%	114	42.2%	7.1%	75	\$ 21,362
CANTON ISD	45.6%	279	49.6%	40.7%	268	53.1%	3.5%	86	\$ 24,924
CANUTILLO ISD	93.4%	3,056	63.3%	95.2%	4,604	98.0%	34.7%	-	\$ -
CANYON ISD	32.5%	1,104	57.6%	32.2%	1,089	52.3%	-5.3%	369	\$ 108,175
CARLISLE ISD	81.1%	226	56.1%	75.3%	236	59.6%	3.4%	41	\$ 12,515
CARRIZO SPRINGS CONS ISD	78.1%	1,172	70.4%	86.2%	855	53.0%	-17.4%	273	\$ 79,928
CARROLLTON-FARMERS BRANCH	62.4%	3,857	31.3%	63.2%	3,649	30.9%	-0.4%	4,622	\$ 1,364,863
CARTHAGE ISD	55.3%	519	50.0%	55.5%	836	76.2%	26.2%	-	\$ -
CASA GRACIA	*	*	*	100.0%	39	92.0%	*	-	\$ -

District	2013-2014			2016-2017			Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Additional Students if 70% Met	Additional Dollars if 70% Met
	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP			
CASTLEBERRY ISD	87.5%	1,025	40.7%	71.9%	1,627	66.5%	25.8%	86	\$ 24,754
CAYUGA ISD	25.6%	80	53.5%	33.6%	84	58.2%	4.7%	17	\$ 4,901
CEDAR HILL ISD	68.2%	2,396	54.3%	68.9%	2,271	55.3%	0.9%	606	\$ 169,335
CEDARS INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY	92.8%	111	40.7%	82.9%	119	36.5%	-4.3%	109	\$ 32,748
CELESTE ISD	48.7%	103	59.9%	54.2%	112	51.4%	-8.6%	41	\$ 11,559
CELINA ISD	30.0%	201	43.8%	26.1%	201	45.9%	2.1%	106	\$ 30,198
CENTER FOR JUVENILE MANAGEMENT, II	92.1%	21	77.1%	*	*	*	*	*	*
CENTER ISD	79.0%	881	54.2%	80.3%	865	53.1%	-1.1%	275	\$ 76,494
CENTER POINT ISD	75.9%	201	60.1%	78.5%	168	48.0%	-12.1%	77	\$ 21,392
CENTERVILLE ISD-CENTERVILLE	42.4%	107	57.3%	46.7%	98	54.3%	-3.0%	28	\$ 8,230
CENTERVILLE ISD-GROVETON	66.4%	45	79.9%	60.0%	31	62.1%	-17.8%	4	\$ 1,145
CENTRAL HEIGHTS ISD	40.8%	182	56.3%	40.9%	160	49.5%	-6.8%	66	\$ 18,732
CENTRAL ISD	53.6%	269	42.7%	57.0%	243	37.9%	-4.9%	207	\$ 58,770
CHANNELVIEW ISD	80.4%	2,959	49.7%	81.2%	2,960	46.6%	-3.1%	1,490	\$ 427,826
CHANNING ISD	46.5%	30	56.6%	60.8%	63	72.2%	15.6%	-	\$ -
CHAPEL HILL ISD-MT. PLEASANT	51.3%	162	52.4%	53.5%	151	47.6%	-4.9%	71	\$ 20,142
CHAPEL HILL ISD-TYLER	74.0%	1,043	48.9%	76.2%	1,012	47.9%	-1.0%	467	\$ 132,734
CHARLOTTE ISD	71.7%	66	24.2%	68.1%	338	110.2%	86.0%	-	\$ -
CHEROKEE ISD	61.8%	24	40.9%	64.0%	18	43.4%	2.5%	11	\$ 3,358
CHESTER ISD	52.3%	60	86.0%	54.6%	65	71.1%	-15.0%	-	\$ -
CHICO ISD	65.1%	137	59.4%	64.9%	121	41.6%	-17.8%	83	\$ 23,295
CHILDRESS ISD	60.6%	384	77.2%	57.9%	218	52.2%	-25.0%	75	\$ 21,463
CHILLICOTHE ISD	83.2%	150	104.5%	87.9%	154	115.6%	11.1%	-	\$ -
CHILTON ISD	87.7%	167	57.7%	87.1%	192	56.5%	-1.2%	46	\$ 13,520
CHINA SPRING ISD	28.2%	243	54.6%	27.5%	216	45.5%	-9.1%	116	\$ 32,935
CHIRENO ISD	75.8%	100	45.5%	65.8%	98	48.3%	2.8%	44	\$ 12,319
CHISUM ISD	45.0%	137	44.9%	53.5%	146	43.9%	-1.0%	87	\$ 24,653
CHRISTOVAL ISD	25.9%	34	53.6%	23.9%	52	70.8%	17.3%	-	\$ -
CISCO ISD	59.7%	175	46.8%	56.9%	164	49.6%	2.8%	67	\$ 19,581
CITY VIEW ISD	72.8%	263	51.3%	70.2%	234	46.7%	-4.6%	117	\$ 34,400
CLARENDON ISD	53.2%	105	56.2%	54.6%	110	57.3%	1.1%	24	\$ 6,990
CLARKSVILLE ISD	89.6%	349	76.4%	100.0%	370	87.3%	10.9%	-	\$ -
CLAUDE ISD	41.0%	49	44.0%	51.5%	68	58.5%	14.5%	13	\$ 3,651
CLEAR CREEK ISD	29.3%	2,875	41.5%	34.2%	2,287	48.6%	7.1%	1,010	\$ 297,558
CLEBURNE ISD	68.4%	1,642	47.5%	68.0%	1,608	45.5%	-2.0%	864	\$ 249,222
CLEVELAND ISD	80.9%	1,178	52.8%	82.1%	1,774	56.4%	3.6%	428	\$ 124,568
CLIFTON ISD	58.9%	300	60.5%	54.4%	249	58.6%	-1.9%	49	\$ 13,927
CLINT ISD	87.3%	9,086	102.5%	97.1%	9,215	101.9%	-0.6%	-	\$ -
CLYDE CONS ISD	49.1%	208	39.9%	51.8%	279	46.9%	7.0%	137	\$ 38,498
COAHOMA ISD	45.3%	142	58.2%	48.4%	105	37.6%	-20.6%	91	\$ 24,452
COLDSPRING-OAKHURST CONS	70.1%	454	58.9%	65.3%	481	60.5%	1.6%	76	\$ 21,474
COLEMAN ISD	58.4%	345	98.3%	55.9%	311	91.4%	-6.9%	-	\$ -
COLLEGE STATION ISD	35.0%	1,483	45.8%	33.7%	1,550	45.8%	0.1%	818	\$ 235,639
COLLINSVILLE ISD	43.2%	64	36.9%	51.0%	89	44.4%	7.5%	51	\$ 14,601
COLMESNEIL ISD	59.7%	97	57.7%	64.6%	171	86.6%	28.9%	-	\$ -
COLORADO ISD	54.7%	412	95.3%	61.5%	357	84.2%	-11.1%	-	\$ -
COLUMBIA-BRAZORIA ISD	57.3%	940	77.5%	54.1%	753	71.4%	-6.1%	-	\$ -
COLUMBUS ISD	67.3%	362	46.3%	66.2%	333	43.7%	-2.5%	200	\$ 57,532
COMAL ISD	33.5%	3,070	64.5%	30.8%	3,060	64.0%	-0.5%	285	\$ 81,790
COMANCHE ISD	67.3%	363	54.8%	67.8%	390	52.7%	-2.1%	128	\$ 36,638
COMFORT ISD	55.4%	214	40.9%	57.2%	228	48.5%	7.6%	101	\$ 29,109
COMMERCE ISD	67.1%	530	71.0%	63.3%	560	82.4%	11.4%	-	\$ -
COMMUNITY ISD	53.5%	270	47.0%	46.7%	266	42.0%	-4.9%	177	\$ 52,654
COMO-PICKTON ISD	73.4%	341	85.5%	79.7%	332	80.2%	-5.3%	-	\$ -
COMSTOCK ISD	30.1%	33	77.5%	30.8%	35	78.2%	0.7%	-	\$ -
CONNALLY ISD	79.2%	997	67.6%	76.5%	1,130	74.2%	6.6%	-	\$ -
CONROE ISD	38.7%	5,875	44.1%	38.2%	6,247	41.9%	-2.2%	4,188	\$ 1,048,074

District	2013-2014			2016-2017			Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Additional Students if 70% Met	Additional Dollars if 70% Met
	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP			
COOLIDGE ISD	82.3%	200	46.1%	80.5%	96	45.5%	-0.6%	52	\$ 15,171
COOPER ISD	61.9%	257	71.0%	75.1%	266	59.9%	-11.1%	45	\$ 13,112
COPPELL ISD	11.1%	195	29.3%	9.7%	151	37.1%	7.8%	134	\$ 38,170
COPPERAS COVE ISD	51.3%	1,519	45.5%	54.4%	1,510	45.6%	0.1%	805	\$ 225,789
CORPUS CHRISTI ISD	66.1%	11,541	58.9%	76.8%	12,068	60.2%	1.4%	1,958	\$ 588,682
CORRIGAN-CAMDEN ISD	76.8%	365	58.5%	76.1%	360	72.9%	14.4%	-	\$ -
CORSICANA ISD	76.8%	2,636	74.3%	77.4%	2,383	69.8%	-4.5%	7	\$ 1,945
COTTON CENTER ISD	77.4%	67	81.6%	87.0%	59	84.4%	2.8%	-	\$ -
COTULLA ISD	82.8%	354	40.2%	87.0%	415	43.0%	2.8%	261	\$ 76,337
COUPLAND ISD	31.4%	14	56.8%	33.5%	18	44.0%	-12.8%	11	\$ 3,102
COVINGTON ISD	50.2%	66	59.2%	50.3%	53	50.9%	-8.3%	20	\$ 5,551
CRANDALL ISD	47.2%	354	36.4%	48.5%	501	42.7%	6.4%	320	\$ 89,876
CRANE ISD	38.4%	87	29.8%	51.0%	146	39.7%	9.8%	112	\$ 32,206
CRANFILLS GAP ISD	82.4%	43	63.2%	73.0%	50	63.4%	0.1%	5	\$ 1,478
CRAWFORD ISD	24.2%	59	60.4%	26.7%	55	66.7%	6.3%	3	\$ 769
CROCKETT CO CONS ISD	53.0%	238	71.7%	58.6%	263	80.4%	8.7%	-	\$ -
CROCKETT ISD	87.7%	742	85.7%	100.0%	1,031	96.4%	10.7%	-	\$ -
CROSBY ISD	51.0%	886	49.8%	52.4%	1,140	51.5%	1.8%	408	\$ 118,328
CROSBYTON ISD	77.7%	219	90.9%	87.4%	237	81.9%	-9.0%	-	\$ -
CROSS PLAINS ISD	71.4%	83	49.0%	61.7%	79	47.0%	-2.1%	39	\$ 10,759
CROSS ROADS ISD	48.5%	133	65.9%	63.0%	113	60.0%	-5.9%	19	\$ 5,457
CROWELL ISD	53.7%	116	117.7%	71.6%	136	110.4%	-7.3%	-	\$ -
CROWLEY ISD	55.4%	3,778	57.0%	59.1%	4,250	61.7%	4.7%	573	\$ 167,566
CRYSTAL CITY ISD	79.4%	526	39.5%	100.0%	661	41.4%	1.9%	456	\$ 133,443
CUERO ISD	61.3%	540	60.4%	69.1%	512	59.5%	-0.9%	91	\$ 26,426
CULBERSON COUNTY-ALLAMORE ISD	75.0%	272	126.5%	66.6%	233	117.6%	-8.9%	-	\$ -
CUMBY ISD	58.7%	120	68.0%	54.8%	156	98.8%	30.8%	-	\$ -
CUSHING ISD	66.4%	172	71.4%	65.6%	189	71.8%	0.4%	-	\$ -
CYPRESS-FAIRBANKS ISD	48.9%	22,964	52.4%	48.9%	24,084	53.2%	0.8%	7,588	\$ 2,163,397
DAINGERFIELD-LONE STAR IS	80.5%	449	57.4%	80.7%	418	58.2%	0.8%	85	\$ 24,830
DALHART ISD	59.7%	552	75.6%	57.0%	596	86.5%	10.9%	-	\$ -
DALLAS ISD	87.4%	74,386	69.4%	91.7%	93,872	82.3%	12.9%	-	\$ -
DAMON ISD	83.9%	68	61.7%	100.0%	102	68.6%	6.9%	2	\$ 633
DANBURY ISD	27.4%	84	53.0%	20.5%	86	61.5%	8.5%	12	\$ 3,358
DARROUZETT ISD	68.8%	47	75.9%	71.2%	58	79.4%	3.5%	-	\$ -
DAWSON ISD	67.2%	183	71.2%	67.2%	206	76.1%	5.0%	-	\$ -
DAWSON ISD-WELCH	46.2%	40	72.8%	45.9%	41	74.1%	1.3%	-	\$ -
DAYTON ISD	64.0%	1,264	50.0%	60.5%	1,213	49.7%	-0.3%	496	\$ 143,774
DE LEON ISD	57.4%	126	46.1%	60.3%	143	47.9%	1.8%	66	\$ 18,755
DECATUR ISD	46.7%	487	48.9%	45.7%	467	44.0%	-4.8%	275	\$ 78,376
DEER PARK ISD	43.5%	2,545	61.5%	46.8%	2,009	55.6%	-5.9%	522	\$ 149,962
DEL VALLE ISD	79.7%	6,944	83.9%	79.3%	6,630	85.1%	1.3%	-	\$ -
DELL CITY ISD	81.7%	43	88.4%	100.0%	57	92.9%	4.5%	-	\$ -
DEMOCRATIC SCHOOLS RESEARCH INSTI	69.1%	107	53.7%	92.7%	136	56.3%	2.5%	33	\$ 9,713
DENISON ISD	64.6%	1,490	62.0%	62.2%	1,567	65.1%	3.1%	119	\$ 35,094
DENTON ISD	42.7%	3,466	41.7%	43.4%	3,832	43.9%	2.2%	2,279	\$ 673,160
DENVER CITY ISD	53.9%	720	128.8%	53.3%	899	121.7%	-7.0%	-	\$ -
DESOTO ISD	67.7%	2,399	45.6%	72.8%	2,548	45.0%	-0.6%	1,415	\$ 419,293
DETROIT ISD	68.7%	170	72.8%	67.7%	148	70.9%	-1.9%	-	\$ -
DEVERS ISD	33.9%	42	82.7%	48.6%	44	70.3%	-12.4%	-	\$ -
DEVINE ISD	64.2%	510	58.5%	61.4%	508	62.2%	3.7%	64	\$ 18,488
DEW ISD	48.3%	18	39.1%	54.5%	35	54.5%	15.4%	10	\$ 2,758
DEWEYVILLE ISD	57.2%	168	60.5%	60.7%	178	68.7%	8.2%	3	\$ 958
DHANIS ISD	54.9%	51	39.4%	53.9%	52	35.3%	-4.0%	51	\$ 14,435
DIBOLL ISD	72.6%	671	56.0%	79.4%	703	55.3%	-0.7%	186	\$ 55,610
DICKINSON ISD	65.8%	2,686	50.8%	64.4%	2,796	50.9%	0.1%	1,047	\$ 307,159
DILLEY ISD	79.2%	365	66.1%	91.1%	530	72.9%	6.8%	-	\$ -

District	2013-2014			2016-2017			Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Additional Students if 70% Met	Additional Dollars if 70% Met
	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP			
DIME BOX ISD	74.7%	83	75.4%	85.7%	99	76.2%	0.8%	-	\$ -
DIMMITT ISD	82.8%	782	87.2%	93.8%	932	91.6%	4.4%	-	\$ -
DODD CITY ISD	47.2%	81	62.6%	44.4%	65	60.2%	-2.4%	11	\$ 2,957
DONNA ISD	89.1%	11,544	97.2%	100.0%	12,284	95.0%	-2.2%	-	\$ -
DOUGLASS ISD	39.3%	75	57.6%	42.1%	71	52.4%	-5.1%	24	\$ 6,903
DRAW ACADEMY	98.3%	158	38.8%	92.4%	122	23.0%	-15.8%	249	\$ 82,666
DRIPPING SPRINGS ISD	12.7%	229	53.2%	11.3%	159	53.9%	0.7%	47	\$ 13,866
DRISCOLL ISD	72.0%	123	65.4%	69.9%	100	58.7%	-6.7%	19	\$ 5,786
DUBLIN ISD	75.7%	437	60.8%	76.4%	442	64.3%	3.5%	39	\$ 11,501
DUMAS ISD	66.8%	1,805	86.8%	66.8%	1,821	90.4%	3.7%	-	\$ -
DUNCANVILLE ISD	78.0%	3,685	46.0%	82.6%	3,076	39.8%	-6.2%	2,338	\$ 673,105
EAGLE MT-SAGINAW ISD	41.0%	2,168	39.3%	43.0%	2,307	38.7%	-0.6%	1,864	\$ 541,087
EAGLE PASS ISD	75.2%	7,657	85.5%	85.9%	7,529	76.8%	-8.7%	-	\$ -
EANES ISD	3.5%	*	*	3.0%	*	*	*	37	*
EARLY ISD	48.2%	206	46.7%	49.1%	189	45.4%	-1.3%	102	\$ 28,913
EAST AUSTIN COLLEGE PREP ACADEMY	90.2%	328	57.2%	85.5%	85	23.3%	-33.9%	170	\$ 52,279
EAST BERNARD ISD	33.6%	98	41.9%	35.6%	99	37.6%	-4.3%	85	\$ 25,342
EAST CENTRAL ISD	67.2%	2,577	48.5%	66.9%	2,643	49.2%	0.7%	1,117	\$ 323,063
EAST CHAMBERS ISD	54.7%	391	63.8%	57.0%	396	58.7%	-5.2%	77	\$ 22,451
EAST FORT WORTH MONTESSORI ACAD	79.4%	131	39.4%	75.9%	93	30.5%	-8.9%	120	\$ 35,319
EASTLAND ISD	58.9%	173	44.0%	57.1%	181	43.8%	-0.2%	108	\$ 23,570
ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES ADVANCEM	95.4%	131	68.6%	100.0%	125	64.7%	-3.9%	10	\$ 3,078
ECTOR COUNTY ISD	51.6%	8,698	82.4%	53.2%	10,545	93.4%	11.0%	-	\$ -
ECTOR ISD	48.2%	57	58.3%	47.2%	45	56.1%	-2.2%	11	\$ 3,113
EDCOUCH-ELSA ISD	91.1%	4,073	97.9%	100.0%	4,421	97.4%	-0.5%	-	\$ -
EDEN CONS ISD	67.8%	43	33.2%	74.2%	76	59.9%	26.7%	13	\$ 3,459
EDGEWOOD ISD-EDGEWOOD	50.8%	149	41.7%	46.0%	182	57.4%	15.8%	40	\$ 11,380
EDGEWOOD ISD-SAN ANTONIO	90.1%	7,658	81.6%	100.0%	6,965	75.4%	-6.2%	-	\$ -
EDINBURG ISD	84.5%	18,756	78.6%	84.5%	18,145	77.5%	-1.2%	-	\$ -
EDNA ISD	60.8%	347	48.1%	64.7%	333	44.7%	-3.4%	188	\$ 53,146
EHRHART SCHOOL	88.0%	95	50.4%	82.0%	81	36.0%	-14.4%	77	\$ 22,126
EL CAMPO ISD	66.8%	911	54.5%	69.6%	888	49.8%	-4.7%	361	\$ 107,203
EL PASO EDUCATION INITIATIVE, INC. (T	48.7%	93	27.2%	55.1%	97	24.7%	-2.6%	179	\$ 53,037
EL PASO EDUCATION INITIATIVE, INC. (T	60.4%	30	26.5%	57.5%	49	34.4%	7.8%	51	\$ 14,918
EL PASO ISD	71.9%	16,303	51.0%	76.8%	23,209	73.5%	22.5%	-	\$ -
EL PASO LEADERSHIP ACADEMY	*	*	*	86.1%	48	29.4%	*	67	\$ 18,780
ELECTRA ISD	65.2%	247	115.1%	66.4%	256	120.0%	4.8%	-	\$ -
ELGIN ISD	71.2%	1,757	70.9%	73.9%	2,077	81.8%	10.8%	-	\$ -
ELKHART ISD	54.4%	140	41.0%	58.3%	237	54.4%	13.4%	68	\$ 20,154
ELYSIAN FIELDS ISD	45.9%	219	59.7%	53.2%	239	65.0%	5.3%	18	\$ 5,301
ENNIS ISD	69.8%	2,515	81.2%	67.3%	2,274	77.9%	-3.2%	-	\$ -
ERA ISD	36.7%	42	33.9%	41.4%	55	40.3%	6.5%	40	\$ 11,726
ERATH EXCELS ACADEMY, INC.	77.3%	47	119.9%	*	*	*	*	*	*
ERATH EXCELS ACADEMY, INC.	*	*	*	78.4%	35	104.5%	*	-	\$ -
ETOILE ISD	74.1%	65	77.4%	83.5%	81	88.2%	10.8%	-	\$ -
EULA ISD	55.9%	99	59.8%	63.5%	105	54.6%	-5.2%	30	\$ 8,269
EUSTACE ISD	69.9%	444	56.1%	86.0%	533	49.2%	-6.9%	226	\$ 66,220
EVADALE ISD	37.6%	64	54.9%	34.5%	63	64.7%	9.8%	5	\$ 1,428
EVANT ISD	64.0%	79	69.1%	63.1%	89	75.6%	6.5%	-	\$ -
EVERMAN ISD	87.2%	1,547	40.1%	80.9%	1,429	38.1%	-2.0%	1,199	\$ 353,241
EVOLUTION ACADEMY CHARTER	67.2%	41	64.2%	74.4%	199	176.8%	112.6%	-	\$ -
EXCELLENCE IN LEADERSHIP ACADEMY	60.4%	61	67.8%	86.8%	87	48.6%	-19.2%	38	\$ 11,208
EXCELSIOR ISD	65.6%	38	76.8%	90.7%	49	76.9%	0.0%	-	\$ -
EZZELL ISD	47.0%	23	88.8%	49.5%	35	85.7%	-3.1%	-	\$ -
FABENS ISD	90.8%	629	37.1%	100.0%	635	34.9%	-2.2%	637	\$ 188,418
FAIRFIELD ISD	54.4%	453	66.9%	50.2%	365	54.1%	-12.8%	107	\$ 30,684
FAITH FAMILY KIDS INC DBA FAITH FAMILI	96.0%	1,513	93.5%	*	*	*	*	*	*

District	2013-2014			2016-2017			Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Additional Students if 70% Met	Additional Dollars if 70% Met
	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP			
FAITH FAMILY KIDS INC DBA WAXAHACH	69.5%	224	94.5%	88.7%	1,416	89.1%	-5.4%	-	\$ -
FALLBROOK COMMUNITY DEVELOPME	52.7%	64	31.2%	*	*	*	*	*	*
FALLS CITY ISD	24.2%	21	31.7%	21.7%	35	70.1%	38.4%	-	\$ -
FANNINDEL ISD	84.4%	113	85.7%	92.7%	99	76.2%	-9.5%	-	\$ -
FARMERSVILLE ISD	55.3%	398	59.4%	55.7%	367	55.0%	-4.4%	100	\$ 28,838
FARWELL ISD	61.1%	112	44.6%	67.0%	112	41.9%	-2.7%	75	\$ 21,332
FAYETTEVILLE ISD	27.8%	19	43.1%	28.9%	21	39.3%	-3.8%	16	\$ 4,759
FERRIS ISD	80.4%	1,033	62.5%	77.0%	932	57.0%	-5.5%	213	\$ 61,874
FLATONIA ISD	61.6%	142	54.8%	62.7%	105	41.8%	-13.0%	71	\$ 13,320
FLORENCE ISD	63.9%	390	78.0%	64.9%	441	82.3%	4.3%	-	\$ -
FLORESVILLE ISD	57.0%	747	49.7%	54.6%	797	53.4%	3.6%	248	\$ 72,759
FLOUR BLUFF ISD	43.2%	1,273	68.6%	44.7%	1,154	60.9%	-7.7%	173	\$ 50,578
FLOYDADA ISD	75.3%	244	56.3%	84.7%	563	114.3%	58.0%	-	\$ -
FOCUS LEARNING ACADEMY, INC.	82.6%	210	38.9%	95.2%	719	101.9%	63.0%	-	\$ -
FOLLETT ISD	57.8%	25	35.4%	50.6%	31	49.8%	14.5%	12	\$ 3,350
FORESTBURG ISD	43.4%	54	79.5%	45.7%	53	92.2%	12.8%	-	\$ -
FORNEY ISD	28.1%	695	44.4%	25.9%	610	41.2%	-3.2%	428	\$ 119,520
FORSAN ISD	30.2%	85	56.3%	33.3%	113	57.5%	1.2%	25	\$ 6,852
FORT BEND ISD	35.6%	5,593	33.4%	39.6%	6,039	34.1%	0.7%	6,375	\$ 1,862,752
FORT ELLIOTT CISD	15.9%	15	72.3%	*	*	*	*	*	*
FORT WORTH ACADEMY OF FINE ARTS	16.1%	6	12.5%	9.8%	6	16.2%	3.7%	20	\$ 5,704
FORT WORTH ISD	82.1%	22,981	44.7%	86.9%	29,937	53.2%	8.6%	9,437	\$ 2,838,331
FRANKLIN ISD	39.8%	186	56.8%	37.0%	194	68.0%	11.2%	6	\$ 1,681
FRANKSTON ISD	58.4%	149	40.6%	52.4%	215	64.2%	23.5%	20	\$ 5,540
FREDERICKSBURG ISD	56.7%	513	41.2%	50.2%	547	42.5%	1.2%	355	\$ 89,367
FREER ISD	68.1%	441	102.0%	97.8%	689	100.6%	-1.4%	-	\$ -
FRENSHIP ISD	36.6%	1,318	57.6%	40.9%	1,431	50.5%	-7.1%	553	\$ 158,012
FRIENDSWOOD ISD	12.0%	39	21.7%	9.3%	46	27.3%	5.7%	72	\$ 10,543
FRIONA ISD	79.7%	689	92.6%	79.8%	682	96.7%	4.1%	-	\$ -
FRISCO ISD	13.4%	1,072	26.3%	11.6%	1,412	29.4%	3.1%	1,946	\$ 559,224
FROST ISD	53.9%	111	61.7%	52.7%	101	54.9%	-6.8%	28	\$ 7,901
FRUITVALE ISD	76.2%	120	53.6%	77.3%	209	86.6%	33.0%	-	\$ -
FT DAVIS ISD	43.9%	13	*	42.7%	12	*	*	*	*
FT HANCOCK ISD	91.8%	330	87.5%	91.6%	298	93.0%	5.5%	-	\$ -
FT SAM HOUSTON ISD	34.9%	140	34.2%	31.0%	134	37.3%	3.1%	117	\$ 31,087
FT STOCKTON ISD	64.3%	425	40.4%	66.9%	435	39.5%	-1.0%	337	\$ 97,483
GAINESVILLE ISD	81.1%	1,582	79.0%	77.3%	1,619	80.1%	1.1%	-	\$ -
GALENA PARK ISD	78.3%	7,186	51.1%	75.6%	6,817	45.2%	-5.9%	3,745	\$ 1,091,603
GALVESTON ISD	76.1%	2,870	72.0%	75.4%	2,773	69.1%	-2.8%	34	\$ 10,158
GANADO ISD	53.6%	125	53.7%	56.5%	160	59.6%	5.9%	28	\$ 7,901
GARLAND ISD	60.9%	9,730	36.0%	61.9%	14,219	48.6%	12.6%	6,255	\$ 1,824,097
GARNER ISD	49.3%	98	102.2%	61.2%	104	109.7%	7.5%	-	\$ -
GARRISON ISD	51.9%	109	44.6%	49.7%	133	60.5%	15.9%	21	\$ 6,015
GARY ISD	54.3%	116	73.9%	46.1%	126	76.7%	2.7%	-	\$ -
GATESVILLE ISD	53.2%	461	43.4%	54.6%	506	47.1%	3.7%	245	\$ 70,286
GATEWAY CHARTER ACADEMY	92.0%	243	44.7%	97.1%	219	44.9%	0.2%	122	\$ 36,340
GATEWAY:STUDENT ALTERNATIVE PROG	98.8%	30	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
GAUSE ISD	70.1%	62	66.0%	62.1%	63	77.8%	11.8%	-	\$ -
GENERATIONS OF LIFE FOUNDATION	*	*	*	89.3%	220	69.2%	*	2	\$ 715
Genesis Schools	80.0%	223	44.6%	89.2%	161	40.9%	-3.6%	115	\$ 38,255
GEORGE GERVIN YOUTH CENTER, INC.	48.5%	491	96.8%	100.0%	619	92.2%	-4.6%	-	\$ -
GEORGE WEST ISD	41.7%	191	60.4%	55.7%	273	66.4%	6.0%	15	\$ 4,341
GEORGETOWN ISD	49.6%	2,312	60.7%	46.6%	2,311	65.4%	4.7%	164	\$ 45,809
GHOLSON ISD	75.5%	100	65.7%	80.4%	111	69.9%	4.2%	0	\$ 55
GIDDINGS ISD	70.1%	460	50.0%	71.4%	450	47.3%	-2.7%	215	\$ 61,985
GILMER ISD	63.6%	756	60.5%	67.9%	1,002	82.4%	21.9%	-	\$ -
GIRLS AND BOYS PREP ACADEMY	91.8%	444	73.3%	*	*	*	*	*	*

District	2013-2014			2016-2017			Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Additional Students if 70% Met	Additional Dollars if 70% Met
	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP			
GLADEWATER ISD	70.1%	673	66.3%	73.0%	669	67.0%	0.8%	29	\$ 8,473
GLASSCOCK ISD	45.0%	68	58.6%	36.0%	40	43.9%	-14.7%	24	\$ 6,905
GLEN ROSE ISD	51.0%	260	48.0%	46.2%	264	48.6%	0.6%	116	\$ 33,288
GODLEY ISD	53.6%	424	53.9%	56.8%	431	51.0%	-2.9%	160	\$ 44,667
GOLD BURG ISD	75.0%	34	62.5%	66.7%	37	64.0%	1.5%	3	\$ 1,036
GOLDEN RULE SCHOOLS INC.	98.6%	354	36.8%	94.8%	371	34.3%	-2.5%	386	\$ 112,405
GOLDTHWAITE ISD	56.0%	70	48.1%	47.0%	113	68.0%	19.9%	3	\$ 948
GOLIAD ISD	51.6%	270	52.9%	54.5%	216	43.9%	-9.0%	128	\$ 36,316
GONZALES ISD	70.7%	991	76.3%	73.8%	885	67.4%	-8.9%	35	\$ 10,106
GOODRICH ISD	82.7%	96	56.4%	100.0%	157	80.7%	24.3%	-	\$ -
GOOSE CREEK ISD	68.9%	7,978	70.1%	61.4%	7,433	64.0%	-6.1%	692	\$ 196,007
GORDON ISD	35.8%	29	59.5%	47.5%	27	43.5%	-16.0%	16	\$ 4,411
GORMAN ISD	66.9%	75	52.1%	69.2%	78	47.3%	-4.8%	37	\$ 10,447
GRADY ISD	28.1%	26	53.4%	35.0%	34	47.5%	-6.0%	16	\$ 4,545
GRAFORD ISD	64.6%	124	65.1%	60.4%	70	48.3%	-16.8%	32	\$ 9,011
GRAHAM ISD	59.1%	467	44.8%	59.0%	455	49.3%	4.5%	191	\$ 44,557
GRANBURY ISD	49.2%	1,335	58.8%	49.1%	1,294	52.3%	-6.5%	439	\$ 115,548
GRAND PRAIRIE ISD	70.4%	10,999	68.7%	67.7%	10,946	67.4%	-1.3%	424	\$ 121,335
GRAND SALINE ISD	64.2%	252	49.1%	66.8%	326	62.8%	13.7%	37	\$ 10,561
GRANDFALLS-ROYALTY ISD	58.4%	42	67.5%	84.0%	40	53.1%	-14.5%	13	\$ 3,748
GRANDVIEW ISD	35.5%	159	53.8%	33.3%	157	57.8%	3.9%	33	\$ 9,546
GRANDVIEW-HOPKINS ISD	10.9%	4	94.5%	*	*	*	*	*	*
GRANGER ISD	57.5%	74	38.5%	68.6%	96	45.0%	6.4%	53	\$ 15,017
GRAPE CREEK ISD	63.7%	375	72.4%	80.9%	474	81.9%	9.5%	-	\$ -
GRAPELAND ISD	72.2%	120	56.0%	85.0%	190	60.1%	4.0%	31	\$ 9,290
GRAPEVINE-COLLEYVILLE ISD	24.0%	1,107	52.5%	27.5%	911	45.3%	-7.3%	498	\$ 111,437
GREAT HEARTS AMERICA-TEXAS	*	*	*	11.1%	28	21.9%	*	61	\$ 16,993
GREENVILLE ISD	68.8%	1,213	47.3%	66.2%	1,428	51.1%	3.8%	527	\$ 136,496
GREENWOOD ISD	30.7%	215	48.7%	40.1%	359	55.9%	7.2%	91	\$ 25,803
GREGORY-PORTLAND ISD	44.7%	619	44.8%	45.5%	590	39.8%	-4.9%	447	\$ 130,364
GROESBECK ISD	62.8%	571	76.7%	60.7%	897	122.4%	45.7%	-	\$ -
GROOM ISD	27.6%	19	58.2%	30.1%	13	50.3%	-7.9%	5	\$ 1,380
GROVETON ISD	62.7%	244	76.4%	62.5%	258	76.1%	-0.3%	-	\$ -
GRUVER ISD	49.4%	39	26.5%	52.3%	37	23.9%	-2.6%	71	\$ 19,226
GULF COAST COUNCIL OF LARAZA, INC.	91.9%	175	98.5%	95.5%	122	93.8%	-4.7%	-	\$ -
GUNTER ISD	33.0%	142	69.7%	29.0%	113	59.2%	-10.6%	21	\$ 5,861
GUSTINE ISD	86.7%	107	68.1%	83.5%	68	59.7%	-8.4%	12	\$ 3,265
GUTHRIE CSD	42.5%	25	69.6%	*	*	*	*	*	*
HALE CENTER ISD	73.0%	197	47.4%	70.6%	185	49.5%	2.1%	77	\$ 22,457
HALLETTSVILLE ISD	41.6%	143	45.3%	44.1%	184	48.1%	2.8%	84	\$ 23,770
HALLSBURG ISD	55.0%	41	62.1%	55.6%	51	64.8%	2.6%	4	\$ 1,133
HALLSVILLE ISD	41.9%	679	54.3%	44.2%	750	49.1%	-5.2%	319	\$ 78,819
HAMILTON ISD	59.6%	210	70.8%	57.5%	238	78.3%	7.4%	-	\$ -
HAMLIN ISD	59.1%	216	108.7%	72.9%	156	79.3%	-29.3%	-	\$ -
HAMPTON PREPARATORY	74.5%	193	38.8%	*	*	*	*	*	*
HAMSHIRE-FANNETT ISD	33.5%	178	48.2%	31.9%	170	47.3%	-0.9%	81	\$ 23,361
HAPPY ISD	41.0%	61	118.1%	38.8%	71	122.6%	4.5%	-	\$ -
HARDIN ISD	47.0%	314	65.0%	37.7%	308	58.6%	-6.4%	60	\$ 17,413
HARDIN-JEFFERSON ISD	38.8%	288	51.9%	39.1%	293	51.5%	-0.4%	105	\$ 31,417
HARLANDALE ISD	86.6%	12,422	112.7%	90.7%	12,377	112.3%	-0.4%	-	\$ -
HARLETON ISD	42.2%	128	57.5%	48.7%	134	52.8%	-4.7%	44	\$ 12,417
HARLINGEN CONS ISD	78.0%	7,160	59.4%	88.7%	8,393	61.8%	2.3%	1,119	\$ 342,434
HARMONY ISD	51.8%	136	35.9%	53.5%	147	37.6%	1.6%	127	\$ 35,971
HARMONY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	58.4%	2,794	28.9%	*	*	*	*	*	*
HARMONY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	*	*	*	71.1%	518	30.8%	*	658	\$ 184,346
HARMONY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	*	*	*	71.0%	555	32.2%	*	653	\$ 165,736
HARMONY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	*	*	*	73.7%	463	28.9%	*	659	\$ 190,350

District	2013-2014			2016-2017			Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Additional Students if 70% Met	Additional Dollars if 70% Met
	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP			
HARMONY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	*	*	*	54.1%	430	31.9%	*	513	\$ 147,023
HARMONY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	*	*	*	42.7%	246	30.8%	*	314	\$ 89,725
HARMONY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	*	*	*	51.7%	568	19.9%	*	1,430	\$ 414,386
HARMONY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	*	*	*	54.4%	327	27.8%	*	496	\$ 144,818
HARPER ISD	43.3%	108	64.9%	43.9%	96	60.9%	-4.0%	14	\$ 3,976
HARROLD ISD	68.3%	60	105.6%	65.8%	53	105.9%	0.3%	-	\$ -
HART ISD	90.9%	133	63.3%	89.7%	132	69.0%	5.6%	2	\$ 596
HARTLEY ISD	70.1%	89	72.7%	62.7%	83	69.6%	-3.1%	0	\$ 122
HARTS BLUFF ISD	65.9%	77	33.1%	67.8%	80	33.2%	0.1%	89	\$ 25,662
HASKELL CISD	72.5%	182	60.0%	73.4%	166	59.2%	-0.8%	30	\$ 8,634
HAWKINS ISD	62.1%	182	52.3%	61.2%	165	49.0%	-3.3%	70	\$ 20,063
HAWLEY ISD	53.8%	108	43.5%	62.5%	147	52.3%	8.8%	50	\$ 14,222
HAYS CONS ISD	50.5%	3,084	46.1%	51.2%	2,960	45.0%	-1.1%	1,645	\$ 456,298
HEARNE ISD	88.6%	458	70.1%	95.2%	402	59.4%	-10.7%	72	\$ 20,940
HEDLEY ISD	75.7%	47	65.2%	78.0%	44	61.1%	-4.1%	6	\$ 1,845
HEMPHILL ISD	70.0%	204	53.9%	66.0%	211	48.5%	-5.4%	93	\$ 26,832
HEMPSTEAD ISD	77.1%	594	73.8%	90.3%	566	55.7%	-18.1%	145	\$ 42,224
HENDERSON ISD	64.4%	1,166	61.7%	66.2%	1,196	64.0%	2.2%	113	\$ 32,565
HENRIETTA ISD	47.6%	389	134.6%	44.6%	321	128.5%	-6.1%	-	\$ -
HENRY FORD LEARNING INSTITUTE	*	13	39.3%	48.2%	7	27.8%	-11.4%	11	\$ 3,189
HEREFORD ISD	82.4%	1,354	49.3%	79.2%	1,834	70.8%	21.5%	-	\$ -
HERMLEIGH ISD	56.2%	73	77.2%	53.7%	76	70.6%	-6.6%	-	\$ -
HICO ISD	56.0%	168	69.3%	56.7%	178	73.4%	4.2%	-	\$ -
HIDALGO ISD	91.2%	2,309	103.4%	91.3%	2,563	95.3%	-8.1%	-	\$ -
HIGGINS ISD	50.0%	52	82.2%	74.3%	65	86.7%	4.5%	-	\$ -
HIGH ISLAND ISD	66.5%	54	68.8%	73.3%	87	65.3%	-3.5%	6	\$ 802
HIGHLAND ISD	35.2%	37	53.0%	42.0%	36	51.3%	-1.7%	13	\$ 3,611
HIGHLAND PARK ISD	61.0%	217	49.4%	62.5%	189	44.9%	-4.5%	106	\$ 29,890
HILL COUNTRY YOUTH RANCH	90.1%	134	95.3%	100.0%	121	86.3%	-9.0%	-	\$ -
HILLSBORO ISD	74.5%	492	42.2%	70.8%	670	63.8%	21.5%	66	\$ 18,531
HITCHCOCK ISD	86.3%	808	76.6%	82.7%	784	73.9%	-2.7%	-	\$ -
HOLLAND ISD	50.6%	182	77.9%	49.4%	154	63.0%	-14.9%	17	\$ 4,897
HOLLIDAY ISD	29.0%	60	37.7%	25.4%	67	41.7%	4.1%	45	\$ 13,138
HONDO ISD	61.7%	483	53.3%	81.3%	592	60.1%	6.8%	98	\$ 28,978
HONEY GROVE ISD	67.5%	228	73.4%	58.7%	235	77.7%	4.3%	-	\$ -
HONORS ACADEMY	76.2%	239	57.2%	*	*	*	*	*	*
HOOKS ISD	61.8%	190	57.8%	59.5%	206	65.8%	7.9%	13	\$ 3,822
HOPE ACADEMY, INC.	*	*	*	*	96	81.0%	*	-	\$ -
HOUSTON GATEWAY ACADEMY, INC.	93.8%	573	45.3%	89.9%	263	21.8%	-23.5%	582	\$ 175,914
HOUSTON HEIGHTS LEARNING ACADEMY	77.1%	55	60.8%	80.3%	16	51.1%	-9.7%	6	\$ 480
HOUSTON ISD	76.6%	97,818	86.6%	84.1%	100,026	85.1%	-1.5%	-	\$ -
HOWE ISD	44.7%	159	47.1%	43.5%	143	41.3%	-5.9%	99	\$ 28,253
HUBBARD ISD-DE KALB	61.1%	35	74.2%	76.2%	33	66.7%	-7.4%	2	\$ 462
HUBBARD ISD-HUBBARD	76.0%	209	97.0%	61.7%	164	96.0%	-1.0%	-	\$ -
HUCKABAY ISD	44.8%	24	42.2%	36.2%	26	54.1%	11.9%	8	\$ 2,131
HUDSON ISD	57.6%	764	59.0%	55.7%	745	59.6%	0.6%	130	\$ 37,636
HUFFMAN ISD	37.5%	512	62.4%	34.4%	480	51.4%	-11.0%	173	\$ 39,909
HUGHES SPRINGS ISD	60.5%	291	61.5%	60.4%	213	48.4%	-13.0%	95	\$ 26,903
HULL-DAISETTA ISD	69.9%	272	101.5%	93.7%	330	94.9%	-6.6%	-	\$ -
HUMBLE ISD	34.2%	4,345	43.9%	33.4%	4,363	41.6%	-2.3%	2,978	\$ 867,407
HUNT ISD	38.2%	25	43.3%	50.3%	26	37.5%	-5.9%	23	\$ 6,503
HUNTINGTON ISD	57.7%	345	48.8%	57.2%	345	47.1%	-1.7%	168	\$ 48,231
HUNTSVILLE ISD	58.3%	2,567	82.4%	62.2%	2,464	83.2%	0.8%	-	\$ -
HURST-EULESS-BEDFORD ISD	56.7%	3,623	41.0%	55.9%	4,378	45.0%	4.0%	2,432	\$ 684,437
HUTTO ISD	50.4%	1,061	48.3%	43.2%	1,268	54.5%	6.3%	360	\$ 102,134
IDALOU ISD	43.0%	78	31.4%	38.2%	42	18.7%	-12.8%	117	\$ 33,585
IDEA ACADEMY	85.5%	8,955	83.8%	88.4%	18,397	88.4%	4.5%	-	\$ -

District	2013-2014			2016-2017			Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Additional Students if 70% Met	Additional Dollars if 70% Met
	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP			
IGNITE PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND COMMUNI	90.2%	340	61.1%	*	*	*	*	*	*
IMAGINE EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION	93.0%	67	33.4%	86.4%	62	28.3%	-5.1%	91	\$ 27,079
IMAGINE INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY OF	5.6%	*	*	5.4%	*	*	*	30	*
INDUSTRIAL ISD	33.5%	143	57.6%	36.7%	126	45.5%	-12.1%	68	\$ 20,213
INGLESIDE ISD	56.1%	429	42.9%	61.6%	479	45.3%	2.4%	261	\$ 75,156
INGRAM ISD	71.0%	272	51.8%	75.6%	288	51.3%	-0.4%	105	\$ 29,885
INTERNATIONAL LEADERSHIP OF TEXAS	46.5%	173	19.4%	50.4%	631	19.5%	0.1%	1,638	\$ 443,666
IOLA ISD	51.0%	104	59.1%	37.5%	87	62.0%	2.9%	11	\$ 3,213
IOWA PARK CONS ISD	43.1%	324	53.2%	42.1%	343	57.7%	4.5%	73	\$ 21,087
IRA ISD	30.4%	25	46.5%	26.5%	26	44.5%	-2.0%	15	\$ 4,145
IRAAN-SHEFFIELD ISD	37.6%	69	57.6%	50.0%	108	67.7%	10.1%	4	\$ 1,027
IREDELL ISD	54.8%	23	44.1%	61.8%	32	51.5%	7.4%	11	\$ 3,265
IRION CO ISD	35.7%	52	55.5%	38.6%	44	79.3%	23.7%	-	\$ -
IRVING ISD	79.1%	14,804	63.8%	82.0%	14,619	66.2%	2.4%	850	\$ 251,832
ITALY ISD	*	*	*	62.3%	103	41.2%	*	72	\$ 20,453
ITASCA ISD	70.2%	133	39.3%	69.9%	143	40.8%	1.5%	103	\$ 28,784
JACKSBORO ISD	57.3%	297	87.2%	63.2%	376	82.3%	-4.9%	-	\$ -
JACKSONVILLE ISD	82.6%	1,576	47.0%	78.1%	1,511	49.0%	2.0%	648	\$ 193,199
JAMIE'S HOUSE CHARTER SCHOOL	94.6%	56	70.1%	*	*	*	*	*	*
JARRELL ISD	69.0%	289	51.5%	58.4%	344	52.2%	0.7%	118	\$ 33,295
JASPER ISD	76.5%	1,356	82.9%	75.9%	1,080	70.7%	-12.2%	-	\$ -
JAYTON-GIRARD ISD	51.4%	49	88.1%	30.7%	19	70.5%	-17.6%	-	\$ -
JEAN MASSIEU Foundation	93.0%	104	70.5%	100.0%	122	77.4%	6.9%	-	\$ -
JEFFERSON ISD	74.7%	465	63.4%	69.8%	516	70.0%	6.6%	0	\$ 14
JIM HOGG COUNTY ISD	77.8%	778	100.4%	77.8%	818	100.1%	-0.3%	-	\$ -
JIM NED CONS ISD	35.1%	131	59.6%	27.8%	124	59.6%	0.1%	21	\$ 6,110
JOAQUIN ISD	64.0%	198	48.5%	64.8%	177	52.0%	3.5%	61	\$ 17,597
JOHNSON CITY ISD	46.2%	90	40.4%	43.0%	89	46.7%	6.2%	45	\$ 12,730
JONESBORO ISD	61.3%	51	69.8%	57.4%	86	77.5%	7.7%	-	\$ -
JOSHUA ISD	50.5%	1,066	52.6%	48.8%	947	45.5%	-7.1%	511	\$ 147,162
JOURDANTON ISD	56.5%	568	92.4%	58.6%	634	99.0%	6.6%	-	\$ -
JUBILEE ACADEMIC CENTER	73.9%	1,087	74.6%	58.0%	1,243	52.7%	-21.8%	407	\$ 119,854
JUDSON ISD	68.4%	6,475	53.1%	61.6%	6,015	51.5%	-1.5%	2,157	\$ 631,433
JUNCTION ISD	60.5%	100	40.9%	69.2%	132	54.1%	13.1%	39	\$ 11,162
KARNACK ISD	96.0%	129	85.0%	100.0%	121	93.9%	8.9%	-	\$ -
KARNES CITY ISD	63.7%	347	68.6%	71.3%	273	50.1%	-18.5%	108	\$ 30,990
KATHERINE ANNE PORTER SCHOOL	47.1%	30	82.1%	42.6%	17	57.1%	-25.0%	4	\$ 1,091
KATY ISD	30.2%	4,841	32.9%	29.6%	5,643	34.0%	1.1%	5,978	\$ 1,783,541
KAUFMAN ISD	65.6%	1,052	55.2%	66.7%	984	51.1%	-4.1%	363	\$ 102,222
KEENE ISD	82.8%	374	60.3%	78.5%	371	57.3%	-3.0%	83	\$ 23,836
KELLER ISD	24.8%	1,837	30.9%	26.3%	2,279	35.3%	4.4%	2,240	\$ 642,693
KELTON ISD	55.1%	60	96.3%	52.7%	32	68.2%	-28.2%	1	\$ 236
KEMP ISD	68.0%	410	50.8%	71.5%	437	52.6%	1.8%	145	\$ 42,420
KENEDY ISD	69.8%	184	46.9%	92.1%	292	52.8%	5.9%	95	\$ 27,204
KENNARD ISD	74.6%	81	62.3%	70.6%	73	57.7%	-4.6%	16	\$ 4,522
KENNEDALE ISD	39.3%	414	41.2%	35.5%	452	48.7%	7.5%	198	\$ 57,545
KERENS ISD	75.7%	170	48.7%	68.5%	213	67.1%	18.4%	9	\$ 2,756
KERMIT ISD	66.1%	831	120.4%	70.7%	643	95.8%	-24.6%	-	\$ -
KERRVILLE ISD	57.4%	992	45.6%	53.9%	985	49.9%	4.3%	398	\$ 117,986
KILGORE ISD	67.1%	1,097	57.5%	65.3%	1,079	52.9%	-4.6%	348	\$ 101,142
KILLEEN ISD	61.3%	7,911	42.1%	60.4%	9,571	48.1%	5.9%	4,371	\$ 1,254,364
KINGSVILLE ISD	75.4%	2,147	114.3%	82.8%	2,349	102.7%	-11.5%	-	\$ -
KIPP AUSTIN PUBLIC SCHOOLS	91.1%	2,020	87.0%	86.7%	2,770	77.5%	-9.5%	-	\$ -
KIPP DALLAS-FORT WORTH, INC.	94.7%	317	72.8%	92.6%	1,124	84.4%	11.6%	-	\$ -
KIPP, INC. CHARTER	89.5%	2,575	46.6%	91.1%	3,945	51.2%	4.6%	1,444	\$ 430,548
KIPP: SAN ANTONIO	86.9%	436	43.9%	85.8%	1,002	54.1%	10.2%	294	\$ 89,025
KIRBYVILLE ISD	60.3%	465	76.6%	63.9%	525	76.8%	0.2%	-	\$ -

District	2013-2014			2016-2017			Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Additional Students if 70% Met	Additional Dollars if 70% Met
	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP			
KLEIN ISD	41.3%	6,821	47.2%	42.5%	6,395	41.4%	-5.8%	4,411	\$ 1,320,528
KLONDIKE ISD	62.1%	79	62.0%	40.9%	57	78.3%	16.3%	-	\$ -
KNIPPA ISD	33.7%	67	62.4%	31.4%	51	52.7%	-9.7%	17	\$ 4,416
KNOX CITY-O'BRIEN ISD	66.3%	173	115.8%	70.6%	179	119.5%	3.7%	-	\$ -
KOPPERL ISD	70.4%	96	71.1%	69.7%	87	70.8%	-0.4%	-	\$ -
KOUNTZE ISD	51.4%	245	60.9%	50.3%	200	51.4%	-9.5%	72	\$ 20,278
KRESS ISD	75.7%	73	60.0%	73.7%	82	59.9%	-0.1%	14	\$ 3,949
KRUM ISD	36.6%	312	55.1%	38.4%	298	52.5%	-2.7%	100	\$ 27,803
L. LOWELL BYRD MEMORIAL EDUCAT. & I	94.9%	227	100.0%	*	*	*	*	*	*
LA ACADEMIA DE ESTRELLAS	93.2%	362	56.5%	91.5%	313	54.4%	-2.1%	90	\$ 29,434
LA FE PREPARATORY SCHOOL	94.5%	153	67.5%	96.1%	138	64.8%	-2.7%	11	\$ 3,375
LA FERIA ISD	87.0%	2,271	82.0%	87.1%	2,070	79.4%	-2.7%	-	\$ -
LA GLORIA ISD	47.9%	26	52.4%	55.9%	34	57.2%	4.8%	8	\$ 2,147
LA GRANGE ISD	50.9%	247	31.1%	54.1%	372	45.2%	14.0%	205	\$ 58,840
LA JOYA ISD	87.9%	18,264	81.8%	87.9%	17,225	80.5%	-1.2%	-	\$ -
LA MARQUE ISD	74.9%	1,211	74.5%	*	*	*	*	*	*
LA PORTE ISD	48.4%	1,627	57.1%	49.1%	1,629	56.3%	-0.8%	398	\$ 114,500
LA POYNOR ISD	53.7%	84	46.5%	53.9%	81	41.6%	-5.0%	55	\$ 16,319
LA PRYOR ISD	81.8%	257	84.9%	84.6%	243	71.4%	-13.6%	-	\$ -
LA VEGA ISD	88.2%	1,232	57.1%	90.8%	1,333	58.9%	1.7%	252	\$ 74,081
LA VERNIA ISD	24.9%	233	38.1%	23.3%	247	39.4%	1.3%	191	\$ 53,991
LA VILLA ISD	88.5%	476	95.4%	100.0%	465	89.4%	-6.0%	-	\$ -
LACKLAND ISD	38.0%	42	17.4%	34.8%	68	28.2%	10.8%	101	\$ 26,599
LAGO VISTA ISD	40.1%	133	43.2%	27.1%	120	49.5%	6.3%	50	\$ 14,298
LAKE DALLAS ISD	39.8%	568	50.5%	43.6%	589	50.2%	-0.3%	232	\$ 66,767
LAKE TRAVIS ISD	14.5%	155	26.8%	15.0%	145	29.7%	2.8%	198	\$ 59,479
LAKE WORTH ISD	72.8%	859	42.0%	75.2%	1,078	47.7%	5.7%	504	\$ 145,655
LAMAR CONSOLIDATED ISD	54.7%	4,279	43.2%	46.6%	4,367	42.1%	-1.1%	2,901	\$ 873,022
LAMESA ISD	70.9%	782	74.4%	81.3%	944	84.7%	10.3%	-	\$ -
LAMPASAS ISD	55.0%	608	44.2%	30.1%	573	45.1%	0.9%	317	\$ 91,369
LANCASTER ISD	84.5%	2,621	56.5%	83.3%	3,471	67.2%	10.7%	142	\$ 41,886
LANEVILLE ISD	93.8%	114	87.1%	94.7%	140	84.7%	-2.4%	-	\$ -
LAREDO ISD	93.8%	13,855	69.2%	100.0%	14,877	72.7%	3.5%	-	\$ -
LASARA ISD	92.3%	421	100.9%	100.0%	383	96.2%	-4.8%	-	\$ -
LATEXO ISD	49.2%	72	44.4%	49.2%	68	48.4%	4.0%	30	\$ 8,460
LAZBUDDIE ISD	80.2%	63	55.5%	66.7%	55	53.2%	-2.3%	18	\$ 4,813
LEAKEY ISD	60.8%	35	42.0%	53.3%	67	55.2%	13.2%	18	\$ 5,203
LEANDER ISD	22.3%	2,107	40.1%	20.6%	2,139	42.1%	2.0%	1,414	\$ 408,141
LEARNING SCHOOLS OF TEXAS	*	*	*	64.9%	11	14.1%	*	44	\$ 13,021
LEARY ISD	68.8%	37	58.7%	78.0%	45	64.8%	6.0%	4	\$ 1,054
LEFORS ISD	58.9%	56	75.5%	71.6%	45	57.6%	-17.9%	10	\$ 2,757
LEGACY PREPARATORY CHARTER ACADEI	75.6%	98	20.4%	70.0%	93	15.3%	-5.1%	331	\$ 99,627
LEGGETT ISD	77.8%	118	101.1%	76.2%	110	106.3%	5.2%	-	\$ -
LENA POPE HOME, INC.	63.9%	91	37.6%	57.9%	84	38.9%	1.3%	67	\$ 21,170
LEON ISD	53.1%	178	57.3%	49.9%	140	46.0%	-11.2%	73	\$ 21,091
LEONARD ISD	58.9%	336	79.9%	56.3%	325	79.0%	-0.9%	-	\$ -
LEVELLAND ISD	68.5%	1,016	64.5%	72.0%	901	61.2%	-3.3%	130	\$ 37,665
LEVERETTS CHAPEL ISD	76.5%	125	77.0%	80.5%	123	81.5%	4.5%	-	\$ -
LEWISVILLE ISD	32.0%	6,861	55.0%	33.4%	6,882	52.6%	-2.4%	2,272	\$ 668,309
LEXINGTON ISD	43.9%	171	51.4%	44.2%	164	52.5%	1.1%	55	\$ 15,419
LIBERTY HILL ISD	27.3%	308	52.1%	27.1%	365	55.0%	2.9%	99	\$ 29,217
LIBERTY ISD	62.5%	507	51.8%	66.8%	485	50.7%	-1.2%	185	\$ 52,069
LIBERTY-EYLAU ISD	79.3%	1,127	71.3%	87.3%	1,137	70.0%	-1.3%	-	\$ -
LIFE SCHOOL	55.4%	446	26.2%	55.9%	635	28.9%	2.7%	901	\$ 257,779
LINDALE ISD	47.9%	636	44.9%	46.5%	623	46.5%	1.6%	315	\$ 90,374
LINDSAY ISD	7.9%	7	24.0%	13.3%	11	23.0%	-0.9%	22	\$ 6,120
LINGLEVILLE ISD	56.2%	42	40.7%	57.7%	25	25.2%	-15.5%	45	\$ 12,913

District	2013-2014			2016-2017			Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Additional Students if 70% Met	Additional Dollars if 70% Met
	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP			
LIPAN ISD	54.3%	67	49.2%	58.3%	69	47.0%	-2.2%	34	\$ 9,924
LIT CYPRESS-MRCEVILLE CONS ISD	45.5%	495	52.2%	41.4%	500	60.3%	8.2%	80	\$ 19,380
LITTLE ELM ISD	49.8%	1,124	46.6%	47.3%	1,111	45.1%	-1.5%	614	\$ 175,198
LITTLEFIELD ISD	72.7%	278	35.8%	87.3%	1,054	113.2%	77.4%	-	\$ -
LIVINGSTON ISD	68.7%	1,848	93.6%	69.2%	1,875	96.3%	2.7%	-	\$ -
LLANO ISD	62.9%	484	56.3%	71.6%	615	63.4%	7.1%	64	\$ 18,458
LOCKHART ISD	70.6%	2,968	102.1%	68.0%	2,904	101.8%	-0.4%	-	\$ -
LOCKNEY ISD	69.1%	122	61.0%	80.0%	134	63.9%	3.0%	13	\$ 2,805
LOHN ISD	73.4%	48	73.8%	100.0%	68	85.0%	11.1%	-	\$ -
LOMETA ISD	82.5%	105	52.4%	76.0%	119	67.1%	14.7%	5	\$ 1,490
LONDON ISD	11.7%	16	30.6%	11.4%	23	32.0%	1.4%	28	\$ 8,020
LONE OAK ISD	46.5%	175	53.3%	43.3%	219	64.2%	10.8%	20	\$ 5,686
LONGVIEW ISD	70.0%	2,316	51.5%	70.6%	2,358	51.2%	-0.3%	868	\$ 255,257
LOOP ISD	53.8%	46	92.5%	54.8%	53	86.5%	-6.0%	-	\$ -
LORAIN ISD	64.2%	66	75.7%	78.0%	88	80.5%	4.8%	-	\$ -
LORENA ISD	28.5%	165	43.0%	27.4%	162	50.3%	7.3%	63	\$ 18,230
LORENZO ISD	77.1%	215	98.4%	100.0%	283	101.6%	3.2%	-	\$ -
LOS FRESNOS CONS ISD	80.8%	6,153	87.0%	80.8%	6,196	85.0%	-2.0%	-	\$ -
LOUISE ISD	65.4%	141	70.0%	61.3%	118	67.2%	-2.8%	5	\$ 1,442
LOVEJOY ISD	4.1%	6	7.7%	3.2%	*	*	*	30	\$ *
LOVELADY ISD	36.9%	99	69.3%	44.7%	103	60.8%	-8.5%	16	\$ 4,459
LUBBOCK ISD	67.0%	12,847	82.3%	76.8%	13,875	81.2%	-1.1%	-	\$ -
LUBBOCK-COOPER ISD	35.4%	563	44.3%	34.2%	631	45.9%	1.6%	332	\$ 93,241
LUEDERS-AVOCA ISD	78.4%	69	87.6%	78.7%	59	88.0%	0.5%	-	\$ -
LUFKIN ISD	73.2%	2,929	57.7%	78.3%	3,026	62.3%	4.5%	375	\$ 108,769
LULING ISD	71.8%	415	54.8%	72.7%	392	52.0%	-2.8%	136	\$ 40,076
LUMBERTON ISD	33.2%	280	33.8%	31.0%	265	38.0%	4.2%	223	\$ 64,684
LYFORD ISD	86.5%	1,257	105.4%	100.0%	1,055	86.6%	-18.8%	-	\$ -
LYTLE ISD	72.0%	606	60.5%	70.8%	522	57.0%	-3.5%	120	\$ 34,965
MABANK ISD	60.4%	816	50.0%	60.2%	716	46.8%	-3.2%	355	\$ 102,792
MADISONVILLE CONS ISD	75.3%	781	54.2%	70.0%	794	58.7%	4.5%	152	\$ 44,172
MAGNOLIA ISD	41.2%	1,741	46.3%	39.8%	2,031	50.0%	3.7%	814	\$ 235,646
MALAKOFF ISD	73.9%	453	65.0%	67.8%	389	53.7%	-11.3%	118	\$ 33,581
MALONE ISD	92.3%	83	95.4%	89.1%	98	93.0%	-2.3%	-	\$ -
MANARA ACADEMY	49.6%	164	83.4%	44.6%	101	55.7%	-27.7%	26	\$ 6,367
MANOR ISD	80.7%	3,222	57.6%	79.7%	3,375	58.7%	1.2%	647	\$ 184,920
MANSFIELD ISD	40.2%	3,734	40.0%	41.0%	4,445	40.4%	0.4%	3,250	\$ 932,218
MARATHON ISD	55.0%	19	*	75.7%	44	*	*	*	\$ *
MARBLE FALLS ISD	61.1%	1,026	53.6%	65.9%	1,119	54.8%	1.2%	310	\$ 89,337
MARFA ISD	69.9%	129	34.9%	71.4%	101	55.6%	20.7%	26	\$ 7,521
MARION ISD	40.7%	202	48.5%	54.1%	261	53.5%	5.0%	81	\$ 22,574
MARLIN ISD	84.9%	439	59.0%	100.0%	434	60.3%	1.4%	70	\$ 20,850
MARSHALL ISD	80.1%	1,862	54.4%	80.1%	1,690	52.5%	-2.0%	564	\$ 163,386
MART ISD	79.4%	296	102.1%	71.1%	275	94.9%	-7.3%	-	\$ -
MARTINS MILL ISD	49.5%	103	58.5%	43.8%	81	49.7%	-8.8%	33	\$ 9,229
MARTINSVILLE ISD	52.2%	166	93.3%	50.9%	163	92.1%	-1.2%	-	\$ -
MASON ISD	53.5%	136	49.4%	51.7%	135	57.2%	7.8%	30	\$ 8,560
MATAGORDA ISD	75.0%	108	101.2%	67.6%	93	104.7%	3.5%	-	\$ -
MATHIS ISD	85.7%	1,209	96.8%	85.7%	1,050	86.7%	-10.1%	-	\$ -
MAUD ISD	62.5%	105	51.7%	66.3%	110	52.0%	0.3%	38	\$ 10,802
MAY ISD	54.2%	69	56.0%	61.4%	81	55.5%	-0.4%	21	\$ 6,229
MAYPEARL ISD	39.3%	212	72.4%	39.4%	179	62.7%	-9.7%	21	\$ 6,004
MCALLEN ISD	65.2%	12,410	99.2%	82.1%	13,483	92.7%	-6.5%	-	\$ -
MCCAMEY ISD	61.5%	107	54.2%	65.5%	108	49.5%	-4.7%	44	\$ 12,490
MCDADE ISD	73.9%	97	74.0%	66.6%	100	58.3%	-15.8%	20	\$ 5,592
MCGREGOR ISD	65.1%	323	47.9%	61.2%	307	47.0%	-0.8%	150	\$ 43,897
MCKINNEY ISD	32.0%	3,553	63.2%	32.1%	3,418	58.4%	-4.8%	681	\$ 199,278

District	2013-2014			2016-2017			Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Additional Students if 70% Met	Additional Dollars if 70% Met
	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP			
MCLEAN ISD	46.9%	29	48.3%	54.3%	48	56.4%	8.2%	11	\$ 3,350
MCLEOD ISD	45.9%	53	38.6%	41.8%	41	33.9%	-4.7%	44	\$ 12,295
MCMULLEN COUNTY ISD	23.0%	27	67.0%	*	*	*	*	*	*
MEADOW ISD	70.5%	212	98.2%	77.0%	219	100.0%	1.8%	-	\$ -
Meadow Oaks Education Foundation	*	*	*	*	5	22.2%	*	12	*
MEDICAL CENTER CHARTER SCH	83.5%	155	89.2%	*	*	*	*	*	*
MEDINA ISD	39.3%	54	48.5%	61.8%	73	49.1%	0.6%	31	\$ 8,792
MEDINA VALLEY ISD	55.4%	932	54.0%	53.9%	1,023	51.9%	-2.1%	356	\$ 100,885
MELISSA ISD	21.3%	118	52.4%	19.0%	177	57.4%	5.0%	39	\$ 8,457
MEMPHIS ISD	67.1%	294	141.2%	73.8%	327	154.0%	12.8%	-	\$ -
MENARD ISD	68.0%	107	68.9%	72.2%	97	69.1%	0.1%	1	\$ 390
MERCEDES ISD	88.8%	4,251	93.9%	100.0%	4,108	88.2%	-5.7%	-	\$ -
MERIDIAN ISD	66.7%	131	51.0%	68.7%	126	50.6%	-0.5%	48	\$ 13,801
MERIDIAN WORLD SCHOOL LLC	8.4%	12	21.8%	8.4%	*	*	*	55	*
MERKEL ISD	64.9%	314	69.6%	59.3%	272	58.8%	-10.8%	52	\$ 14,424
MESQUITE ISD	69.7%	7,859	34.7%	78.5%	9,044	38.3%	3.6%	7,483	\$ 2,185,174
MEXIA ISD	77.4%	757	66.2%	71.0%	916	87.7%	21.5%	-	\$ -
MEYERPARK ELEMENTARY	89.6%	119	77.9%	92.2%	130	80.1%	2.2%	-	\$ -
MEYERSVILLE ISD	30.5%	19	66.9%	31.3%	14	51.9%	-15.1%	5	\$ 1,406
MIAMI ISD	24.3%	28	73.6%	21.5%	22	63.9%	-9.6%	2	\$ 542
MIDLAND ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL	62.7%	235	97.1%	58.6%	194	98.1%	0.9%	-	\$ -
MIDLAND ISD	47.7%	6,738	81.8%	53.3%	7,356	82.3%	0.5%	-	\$ -
MIDLOTHIAN ISD	26.5%	557	42.7%	23.7%	505	40.3%	-2.4%	372	\$ 106,549
MID-VALLEY ACADEMY	94.4%	88	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MIDWAY ISD-HENRIETTA	44.2%	24	69.8%	40.0%	38	74.7%	4.9%	-	\$ -
MIDWAY ISD-WACO	29.9%	735	44.1%	32.4%	770	41.0%	-3.0%	543	\$ 157,911
MILANO ISD	57.1%	53	31.3%	62.1%	54	32.5%	1.3%	62	\$ 18,288
MILDRED ISD	43.6%	137	64.1%	41.9%	126	59.4%	-4.7%	23	\$ 6,357
MILES ISD	38.2%	28	23.3%	36.6%	29	23.5%	0.3%	58	\$ 16,130
MILFORD ISD	81.2%	89	58.6%	76.2%	88	60.0%	1.4%	15	\$ 4,137
MILLER GROVE ISD	69.4%	48	41.6%	65.1%	76	52.9%	11.3%	25	\$ 7,026
MILLSAP ISD	48.0%	137	52.9%	50.7%	161	52.1%	-0.8%	55	\$ 15,612
MINEOLA ISD	69.3%	299	43.6%	67.6%	292	41.9%	-1.7%	196	\$ 57,493
MINERAL WELLS ISD	72.9%	1,064	62.2%	72.2%	1,086	59.1%	-3.1%	200	\$ 55,928
MIRACLE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM	92.3%	143	80.5%	*	*	*	*	*	*
MISSION CONS ISD	86.8%	11,160	96.3%	86.8%	10,551	88.7%	-7.6%	-	\$ -
MONAHANS-WICKETT-PYOTE ISD	48.2%	338	49.1%	62.1%	388	46.4%	-2.8%	198	\$ 55,830
MONTAGUE ISD	35.7%	21	79.0%	51.0%	39	70.9%	-8.1%	-	\$ -
MONTE ALTO ISD	89.7%	818	102.1%	100.0%	947	102.0%	0.0%	-	\$ -
MONTESSORI FOR ALL, Inc.	*	*	*	40.0%	35	39.3%	*	27	\$ 7,979
MONTGOMERY ISD	27.1%	772	49.4%	24.8%	835	54.9%	5.6%	229	\$ 65,362
MOODY ISD	66.9%	205	54.6%	67.7%	312	82.9%	28.3%	-	\$ -
MORAN ISD	78.6%	56	80.0%	95.8%	69	90.4%	10.4%	-	\$ -
MORGAN ISD	95.7%	44	46.6%	90.4%	56	57.0%	10.3%	13	\$ 3,696
MORGAN MILL ISD	42.6%	20	57.3%	39.8%	9	53.6%	-3.7%	3	\$ 786
MORTON ISD	78.2%	300	94.9%	78.2%	303	96.9%	2.1%	-	\$ -
MOTLEY COUNTY ISD	79.3%	90	102.2%	75.2%	87	109.2%	7.0%	-	\$ -
MOULTON ISD	55.6%	72	57.0%	54.0%	63	57.4%	0.5%	14	\$ 3,847
MOUNT CALM ISD	73.6%	66	60.9%	83.8%	89	75.1%	14.2%	-	\$ -
MOUNT ENTERPRISE ISD	51.3%	46	33.9%	56.8%	74	41.6%	7.7%	51	\$ 14,530
MOUNT PLEASANT ISD	82.0%	1,685	44.1%	78.9%	1,832	54.7%	10.7%	510	\$ 147,653
MOUNT VERNON ISD	55.7%	380	63.9%	61.3%	353	61.5%	-2.4%	49	\$ 13,779
MUENSTER ISD	16.1%	14	25.7%	14.5%	14	22.4%	-3.3%	31	\$ 8,604
MULESHOE ISD	83.3%	697	65.2%	82.9%	681	66.4%	1.2%	37	\$ 10,771
MULLIN ISD	82.9%	40	63.0%	85.3%	50	71.7%	8.7%	-	\$ -
MUMFORD ISD	71.0%	277	76.6%	74.0%	294	78.2%	1.6%	-	\$ -
MUNDAY ISD	64.0%	228	103.3%	66.2%	187	100.3%	-2.9%	-	\$ -

District	2013-2014			2016-2017			Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Additional Students if 70% Met	Additional Dollars if 70% Met
	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP			
MURCHISON ISD	56.5%	41	45.8%	64.3%	34	43.5%	-2.3%	20	\$ 5,750
NACOGDOCHES ISD	79.0%	3,397	77.0%	78.7%	3,169	71.5%	-5.5%	-	\$ -
NATALIA ISD	74.9%	541	75.4%	78.3%	761	106.7%	31.4%	-	\$ -
NAVARRO ISD	42.5%	239	44.1%	36.9%	215	43.1%	-1.0%	134	\$ 38,125
NAVASOTA ISD	78.0%	955	51.9%	79.4%	996	51.0%	-0.9%	371	\$ 104,935
NAZARETH ISD	21.6%	8	21.0%	18.4%	7	23.2%	2.2%	13	\$ 3,438
NECHES ISD	40.4%	73	58.7%	47.4%	59	46.0%	-12.7%	31	\$ 8,938
NEDERLAND ISD	41.7%	704	43.7%	41.2%	665	40.6%	-3.2%	482	\$ 139,939
NEEDVILLE ISD	40.6%	400	50.1%	40.5%	406	47.6%	-2.5%	192	\$ 54,529
NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS INC.	90.9%	434	58.2%	100.0%	702	87.6%	29.4%	-	\$ -
NEIGHBORS UNITED FOR QUALITY EDUC/	58.4%	92	100.6%	64.4%	97	83.8%	-16.8%	-	\$ -
NEW BRAUNFELS ISD	42.3%	931	41.6%	36.4%	931	43.7%	2.1%	559	\$ 160,632
NEW CANEY ISD	64.3%	3,517	56.9%	64.5%	3,823	53.2%	-3.6%	1,204	\$ 352,753
NEW DEAL ISD	62.2%	261	93.5%	62.2%	294	95.2%	1.7%	-	\$ -
NEW DIANA ISD	41.8%	114	39.8%	39.4%	194	63.1%	23.3%	21	\$ 6,120
NEW FRONTIERS CHARTER SCHOOL, S.A.	89.4%	155	32.1%	87.3%	366	67.5%	35.3%	14	\$ 4,146
NEW HOME ISD	34.5%	29	37.0%	25.1%	24	36.5%	-0.5%	22	\$ 6,369
NEW SUMMERFIELD ISD	92.1%	284	69.8%	92.1%	258	61.3%	-8.5%	37	\$ 10,457
NEW WAVERLY ISD	54.1%	258	66.4%	53.2%	215	56.7%	-9.7%	51	\$ 14,329
NEWCASTLE ISD	52.4%	91	117.6%	65.9%	120	118.8%	1.3%	-	\$ -
NEWMAN INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF A	46.4%	50	22.7%	41.2%	160	27.8%	5.1%	242	\$ 65,987
NEWTON ISD	77.5%	408	66.7%	81.8%	542	78.1%	11.5%	-	\$ -
NIXON-SMILEY CONS ISD	80.3%	731	106.0%	82.7%	769	108.0%	1.9%	-	\$ -
NOCONA ISD	57.8%	197	61.3%	61.7%	188	58.2%	-3.1%	38	\$ 11,162
NORDHEIM ISD	52.3%	37	49.8%	63.8%	36	52.3%	2.5%	12	\$ 3,466
NORMANGEE ISD	56.8%	87	49.7%	55.3%	105	48.4%	-1.3%	47	\$ 13,184
NORTH EAST ISD	49.1%	9,106	36.1%	48.6%	9,654	38.3%	2.2%	7,996	\$ 2,347,307
NORTH HOPKINS ISD	67.1%	219	88.4%	63.6%	205	83.8%	-4.6%	-	\$ -
NORTH LAMAR ISD	50.6%	610	57.0%	49.3%	557	57.7%	0.7%	119	\$ 33,796
NORTH ZULCH ISD	64.8%	99	58.1%	100.0%	161	58.2%	0.1%	33	\$ 9,629
NORTHSIDE ISD-SAN ANTONIO	55.8%	19,239	45.5%	51.9%	18,128	46.3%	0.9%	9,273	\$ 2,752,271
NORTHSIDE ISD-VERNON	49.4%	31	45.3%	31.9%	24	41.9%	-3.4%	16	\$ 4,503
NORTHWEST ISD	22.6%	1,123	40.4%	20.1%	1,088	47.5%	7.1%	516	\$ 147,098
NOVA CHARTER SCHOOL (SOUTHEAST)	91.6%	177	35.4%	75.9%	165	35.5%	0.1%	161	\$ 48,519
NOVA SCHOOLS, WEST OAK CLIFF	92.5%	56	52.4%	100.0%	54	36.9%	-15.5%	49	\$ 14,714
NUECES CANYON CONS ISD	71.8%	102	66.5%	82.7%	108	71.1%	4.7%	-	\$ -
NURSERY ISD	58.5%	31	72.7%	65.4%	38	74.5%	1.8%	-	\$ -
NYOS CHARTER SCHOOL INC.	39.5%	81	35.7%	31.0%	73	49.5%	13.8%	30	\$ 8,768
OAKWOOD ISD	83.0%	108	92.8%	87.7%	128	91.1%	-1.7%	-	\$ -
ODEM-EDROY ISD	66.5%	184	35.3%	78.1%	209	35.3%	0.1%	205	\$ 59,139
O'DONNELL ISD	72.1%	113	70.8%	72.6%	110	69.7%	-1.1%	0	\$ 140
ODYSSEY 2020 ACADEMY, INC.	87.7%	285	60.4%	78.0%	402	66.4%	6.0%	22	\$ 6,478
OGLESBY ISD	70.7%	54	52.6%	65.0%	103	123.0%	70.4%	-	\$ -
OLFEN ISD	83.9%	43	86.6%	100.0%	63	96.3%	9.7%	-	\$ -
OLNEY ISD	67.5%	206	67.6%	65.9%	210	71.6%	4.0%	-	\$ -
OLTON ISD	73.6%	173	46.8%	72.6%	231	69.9%	23.1%	0	\$ 76
ONALASKA ISD	77.6%	519	91.4%	74.0%	446	81.6%	-9.8%	-	\$ -
ORANGE GROVE ISD	57.0%	674	81.2%	58.6%	731	85.0%	3.9%	-	\$ -
ORANGFIELD ISD	40.3%	281	53.8%	34.5%	219	47.3%	-6.5%	105	\$ 29,425
ORE CITY ISD	71.2%	249	52.7%	78.0%	259	48.3%	-4.4%	116	\$ 33,750
OVERTON ISD	56.5%	105	60.8%	64.4%	111	63.3%	2.5%	12	\$ 3,360
PADUCAH ISD	66.5%	85	80.9%	75.4%	82	92.5%	11.6%	-	\$ -
PAINT CREEK ISD	72.5%	77	106.0%	78.6%	89	99.0%	-7.0%	-	\$ -
PAINT ROCK ISD	68.5%	116	92.5%	79.7%	103	74.9%	-17.6%	-	\$ -
PALACIOS ISD	69.0%	516	68.0%	67.6%	721	92.9%	24.9%	-	\$ -
PALESTINE ISD	79.9%	1,086	53.6%	77.6%	1,184	58.9%	5.3%	223	\$ 65,183
PALMER ISD	64.7%	257	60.2%	52.0%	250	61.9%	1.7%	33	\$ 9,325

District	2013-2014			2016-2017			Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Additional Students if 70% Met	Additional Dollars if 70% Met
	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP			
PALO PINTO ISD	57.5%	44	92.2%	63.3%	46	79.8%	-12.4%	-	\$ -
PAMPA ISD	57.3%	1,177	74.8%	61.2%	1,144	72.7%	-2.0%	-	\$ -
PANHANDLE ISD	22.4%	46	54.8%	30.0%	65	53.9%	-0.9%	19	\$ 5,401
PANTHER CREEK CONS ISD	79.9%	66	70.9%	77.0%	73	75.7%	4.8%	-	\$ -
PARADISE ISD	31.6%	113	50.3%	32.3%	93	41.8%	-8.5%	63	\$ 17,824
PARIS ISD	79.1%	1,487	62.7%	92.5%	1,729	64.4%	1.7%	151	\$ 44,122
PARTNERSHIP TO ENSURE THE ACQUISIT	84.2%	134	50.1%	*	*	*	*	*	*
PASADENA ISD	76.5%	15,719	43.5%	74.8%	18,286	51.5%	8.0%	6,578	\$ 1,893,935
PATTON SPRINGS ISD	89.7%	54	71.3%	90.3%	57	74.2%	2.9%	-	\$ -
PAWNEE ISD	62.6%	66	77.7%	63.4%	55	81.8%	4.0%	-	\$ -
PEARLAND ISD	29.2%	1,828	41.6%	29.1%	1,807	40.1%	-1.5%	1,349	\$ 393,278
PEARSALL ISD	80.6%	940	62.3%	78.6%	1,195	90.4%	28.0%	-	\$ -
PEASTER ISD	35.6%	126	48.2%	36.2%	108	43.2%	-4.9%	67	\$ 18,907
PECOS-BARSTOW-TOYAH ISD	62.3%	830	84.0%	67.2%	973	82.4%	-1.7%	-	\$ -
PENELOPE ISD	78.2%	94	74.7%	72.3%	96	76.3%	1.5%	-	\$ -
PERRIN-WHITT CONS ISD	54.4%	71	51.0%	57.8%	81	52.4%	1.4%	27	\$ 7,865
PERRYTON ISD	57.3%	458	46.0%	62.5%	483	47.8%	1.8%	224	\$ 65,611
PETERSBURG ISD	75.6%	76	45.4%	75.4%	176	115.4%	70.0%	-	\$ -
PETROLIA ISD	46.0%	206	160.1%	52.5%	244	126.9%	-33.2%	-	\$ -
PETTUS ISD	60.1%	92	48.0%	73.1%	109	53.6%	5.6%	33	\$ 8,766
PEWITT CONS ISD	67.1%	277	51.7%	70.2%	275	56.3%	4.6%	67	\$ 19,119
PFLUGERVILLE ISD	52.8%	4,917	51.9%	51.0%	5,022	55.1%	3.1%	1,363	\$ 393,855
PHARR-SAN JUAN-ALAMO ISD	87.1%	21,018	96.2%	93.4%	15,232	65.2%	-31.1%	1,130	\$ 327,413
PHOENIX CHARTER SCHOOL	71.7%	176	47.8%	*	*	*	*	*	*
PILOT POINT ISD	54.5%	256	45.9%	57.2%	224	45.8%	-0.2%	118	\$ 33,421
PINE TREE ISD	64.2%	1,080	51.2%	66.6%	1,267	61.3%	10.1%	180	\$ 39,122
PINEYWOODS COMMUNITY ACADEMY	58.5%	112	33.2%	53.4%	122	35.9%	2.7%	116	\$ 33,021
PITTSBURG ISD	80.6%	740	52.1%	78.4%	654	46.5%	-5.7%	331	\$ 95,516
PLAINS ISD	71.1%	170	77.6%	49.1%	145	74.1%	-3.5%	-	\$ -
PLAINVIEW ISD	78.5%	2,914	91.2%	72.1%	2,841	87.5%	-3.6%	-	\$ -
PLANO ISD	30.0%	4,560	39.1%	28.8%	4,658	39.7%	0.6%	3,563	\$ 961,589
PLEASANT GROVE ISD	35.1%	160	43.6%	40.9%	170	39.4%	-4.2%	132	\$ 36,620
PLEASANTON ISD	65.5%	1,907	118.0%	64.2%	1,676	112.5%	-5.5%	-	\$ -
PLEMONS-STINNETT-PHILLIPS	50.1%	166	84.8%	37.6%	152	91.8%	7.0%	-	\$ -
POINT ISABEL ISD	83.8%	1,804	102.6%	100.0%	1,867	97.6%	-5.0%	-	\$ -
PONDER ISD	41.1%	210	52.9%	39.2%	191	45.6%	-7.4%	102	\$ 29,854
POOLVILLE ISD	53.8%	143	63.0%	55.9%	108	51.2%	-11.8%	40	\$ 11,419
POR VIDA ACAD CHARTER H S	73.6%	39	46.8%	65.7%	40	59.8%	13.0%	7	\$ 1,983
PORT ARANSAS ISD	40.9%	30	37.6%	32.0%	50	48.4%	10.8%	22	\$ 6,322
PORT ARTHUR ISD	87.2%	3,650	52.6%	76.8%	3,357	50.5%	-2.1%	1,293	\$ 353,773
PORT NECHES-GROVES ISD	40.5%	537	38.5%	38.1%	533	38.5%	0.0%	436	\$ 126,289
POST ISD	68.6%	98	29.5%	69.2%	110	33.7%	4.1%	119	\$ 33,858
POTEET ISD	73.7%	501	46.1%	75.9%	817	78.7%	32.6%	-	\$ -
POTH ISD	40.0%	125	43.4%	45.8%	123	46.9%	3.6%	60	\$ 16,985
POTTSBORO ISD	40.7%	313	70.4%	37.5%	248	62.4%	-8.0%	30	\$ 8,610
PRAIRIE LEA ISD	77.0%	98	88.8%	100.0%	176	95.2%	6.4%	-	\$ -
PRAIRIE VALLEY ISD	60.7%	38	62.7%	63.2%	43	64.6%	1.9%	4	\$ 1,033
PRAIRILAND ISD	59.7%	331	71.4%	54.9%	288	75.7%	4.2%	-	\$ -
PREMIER HIGH SCHOOL	65.1%	364	54.4%	54.7%	407	68.8%	14.4%	7	\$ 1,790
PREMIER LEARNING ACADEMY	76.4%	98	37.7%	*	*	*	*	*	*
PREMONT ISD	74.6%	335	96.5%	89.9%	367	94.3%	-2.2%	-	\$ -
PRESIDIO ISD	94.4%	857	70.1%	94.4%	596	53.6%	-16.5%	182	\$ 53,448
PRIDY ISD	68.6%	47	71.3%	75.7%	52	79.9%	8.6%	-	\$ -
PRINCETON ISD	63.7%	769	44.8%	63.0%	850	45.2%	0.3%	468	\$ 138,544
PRINGLE-MORSE CONS ISD	54.0%	46	87.8%	58.8%	64	95.4%	7.6%	-	\$ -
PRIORITY SYSTEMS, INC.	64.3%	191	54.2%	42.1%	245	86.4%	32.2%	-	\$ -
PROGRESO ISD	90.9%	1,645	97.0%	100.0%	1,288	81.2%	-15.8%	-	\$ -

District	2013-2014			2016-2017			Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Additional Students if 70% Met	Additional Dollars if 70% Met
	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP			
PROSPER ISD	13.1%	185	42.6%	7.3%	140	57.5%	15.0%	30	\$ 8,645
PRO-VISION EDUCATIONAL SERVICES	95.9%	225	94.9%	90.9%	124	58.6%	-36.3%	24	\$ 7,039
QUANAH ISD	76.1%	188	58.0%	81.6%	316	87.6%	29.7%	-	\$ -
QUEEN CITY ISD	55.9%	195	49.4%	57.6%	221	55.7%	6.3%	57	\$ 16,374
QUINLAN ISD	72.6%	681	56.2%	70.6%	570	47.4%	-8.8%	272	\$ 79,295
QUITMAN ISD	62.9%	301	61.3%	59.8%	326	71.9%	10.7%	-	\$ -
RAINS ISD	58.1%	397	55.6%	58.5%	410	58.2%	2.7%	83	\$ 24,154
RALLS ISD	89.2%	357	98.8%	100.0%	463	102.7%	4.0%	-	\$ -
RAMIREZ CSD	100.0%	20	85.9%	100.0%	25	96.1%	10.3%	-	\$ -
RANDOLPH FIELD ISD	12.1%	21	28.2%	*	*	*	*	*	*
RANGER ISD	76.1%	186	64.7%	76.2%	127	61.2%	-3.5%	18	\$ 5,394
RANKIN ISD	46.6%	44	57.1%	48.6%	81	94.8%	37.7%	-	\$ -
RAPOPORT ACADEMY	62.0%	210	53.1%	71.5%	249	55.1%	1.9%	68	\$ 18,992
RAYMONDVILLE ISD	88.8%	1,484	89.6%	100.0%	1,402	87.5%	-2.1%	-	\$ -
REAGAN COUNTY ISD	58.5%	250	69.4%	63.1%	299	73.3%	4.0%	-	\$ -
RECONCILIATION ACADEMY, INC.	97.1%	25	17.0%	94.0%	94	19.7%	2.7%	240	\$ 70,331
RED OAK ISD	44.0%	911	45.2%	52.6%	580	41.1%	-4.1%	408	\$ 101,405
REFUGIO ISD	65.4%	150	47.8%	67.0%	164	51.5%	3.7%	59	\$ 16,681
RICARDO ISD	58.4%	156	45.7%	60.6%	157	43.4%	-2.3%	96	\$ 27,122
RICE CONS ISD	79.1%	430	57.8%	77.9%	430	56.6%	-1.2%	102	\$ 29,172
RICE ISD	71.0%	246	50.8%	73.2%	211	42.2%	-8.6%	139	\$ 39,511
RICHARD MILBURN ACADEMY TEXAS, INC	*	*	*	72.5%	162	51.1%	*	60	\$ 17,634
RICHARDS ISD	63.3%	45	68.6%	75.8%	47	55.0%	-13.6%	13	\$ 3,859
RICHARDSON ISD	57.3%	7,717	47.0%	54.9%	6,070	38.5%	-8.5%	4,964	\$ 1,450,127
RICHLAND SPRINGS ISD	50.8%	46	80.1%	55.4%	36	70.5%	-9.6%	-	\$ -
RIESEL ISD	46.7%	81	38.3%	42.1%	96	47.3%	9.0%	46	\$ 12,955
RIO GRANDE CITY ISD	91.3%	8,119	101.0%	96.8%	8,027	89.5%	-11.5%	-	\$ -
RIO HONDO ISD	82.4%	1,406	87.2%	91.3%	1,374	85.6%	-1.6%	-	\$ -
RIO VISTA ISD	47.5%	147	55.1%	52.8%	165	61.1%	6.0%	24	\$ 6,800
RISING STAR ISD	81.6%	63	52.7%	70.9%	73	80.8%	28.1%	-	\$ -
RIVER ROAD ISD	67.0%	593	77.4%	66.1%	452	68.7%	-8.7%	9	\$ 2,476
RIVERCREST ISD	61.5%	201	60.4%	56.8%	152	56.7%	-3.7%	36	\$ 9,995
RIVERWALK EDUCATION FOUNDATION, I	55.8%	262	37.2%	53.9%	209	38.2%	1.0%	174	\$ 49,561
RIVERWALK EDUCATION FOUNDATION, I	*	*	*	46.9%	129	34.0%	*	136	\$ 38,486
RIVIERA ISD	58.5%	78	39.3%	69.0%	84	38.7%	-0.6%	68	\$ 18,398
ROBERT LEE ISD	60.3%	72	75.1%	61.2%	79	80.3%	5.2%	-	\$ -
ROBINSON ISD	34.3%	242	43.3%	35.1%	239	45.0%	1.6%	133	\$ 37,411
ROBSTOWN ISD	90.9%	2,118	97.3%	100.0%	1,811	81.2%	-16.1%	-	\$ -
ROBY CONS ISD	56.9%	71	82.1%	56.4%	71	88.6%	6.5%	-	\$ -
ROCHELLE ISD	76.0%	99	82.2%	90.2%	108	81.4%	-0.7%	-	\$ -
ROCKDALE ISD	73.8%	476	55.9%	70.5%	525	63.9%	8.1%	50	\$ 14,456
ROCKSPRINGS ISD	75.1%	128	81.5%	75.0%	125	84.4%	2.8%	-	\$ -
ROCKWALL ISD	25.5%	1,131	41.4%	26.5%	1,426	47.3%	5.9%	685	\$ 200,224
ROGERS ISD	54.1%	167	62.9%	50.1%	148	52.4%	-10.5%	50	\$ 13,754
ROMA ISD	91.4%	4,588	94.3%	100.0%	4,840	87.0%	-7.3%	-	\$ -
ROOSEVELT ISD	75.8%	562	84.3%	77.1%	522	87.0%	2.7%	-	\$ -
ROPEVILLE ISD	46.3%	58	52.5%	45.3%	47	41.6%	-10.9%	32	\$ 9,150
ROSCOE ISD	52.0%	102	52.4%	47.8%	99	47.9%	-4.5%	46	\$ 13,334
ROSEBUD-LOTT ISD	72.3%	252	74.5%	74.1%	247	73.2%	-1.3%	-	\$ -
ROTAN ISD	70.8%	158	112.1%	58.7%	89	100.1%	-12.1%	-	\$ -
ROUND ROCK ISD	29.1%	4,969	50.3%	29.2%	5,107	51.7%	1.4%	1,809	\$ 512,165
ROUND TOP-CARMINE ISD	33.0%	41	53.8%	39.5%	34	43.1%	-10.7%	21	\$ 5,892
ROXTON ISD	80.0%	66	80.3%	77.8%	85	82.8%	2.5%	-	\$ -
ROYAL ISD	81.8%	720	49.5%	83.4%	743	53.3%	3.8%	233	\$ 66,596
ROYSE CITY ISD	41.8%	753	50.3%	38.8%	626	44.5%	-5.9%	360	\$ 100,980
RULE ISD	75.0%	80	102.4%	87.1%	101	109.2%	6.8%	-	\$ -
RUNGE ISD	76.6%	205	111.4%	92.0%	210	101.4%	-10.0%	-	\$ -

District	2013-2014			2016-2017			Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Additional Students if 70% Met	Additional Dollars if 70% Met
	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP			
RUSK ISD	60.6%	754	72.4%	64.1%	712	69.5%	-2.9%	5	\$ 1,418
S AND S CISD	50.6%	248	69.7%	54.9%	257	70.8%	1.1%	-	\$ -
SABINAL ISD	69.4%	87	30.5%	76.1%	134	42.9%	12.5%	84	\$ 25,080
SABINE ISD	45.2%	224	49.1%	48.7%	279	52.5%	3.3%	93	\$ 27,268
SABINE PASS ISD	59.4%	115	68.4%	61.3%	108	64.7%	-3.7%	9	\$ 2,430
SAINT JO ISD	48.2%	69	80.4%	51.5%	72	79.4%	-0.9%	-	\$ -
SALADO ISD	27.4%	110	39.1%	26.7%	97	36.8%	-2.4%	88	\$ 24,653
SALTILLO ISD	69.1%	117	87.0%	69.4%	116	87.3%	0.4%	-	\$ -
SAM RAYBURN ISD	45.0%	103	59.4%	44.2%	95	55.9%	-3.5%	24	\$ 6,669
SAN ANGELO ISD	62.3%	4,722	75.1%	59.7%	4,324	71.1%	-4.0%	-	\$ -
SAN ANTONIO ISD	90.9%	35,995	88.1%	96.5%	38,354	94.1%	6.0%	-	\$ -
SAN AUGUSTINE ISD	91.4%	399	67.9%	100.0%	416	66.8%	-1.1%	20	\$ 5,843
SAN BENITO CONS ISD	85.1%	5,688	68.9%	100.0%	5,922	64.1%	-4.7%	540	\$ 169,124
SAN DIEGO ISD	87.8%	427	47.2%	87.7%	444	44.4%	-2.8%	256	\$ 72,749
SAN ELIZARIO ISD	94.9%	2,284	65.2%	100.0%	2,316	67.5%	2.3%	86	\$ 26,179
SAN FELIPE-DEL RIO	73.1%	4,848	73.1%	71.4%	2,564	42.6%	-30.5%	1,647	\$ 489,118
SAN ISIDRO ISD	87.6%	211	99.5%	86.1%	187	97.3%	-2.2%	-	\$ -
SAN MARCOS CONS ISD	71.4%	2,445	56.0%	70.4%	2,450	56.2%	0.2%	601	\$ 175,381
SAN PERLITA ISD	72.0%	181	97.9%	84.7%	208	98.6%	0.8%	-	\$ -
SAN SABA ISD	63.6%	224	71.7%	63.8%	223	75.2%	3.5%	-	\$ -
SANDS ISD	58.0%	61	71.9%	50.6%	60	65.6%	-6.4%	4	\$ 1,145
SANFORD-FRITCH ISD	49.3%	130	54.4%	37.6%	112	57.1%	2.8%	25	\$ 7,292
SANGER ISD	46.2%	413	49.0%	41.3%	398	45.1%	-3.9%	219	\$ 62,628
SANTA ANNA ISD	71.8%	88	65.9%	72.6%	99	73.7%	7.8%	-	\$ -
SANTA FE ISD	41.7%	546	54.1%	39.4%	617	61.6%	7.5%	84	\$ 24,137
SANTA GERTRUDIS ISD	38.8%	86	54.2%	30.9%	83	48.1%	-6.1%	38	\$ 10,977
SANTA MARIA ISD	94.2%	527	88.7%	100.0%	580	105.4%	16.6%	-	\$ -
SANTA ROSA ISD	89.8%	913	103.8%	100.0%	744	81.9%	-22.0%	-	\$ -
SANTO ISD	44.2%	113	68.3%	48.7%	105	61.5%	-6.8%	15	\$ 4,156
SAVOY ISD	53.9%	61	61.9%	44.9%	66	68.4%	6.5%	2	\$ 434
SCHERTZ-CIBOLO-U CITY ISD	28.8%	1,112	43.2%	30.4%	1,183	41.7%	-1.6%	804	\$ 229,244
SCHLEICHER ISD	48.8%	104	56.6%	59.5%	158	69.1%	12.5%	2	\$ 603
SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE ED	82.5%	740	76.2%	100.0%	495	66.3%	-9.9%	27	\$ 8,273
SCHULENBURG ISD	59.9%	201	66.9%	56.4%	180	62.4%	-4.4%	22	\$ 6,265
SCURRY-ROSSER ISD	47.0%	169	51.3%	44.1%	172	57.4%	6.0%	38	\$ 10,679
SEAGRAVES ISD	65.1%	204	69.4%	67.8%	192	72.1%	2.7%	-	\$ -
SEALY ISD	55.5%	502	41.6%	56.5%	585	47.0%	5.4%	287	\$ 81,871
SEGUIN ISD	67.5%	2,929	79.7%	62.4%	2,683	75.7%	-4.0%	-	\$ -
SEMINOLE ISD	48.5%	432	45.1%	53.1%	495	44.8%	-0.3%	278	\$ 78,145
SER-NINOS SCH.	97.0%	250	31.8%	96.4%	236	29.2%	-2.6%	329	\$ 109,958
SEYMOUR ISD	57.8%	117	50.7%	62.2%	223	81.8%	31.0%	-	\$ -
SHALLOWATER ISD	48.5%	301	63.3%	42.7%	373	67.6%	4.3%	13	\$ 2,986
SHAMROCK ISD	58.7%	85	46.9%	66.9%	94	46.5%	-0.4%	47	\$ 13,067
SHARYLAND ISD	62.2%	2,277	46.3%	63.3%	2,068	44.9%	-1.5%	1,157	\$ 335,311
SHEKINAH LEARNING INSTITUTE	67.7%	358	52.2%	76.4%	98	40.8%	-11.4%	70	\$ 20,876
SHELBYVILLE ISD	65.6%	192	48.7%	70.1%	193	47.4%	-1.3%	92	\$ 26,477
SHELDON ISD	76.7%	3,791	74.0%	82.5%	4,227	77.3%	3.3%	-	\$ -
SHEPHERD ISD	70.5%	558	49.6%	75.0%	543	46.1%	-3.5%	282	\$ 80,922
SHERMAN ISD	66.4%	2,675	67.3%	67.5%	2,556	63.8%	-3.4%	247	\$ 71,936
SHINER ISD	34.7%	79	50.6%	33.9%	79	54.0%	3.4%	23	\$ 6,717
SIDNEY ISD	69.6%	40	54.3%	60.6%	22	41.0%	-13.4%	16	\$ 4,463
SIERRA BLANCA ISD	68.0%	52	76.6%	91.1%	97	112.1%	35.5%	-	\$ -
SILSBEE ISD	59.8%	763	68.2%	54.4%	680	59.2%	-8.9%	124	\$ 35,299
SILVERTON ISD	59.5%	69	79.3%	54.0%	39	51.7%	-27.6%	14	\$ 4,019
SIMMS ISD	55.6%	100	48.1%	52.6%	82	47.1%	-1.0%	40	\$ 11,418
SINTON ISD	75.6%	589	45.2%	74.5%	577	47.3%	2.0%	278	\$ 80,777
SIVELLS BEND ISD	71.0%	26	66.9%	81.7%	47	86.7%	19.8%	-	\$ -

District	2013-2014			2016-2017			Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Additional Students if 70% Met	Additional Dollars if 70% Met
	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP			
SKIDMORE-TYNAN ISD	58.6%	189	57.5%	59.5%	249	67.7%	10.2%	8	\$ 2,356
SLATON ISD	76.0%	591	76.5%	80.6%	643	86.5%	10.0%	-	\$ -
SLIDELL ISD	55.0%	84	84.9%	57.2%	95	78.8%	-6.1%	-	\$ -
SLOCUM ISD	48.2%	82	56.8%	48.8%	91	71.0%	14.2%	-	\$ -
SMITHVILLE ISD	60.8%	531	61.2%	64.3%	495	58.4%	-2.8%	99	\$ 28,128
SMYER ISD	58.1%	148	73.2%	70.3%	165	70.7%	-2.5%	-	\$ -
SNOOK ISD	70.0%	150	54.1%	70.4%	175	67.1%	13.1%	7	\$ 2,133
SNYDER ISD	62.1%	943	80.7%	60.3%	822	72.8%	-7.9%	-	\$ -
SOCORRO ISD	71.0%	22,626	92.4%	71.4%	21,625	96.5%	4.2%	-	\$ -
SOMERSET ISD	82.6%	1,748	66.5%	75.6%	1,672	63.8%	-2.7%	164	\$ 45,357
SOMERVILLE ISD	73.8%	210	66.6%	81.6%	173	58.7%	-7.9%	33	\$ 9,522
SONORA ISD	52.1%	287	80.7%	58.2%	287	84.7%	4.0%	-	\$ -
SOUTH PLAINS ACADEMY	74.0%	28	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
SOUTH SAN ANTONIO ISD	89.0%	5,407	70.1%	91.1%	5,496	71.0%	1.0%	-	\$ -
SOUTH TEXAS EDUCATIONAL TECH	75.4%	366	58.7%	83.4%	559	65.8%	7.1%	36	\$ 10,898
SOUTH TEXAS ISD	61.0%	801	72.9%	55.7%	807	72.2%	-0.7%	-	\$ -
SOUTHLAND ISD	83.2%	108	88.1%	82.8%	121	100.2%	12.1%	-	\$ -
SOUTHSIDE ISD	77.2%	2,681	77.1%	71.1%	2,772	74.4%	-2.7%	-	\$ -
SOUTHWEST HIGH SCHOOL	93.6%	449	47.5%	93.4%	356	45.8%	-1.7%	188	\$ 60,088
SOUTHWEST ISD	84.9%	5,600	57.8%	83.8%	5,229	53.2%	-4.6%	1,651	\$ 482,527
SOUTHWEST PREPARATORY SCHOOL	78.2%	87	29.6%	76.2%	182	40.6%	11.0%	132	\$ 38,724
SPEARMAN ISD	59.8%	133	35.7%	63.3%	136	34.7%	-1.1%	139	\$ 38,934
SPLENDORA ISD	64.3%	1,340	76.5%	57.4%	1,249	71.7%	-4.8%	-	\$ -
SPRING BRANCH ISD	58.9%	9,146	52.3%	60.9%	8,603	49.3%	-3.0%	3,603	\$ 962,424
SPRING CREEK ISD	59.3%	38	73.8%	21.0%	9	50.2%	-23.7%	4	\$ 1,008
SPRING HILL ISD	36.8%	210	45.4%	43.6%	286	48.2%	2.9%	129	\$ 37,448
SPRING ISD	67.3%	13,583	61.2%	72.4%	14,907	65.6%	4.4%	988	\$ 288,671
SPRINGLAKE-EARTH ISD	62.3%	156	83.8%	73.3%	147	74.1%	-9.7%	-	\$ -
SPRINGTOWN ISD	56.2%	543	40.9%	54.6%	432	33.9%	-7.0%	460	\$ 131,341
SPUR ISD	55.1%	105	80.4%	56.1%	102	77.4%	-3.0%	-	\$ -
SPURGER ISD	60.6%	111	66.7%	65.2%	118	64.3%	-2.5%	11	\$ 3,065
ST ANTHONY ACADEMY	61.0%	55	44.1%	63.3%	57	39.0%	-5.1%	45	\$ 12,100
ST MARY ACADEMY	78.7%	170	62.4%	80.4%	162	57.7%	-4.7%	35	\$ 9,595
STAFFORD MSD	67.5%	1,367	71.1%	66.7%	1,141	62.5%	-8.6%	137	\$ 39,978
STAMFORD ISD	72.1%	416	113.1%	66.4%	373	125.9%	12.7%	-	\$ -
STANTON ISD	61.7%	151	46.0%	58.9%	148	40.5%	-5.5%	107	\$ 31,307
STAR ISD	88.5%	32	81.5%	*	*	*	*	*	*
STEPHENVILLE ISD	48.6%	650	47.2%	45.4%	554	45.1%	-2.1%	307	\$ 89,947
STEPPING STONES CHARTER EL	85.9%	54	26.3%	96.2%	80	23.8%	-2.5%	156	\$ 46,541
STERLING CITY ISD	44.6%	39	42.0%	45.4%	32	42.5%	0.5%	21	\$ 5,867
STOCKDALE ISD	53.6%	309	98.3%	54.0%	283	95.4%	-2.9%	-	\$ -
STRATFORD ISD	64.8%	132	41.7%	59.7%	111	41.1%	-0.6%	78	\$ 22,250
STRAWN ISD	61.5%	68	80.5%	62.0%	76	93.6%	13.2%	-	\$ -
SUDAN ISD	60.7%	140	67.4%	56.6%	130	62.5%	-4.9%	16	\$ 2,968
SULPHUR BLUFF ISD	43.7%	43	53.7%	54.4%	67	73.8%	20.1%	-	\$ -
SULPHUR SPRINGS ISD	64.7%	1,257	56.4%	66.4%	1,238	54.4%	-2.0%	355	\$ 99,980
SUMMIT INTERNATIONAL PREPARATORY	76.3%	967	65.0%	*	*	*	*	*	*
SUNDOWN ISD	31.0%	75	53.1%	43.7%	94	51.6%	-1.5%	33	\$ 9,691
SUNNYVALE ISD	11.4%	29	26.1%	16.5%	69	34.0%	7.9%	73	\$ 21,001
SUNRAY ISD	60.2%	85	59.7%	57.6%	134	72.9%	13.2%	-	\$ -
SUSTAINABLE EDUCATION SOLUTIONS	*	*	*	90.0%	87	56.9%	*	20	\$ 5,834
SWEENEY ISD	53.9%	391	50.5%	53.0%	412	54.5%	4.1%	117	\$ 33,388
SWEET HOME ISD	18.5%	10	44.1%	15.6%	8	50.5%	6.4%	3	\$ 847
SWEETWATER ISD	68.8%	1,195	100.7%	70.6%	1,110	83.3%	-17.4%	-	\$ -
TAFT ISD	78.2%	745	105.6%	78.6%	728	105.9%	0.3%	-	\$ -
TAHOKA ISD	64.0%	309	122.3%	58.4%	228	108.6%	-13.7%	-	\$ -
TARKINGTON ISD	51.8%	465	61.8%	50.0%	416	60.1%	-1.7%	69	\$ 19,970

District	2013-2014			2016-2017			Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Additional Students if 70% Met	Additional Dollars if 70% Met
	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP			
TATUM ISD	57.2%	372	47.8%	58.5%	429	55.3%	7.5%	114	\$ 33,440
TAYLOR ISD	65.2%	1,245	75.4%	62.1%	1,124	76.0%	0.6%	-	\$ -
TEAGUE ISD	53.0%	311	65.6%	57.6%	345	65.8%	0.2%	22	\$ 6,419
TEJANO CENTER FOR COMMUNITY CONC	96.9%	381	33.8%	96.5%	604	52.0%	18.2%	209	\$ 61,588
TEKOA CHARTER SCHOOL	84.5%	239	86.6%	100.0%	367	81.0%	-5.6%	-	\$ -
TEMPLE ISD	77.6%	2,834	54.6%	78.1%	2,706	56.2%	1.6%	667	\$ 192,745
TENAHA ISD	85.1%	229	55.0%	91.9%	260	56.7%	1.7%	61	\$ 17,982
TERLINGUA CSD	71.3%	30	*	77.1%	27	*	*	*	*
TERRELL COUNTY ISD	35.8%	23	*	50.7%	36	*	*	*	*
TERRELL ISD	80.6%	1,394	54.4%	76.9%	1,332	53.8%	-0.6%	400	\$ 113,764
TEXANS CAN ACADEMIES	91.8%	898	103.7%	63.9%	869	90.7%	-13.0%	-	\$ -
TEXARKANA ISD	67.5%	3,798	66.4%	70.5%	3,626	59.1%	-7.3%	672	\$ 189,055
TEXAS CITY ISD	73.9%	1,969	57.3%	72.3%	3,025	58.9%	1.6%	573	\$ 167,215
TEXAS COLLEGE PREPARATORY ACADEMI	30.1%	343	39.2%	34.5%	684	37.6%	-1.6%	589	\$ 123,962
TEXAS EMPOWERMENT ACADEMY	82.1%	107	70.2%	78.0%	132	67.6%	-2.6%	5	\$ 1,377
TEXAS SERENITY ACADEMY (CONROE,TX)	88.1%	179	57.1%	99.2%	308	74.8%	17.7%	-	\$ -
TEXHOMA ISD	64.4%	57	61.4%	67.4%	40	55.8%	-5.6%	10	\$ 2,793
TEXLINE ISD	62.3%	44	56.0%	56.1%	56	74.3%	18.3%	-	\$ -
THE BETA FOUNDATION	*	*	*	66.5%	33	17.5%	*	100	\$ 27,632
THE BRAZOS SCH INQ & CREATIVITY	93.9%	222	58.5%	92.3%	158	59.3%	0.7%	29	\$ 8,331
THE EDUCATION CENTER	70.1%	112	44.0%	79.1%	123	61.5%	17.5%	17	\$ 4,908
THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER ,II	100.0%	425	101.5%	100.0%	293	101.0%	-0.5%	-	\$ -
THE RHODES SCHOOL	58.1%	143	65.0%	70.2%	372	67.1%	2.1%	16	\$ 3,724
THORNDALE ISD	46.5%	111	45.4%	52.6%	132	57.7%	12.3%	28	\$ 7,593
THRALL ISD	40.9%	65	37.1%	31.9%	85	63.0%	25.9%	9	\$ 2,768
THREE RIVERS ISD	52.6%	132	45.9%	68.8%	188	55.6%	9.7%	49	\$ 13,756
THREE WAY ISD	78.7%	31	72.5%	79.7%	56	73.8%	1.3%	-	\$ -
THROCKMORTON ISD	50.5%	86	72.3%	63.5%	46	82.2%	9.9%	-	\$ -
TIDEHAVEN ISD	68.5%	242	57.1%	67.7%	245	52.3%	-4.8%	83	\$ 23,748
TIMPSON ISD	74.4%	303	78.0%	67.1%	305	83.2%	5.2%	-	\$ -
TIOGA ISD	56.7%	72	54.8%	39.7%	102	62.3%	7.5%	13	\$ 3,564
TLC ACADEMY	46.6%	122	33.5%	48.6%	359	42.2%	8.7%	236	\$ 66,470
TOLAR ISD	25.0%	49	40.5%	28.4%	66	50.4%	9.9%	26	\$ 7,294
TOM BEAN ISD	43.4%	129	51.8%	46.3%	137	59.2%	7.4%	25	\$ 7,121
TOMBALL ISD	24.7%	919	42.4%	22.8%	1,017	41.7%	-0.7%	690	\$ 200,017
TORNILLO ISD	97.0%	438	37.4%	100.0%	287	27.5%	-9.9%	445	\$ 136,925
TRENT ISD	43.7%	34	57.6%	53.6%	53	84.1%	26.5%	-	\$ -
TRENTON ISD	41.6%	122	69.7%	42.2%	111	68.3%	-1.4%	3	\$ 789
TRINIDAD ISD	75.5%	82	68.6%	83.3%	83	71.9%	3.3%	-	\$ -
TRINITY BASIN PREPARATORY	90.0%	285	23.8%	89.3%	539	28.4%	4.6%	792	\$ 237,941
TRINITY ISD	68.1%	540	87.6%	76.6%	670	102.7%	15.1%	-	\$ -
TROUP ISD	54.8%	363	77.6%	57.3%	473	111.2%	33.6%	-	\$ -
TROY ISD	51.7%	310	56.4%	51.0%	301	51.8%	-4.6%	106	\$ 29,455
TULIA ISD	76.3%	374	57.6%	77.2%	426	64.2%	6.6%	39	\$ 11,298
TULOSO-MIDWAY ISD	51.4%	1,027	84.8%	54.3%	1,218	98.0%	13.2%	-	\$ -
TURKEY-QUITAQUE ISD	58.5%	51	60.3%	51.0%	47	57.6%	-2.7%	10	\$ 2,813
TWO DIMENSIONS PREPARATORY ACADE	95.3%	452	112.5%	94.7%	404	110.7%	-1.8%	-	\$ -
TYLER ISD	73.8%	5,077	46.2%	70.4%	4,590	44.7%	-1.5%	2,598	\$ 771,100
UMEP Inc.	15.7%	*	*	28.9%	31	28.5%	*	46	\$ 12,723
UNION GROVE ISD	46.3%	110	42.5%	46.4%	113	46.3%	3.8%	58	\$ 16,568
UNION HILL ISD	66.5%	97	56.4%	67.9%	87	49.5%	-6.9%	36	\$ 9,442
UNITED ISD	76.6%	17,513	71.7%	82.9%	18,921	69.1%	-2.6%	243	\$ 72,455
UNIVERSAL ACADEMY	95.1%	237	44.2%	89.6%	217	42.4%	-1.8%	141	\$ 41,334
UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON CHARTER	35.5%	19	52.4%	33.1%	17	43.1%	-9.3%	11	\$ 2,989
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN	52.0%	62	44.8%	57.0%	65	46.3%	1.5%	33	\$ 9,116
UPLIFT EDUCATION	85.3%	686	50.0%	*	*	*	*	*	*
UPLIFT EDUCATION-NORTH HILLS PREPAI	27.5%	141	39.8%	75.2%	3,722	42.8%	3.1%	2,361	\$ 703,081

District	2013-2014			2016-2017			Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Additional Students if 70% Met	Additional Dollars if 70% Met
	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP			
UPLIFT FORT WORTH, CDC	63.1%	96	35.6%	*	*	*	*	*	*
UT TYLER INNOVATION ACADEMY	*	*	*	28.0%	39	*	*	*	*
UTOPIA ISD	47.7%	46	60.6%	46.0%	34	55.0%	-5.7%	9	\$ 2,623
UVALDE CONS ISD	81.7%	1,955	64.6%	81.4%	1,440	50.6%	-14.0%	552	\$ 163,429
VALENTINE ISD	87.1%	23	*	71.7%	29	*	*	*	*
VALLEY MILLS ISD	64.4%	156	53.1%	57.3%	139	52.1%	-1.0%	48	\$ 13,807
VALLEY VIEW ISD-PHARR	97.9%	4,126	101.5%	85.8%	3,475	99.7%	-1.7%	-	\$ -
VALLEY VIEW ISD-VALLEY VIEW	49.1%	120	45.9%	46.0%	140	53.1%	7.2%	44	\$ 13,011
VAN ALSTYNE ISD	31.8%	145	59.5%	29.9%	116	38.5%	-21.0%	95	\$ 26,764
VAN ISD	59.7%	523	52.8%	51.1%	451	49.5%	-3.3%	187	\$ 53,500
VAN VLECK ISD	57.4%	353	92.9%	53.8%	330	83.1%	-9.8%	-	\$ -
VANGUARD ACADEMY	81.5%	579	39.6%	82.2%	689	35.5%	-4.1%	668	\$ 184,027
VARNETT SCHOOLS, INC. (THE)	94.6%	735	55.2%	85.8%	600	57.4%	2.2%	132	\$ 42,945
VEGA ISD	34.1%	65	86.5%	34.3%	66	94.5%	8.0%	-	\$ -
VENUS ISD	71.0%	778	66.5%	72.9%	799	62.7%	-3.8%	93	\$ 26,971
VERIBEST ISD	46.6%	58	53.4%	48.8%	56	51.2%	-2.2%	21	\$ 5,617
VERNON ISD	70.5%	464	46.5%	61.2%	713	76.2%	29.7%	-	\$ -
VICTORIA ISD	62.8%	2,435	36.4%	66.2%	2,736	39.6%	3.2%	2,099	\$ 603,824
VICTORY PREPARATORY	73.6%	206	81.9%	*	*	*	*	*	*
VIDOR ISD	60.7%	1,260	57.8%	50.1%	1,152	60.7%	2.9%	177	\$ 50,728
VILLAGE TECH SCHOOL	25.7%	37	34.2%	32.7%	13	22.4%	-11.8%	27	\$ 6,893
VYSEHRAD ISD	45.4%	24	48.6%	45.7%	25	54.7%	6.1%	7	\$ 2,051
WACO ISD	89.0%	6,638	58.6%	83.5%	6,438	61.0%	2.4%	951	\$ 285,717
WAELEDER ISD	92.2%	154	71.3%	89.7%	107	48.5%	-22.9%	47	\$ 13,639
WALCOTT ISD	69.0%	66	72.8%	61.6%	66	93.3%	20.5%	-	\$ -
WALIPP PREPARATORY ACADEMY	72.8%	42	47.2%	100.0%	92	56.0%	8.8%	23	\$ 6,893
WALL ISD	18.3%	69	48.6%	17.3%	66	49.7%	1.1%	27	\$ 7,703
WALLER ISD	67.3%	1,811	57.2%	66.3%	1,793	50.9%	-6.3%	672	\$ 192,903
WALNUT BEND ISD	74.4%	55	100.0%	100.0%	65	103.5%	3.5%	-	\$ -
WALNUT SPRINGS ISD	88.4%	89	71.9%	86.4%	103	75.0%	3.2%	-	\$ -
WARREN ISD	49.1%	374	94.4%	51.8%	384	86.5%	-7.9%	-	\$ -
WASKOM ISD	62.1%	225	52.1%	62.3%	174	41.2%	-10.9%	122	\$ 33,596
WATER VALLEY ISD	48.3%	79	77.0%	58.9%	98	64.8%	-12.2%	8	\$ 2,195
WAXAHACHIE ISD	50.3%	1,487	52.3%	48.5%	1,326	44.9%	-7.4%	741	\$ 197,130
WAYSIDE SCHOOLS	56.0%	99	29.4%	57.2%	182	30.8%	1.4%	231	\$ 68,758
WEATHERFORD ISD	45.9%	1,076	41.8%	45.8%	978	42.4%	0.5%	638	\$ 178,393
WEBB CONS ISD	63.6%	184	47.7%	75.4%	132	64.5%	16.8%	11	\$ 3,495
WEIMAR ISD	56.7%	107	44.8%	55.3%	107	47.1%	2.3%	52	\$ 14,696
WELLINGTON ISD	59.1%	106	42.6%	58.8%	111	43.1%	0.5%	69	\$ 19,807
WELLMAN-UNION CISD	60.6%	66	55.3%	64.8%	83	54.5%	-0.9%	24	\$ 6,522
WELLS ISD	66.9%	104	64.6%	67.7%	101	68.8%	4.2%	2	\$ 500
WESLACO ISD	87.5%	12,333	104.3%	99.2%	12,370	96.3%	-8.0%	-	\$ -
WEST HARDIN COUNTY CONS I	54.6%	139	59.8%	52.9%	138	59.9%	0.2%	23	\$ 6,560
WEST HOUSTON CHARTER ALLIANCE, INC	23.2%	15	25.2%	17.3%	29	40.0%	14.8%	22	\$ 6,390
WEST ISD	62.5%	233	44.4%	46.6%	208	52.3%	7.9%	71	\$ 19,989
WEST ORANGE-COVE CONS ISD	84.3%	1,084	63.7%	89.9%	1,428	84.3%	20.5%	-	\$ -
WEST OSO ISD	82.9%	759	58.5%	87.9%	860	59.9%	1.4%	146	\$ 43,087
WEST RUSK ISD	69.5%	234	47.2%	77.4%	369	59.1%	12.0%	68	\$ 19,593
WEST SABINE ISD	78.1%	224	50.9%	75.9%	221	55.6%	4.6%	57	\$ 17,204
WESTBROOK ISD	37.8%	54	65.2%	*	*	*	*	*	*
WESTHOFF ISD	52.9%	26	83.8%	63.9%	37	95.6%	11.8%	-	\$ -
WESTPHALIA ISD	17.7%	7	30.5%	24.4%	6	20.0%	-10.4%	16	\$ 4,416
WESTWOOD ISD	61.6%	416	53.5%	85.6%	718	69.2%	15.6%	9	\$ 2,579
WHARTON ISD	84.2%	552	43.2%	86.7%	637	49.1%	5.9%	272	\$ 80,127
WHEELER ISD	59.3%	111	57.3%	53.9%	121	67.8%	10.5%	4	\$ 1,075
WHITE DEER ISD	50.5%	79	59.9%	50.4%	81	60.8%	0.9%	12	\$ 3,436
WHITE OAK ISD	37.4%	173	44.2%	42.5%	199	44.1%	-0.1%	117	\$ 33,937

District	2013-2014			2016-2017			Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Additional Students if 70% Met	Additional Dollars if 70% Met
	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP			
WHITE SETTLEMENT ISD	53.2%	1,114	37.7%	59.0%	1,099	36.4%	-1.3%	1,015	\$ 281,298
WHITEFACE CONS ISD	55.5%	77	48.8%	55.6%	160	120.1%	71.4%	-	\$ -
WHITEHOUSE ISD	39.5%	745	54.8%	43.8%	831	57.7%	2.9%	176	\$ 51,553
WHITESBORO ISD	53.6%	302	51.2%	59.5%	375	47.3%	-3.9%	180	\$ 49,420
WHITEWRIGHT ISD	46.8%	177	63.6%	45.7%	162	61.1%	-2.5%	24	\$ 6,751
WHITHARRAL ISD	50.4%	18	37.6%	31.8%	12	27.4%	-10.2%	18	\$ 5,187
WHITNEY ISD	61.0%	354	48.6%	61.7%	398	55.4%	6.8%	105	\$ 30,215
WICHITA FALLS ISD	59.2%	4,570	68.7%	61.7%	3,937	60.7%	-8.0%	606	\$ 176,169
WILDORADO ISD	37.8%	18	70.4%	30.5%	16	76.2%	5.8%	-	\$ -
WILLIAMS PREPARATORY	91.1%	580	33.7%	*	*	*	*	*	*
WILLIS ISD	63.8%	2,548	76.2%	60.9%	2,309	68.0%	-8.2%	67	\$ 19,487
WILLS POINT ISD	64.4%	581	45.7%	65.5%	575	51.7%	6.0%	204	\$ 58,729
WILSON ISD	64.5%	42	52.3%	83.9%	82	103.2%	50.9%	-	\$ -
WIMBERLEY ISD	32.9%	202	43.3%	23.3%	144	34.0%	-9.3%	152	\$ 43,417
WINDTHORST ISD	46.7%	82	53.4%	43.3%	47	41.6%	-11.8%	32	\$ 8,727
WINFIELD ISD	93.7%	98	72.1%	91.9%	119	80.9%	8.8%	-	\$ -
WINK-LOVING ISD	21.1%	46	52.0%	36.0%	48	49.8%	-2.2%	19	\$ 5,455
WINNSBORO ISD	57.3%	246	42.0%	55.9%	245	44.6%	2.6%	140	\$ 39,629
WINONA ISD	67.7%	447	81.0%	72.6%	415	73.5%	-7.5%	-	\$ -
WINTERS ISD	62.7%	292	93.9%	80.1%	352	92.9%	-1.0%	-	\$ -
WODEN ISD	59.0%	183	47.2%	55.0%	148	41.1%	-6.2%	104	\$ 29,500
WOLFE CITY ISD	54.2%	175	65.5%	58.8%	175	61.7%	-3.8%	24	\$ 6,686
WONDERLAND EDUCATIONAL ESTATE AS	75.5%	107	46.6%	73.8%	92	45.1%	-1.5%	51	\$ 14,836
WOODSBORO ISD	54.7%	118	72.4%	61.0%	136	76.7%	4.3%	-	\$ -
WOODSON ISD	64.1%	55	113.2%	61.0%	87	130.7%	17.5%	-	\$ -
WOODVILLE ISD	69.3%	421	56.9%	67.9%	540	71.8%	14.9%	-	\$ -
WORTHAM ISD	48.7%	97	53.1%	54.3%	91	47.5%	-5.7%	43	\$ 12,432
WYLIE ISD-ABILENE	15.1%	177	43.1%	19.7%	225	72.6%	29.5%	-	\$ -
WYLIE ISD-WYLIE	29.5%	1,161	40.6%	27.6%	1,326	46.5%	5.9%	672	\$ 190,657
YANTIS ISD	58.2%	155	87.3%	55.7%	140	94.0%	6.7%	-	\$ -
YES PREP PUBLIC SCHOOLS, INC.	85.5%	896	22.3%	86.6%	1,309	22.5%	0.2%	2,756	\$ 816,143
YOAKUM ISD	71.5%	568	64.8%	77.3%	614	67.9%	3.1%	19	\$ 5,682
YORKTOWN ISD	63.2%	99	46.4%	66.2%	71	36.6%	-9.8%	65	\$ 19,320
YOUTH EMPOWERMENT SERVICES INC.	92.3%	359	91.0%	*	*	*	*	*	*
YSLETA ISD	82.2%	21,551	95.9%	84.1%	21,516	93.0%	-3.0%	-	\$ -
ZAPATA ISD	78.2%	2,269	102.7%	90.1%	1,482	59.6%	-43.0%	258	\$ 75,531
ZAVALLA ISD	63.6%	65	33.5%	66.4%	59	34.5%	1.0%	61	\$ 17,876
ZEPHYR ISD	83.0%	84	63.9%	67.1%	59	61.3%	-2.6%	8	\$ 2,471
ZOE LEARNING ACADEMY	97.4%	260	70.8%	100.0%	226	73.2%	2.4%	-	\$ -

BREAKFAST PARTICIPATION BY COUNTY

County	2013-2014			2016-2017			Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Additional Students if 70% Met	Additional Dollars if 70% Met
	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP			
ANDERSON	61.9%	2,026	51.6%	68.1%	2,587	61.3%	9.8%	366	\$ 106,939
ANDREWS	48.2%	497	44.9%	42.9%	517	42.7%	-2.2%	331	\$ 94,643
ANGELINA	66.8%	5,153	54.6%	69.3%	5,244	56.6%	1.9%	1,243	\$ 359,914
ARANSAS	62.1%	913	58.1%	61.4%	899	55.1%	-3.0%	244	\$ 71,104
ARCHER	36.3%	232	51.0%	35.1%	213	53.6%	2.6%	65	\$ 18,423
ARMSTRONG	41.0%	49	44.0%	51.5%	68	58.5%	14.5%	13	\$ 3,651
ATASCOSA	67.1%	3,647	79.4%	66.9%	3,987	90.8%	11.4%	-	\$ -
AUSTIN	53.1%	1,084	45.5%	54.8%	1,194	47.5%	2.0%	566	\$ 161,233
BAILEY	83.3%	697	65.2%	82.9%	681	66.4%	1.2%	37	\$ 10,771
BANDERA	52.7%	521	49.8%	54.7%	502	49.6%	-0.2%	207	\$ 60,489
BASTROP	69.9%	4,406	50.8%	70.3%	4,783	54.4%	3.5%	1,376	\$ 394,438
BAYLOR	57.8%	117	50.7%	62.2%	223	81.8%	31.0%	-	\$ -
BEE	72.8%	1,733	64.5%	75.6%	1,337	46.4%	-18.1%	679	\$ 199,068
BELL	59.9%	14,387	47.5%	58.6%	15,887	50.8%	3.3%	5,998	\$ 1,721,751
BEXAR	66.8%	114,540	63.7%	65.6%	115,650	64.6%	0.8%	9,757	\$ 2,759,839
BLANCO	49.7%	276	44.6%	46.3%	267	46.9%	2.3%	131	\$ 37,456
BORDEN	36.2%	37	48.4%	36.6%	27	43.2%	-5.3%	17	\$ 4,671
BOSQUE	66.3%	882	58.0%	63.4%	841	58.4%	0.4%	166	\$ 47,766
BOWIE	64.9%	5,553	65.2%	68.3%	5,410	60.0%	-5.2%	901	\$ 253,208
BRAZORIA	46.4%	12,028	51.0%	47.3%	11,784	49.8%	-1.2%	4,786	\$ 1,381,190
BRAZOS	59.2%	7,523	53.9%	57.4%	7,498	54.2%	0.3%	2,190	\$ 634,656
BREWSTER	56.4%	214	54.4%	54.7%	229	57.7%	3.3%	49	\$ 14,182
BRISCOE	59.5%	69	79.3%	54.0%	39	51.7%	-27.6%	14	\$ 4,019
BROOKS	78.0%	590	56.5%	97.5%	1,296	100.0%	43.4%	-	\$ -
BROWN	60.7%	1,957	63.5%	62.8%	1,756	59.6%	-3.9%	305	\$ 87,655
BURLESON	64.8%	703	51.7%	65.0%	655	50.1%	-1.6%	260	\$ 73,563
BURNET	61.5%	1,972	57.5%	61.8%	2,015	58.1%	0.6%	412	\$ 118,425
CALDWELL	71.0%	3,481	92.2%	69.7%	3,471	91.6%	-0.7%	-	\$ -
CALHOUN	62.8%	822	43.4%	65.1%	1,157	64.4%	21.0%	100	\$ 28,076
CALLAHAN	55.5%	540	52.5%	57.0%	601	54.4%	1.9%	173	\$ 48,084
CAMERON	85.3%	65,276	91.2%	89.1%	59,447	81.1%	-10.1%	-	\$ -
CAMP	80.6%	740	52.1%	78.4%	654	46.5%	-5.7%	331	\$ 95,516
CARSON	31.9%	145	58.0%	36.2%	158	56.9%	-1.1%	36	\$ 10,217
CASS	61.6%	1,228	59.9%	61.6%	1,142	58.8%	-1.0%	217	\$ 61,471
CASTRO	76.1%	922	80.6%	83.5%	1,070	86.6%	5.9%	-	\$ -
CHAMBERS	33.7%	1,105	67.2%	40.4%	909	56.8%	-10.5%	212	\$ 61,275
CHEROKEE	76.2%	2,911	54.7%	74.8%	2,738	55.0%	0.4%	745	\$ 221,852
CHILDRESS	60.6%	384	77.2%	57.9%	218	52.2%	-25.0%	75	\$ 21,463
CLAY	46.9%	644	132.1%	47.5%	630	114.9%	-17.2%	-	\$ -
COCHRAN	68.3%	377	79.6%	68.8%	463	103.9%	24.3%	-	\$ -
COKE	55.9%	153	77.5%	54.7%	150	80.0%	2.5%	-	\$ -
COLEMAN	63.5%	499	86.4%	62.0%	483	84.6%	-1.8%	-	\$ -
COLLIN	25.2%	13,391	42.7%	23.0%	13,889	42.6%	-0.1%	8,908	\$ 2,490,276
COLLINGSWORTH	59.1%	106	42.6%	58.8%	111	43.1%	0.5%	69	\$ 19,807
COLORADO	69.6%	900	50.9%	68.5%	870	49.8%	-1.1%	353	\$ 101,399
COMAL	36.1%	4,000	57.2%	32.5%	4,030	58.0%	0.8%	835	\$ 239,574
COMANCHE	66.6%	636	54.5%	66.3%	623	51.6%	-2.9%	222	\$ 63,122
CONCHO	68.2%	159	62.5%	76.9%	179	67.7%	5.2%	6	\$ 1,494
COOKE	59.9%	2,051	68.8%	57.3%	2,268	74.4%	5.5%	-	\$ -
CORYELL	52.4%	2,163	46.2%	54.8%	2,294	48.9%	2.7%	992	\$ 279,011
COTTLE	66.5%	85	80.9%	75.4%	82	92.5%	11.6%	-	\$ -
CRANE	38.4%	87	29.8%	51.0%	146	39.7%	9.8%	112	\$ 32,206
CROCKETT	53.0%	238	71.7%	58.6%	263	80.4%	8.7%	-	\$ -
CROSBY	82.5%	790	96.4%	96.2%	984	96.5%	0.1%	-	\$ -
CULBERSON	75.0%	272	126.5%	66.6%	233	117.6%	-8.9%	-	\$ -
DALLAM	59.9%	596	73.7%	56.9%	651	85.3%	11.6%	-	\$ -
DALLAS	73.6%	150,436	55.9%	75.4%	176,447	61.9%	5.9%	23,167	\$ 6,659,770

County	2013-2014			2016-2017			Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Additional Students if 70% Met	Additional Dollars if 70% Met
	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP			
DAWSON	67.6%	963	73.0%	72.9%	1,103	82.6%	9.6%	-	\$ -
DEAF SMITH	81.9%	1,421	50.1%	78.6%	1,900	71.4%	21.3%	-	\$ -
DELTA	65.7%	370	74.9%	78.2%	365	63.6%	-11.4%	37	\$ 10,703
DENTON	34.6%	14,765	48.7%	34.8%	14,990	48.7%	0.0%	6,552	\$ 1,913,180
DEWITT	63.8%	1,289	60.9%	70.5%	1,284	61.3%	0.4%	182	\$ 53,469
DICKENS	64.1%	159	77.0%	65.3%	159	76.3%	-0.8%	-	\$ -
DIMITT	78.1%	1,172	70.4%	86.2%	855	53.0%	-17.4%	273	\$ 79,928
DONLEY	57.5%	152	58.7%	59.2%	155	58.3%	-0.4%	31	\$ 8,836
DUVAL	82.3%	1,129	68.4%	91.8%	1,430	71.9%	3.5%	-	\$ -
EASTLAND	64.1%	672	51.0%	61.7%	624	51.6%	0.6%	222	\$ 56,269
ECTOR	51.6%	8,698	82.4%	53.2%	10,545	93.4%	11.0%	-	\$ -
EDWARDS	73.4%	230	74.1%	78.8%	233	77.7%	3.6%	-	\$ -
EL PASO	76.6%	76,895	76.6%	81.1%	85,033	84.6%	8.0%	-	\$ -
ELLIS	50.2%	7,371	60.6%	51.7%	7,717	59.4%	-1.2%	1,376	\$ 356,646
ERATH	58.4%	1,623	53.0%	53.7%	1,569	55.9%	2.8%	397	\$ 115,906
FALLS	77.4%	864	62.0%	83.8%	879	61.5%	-0.4%	121	\$ 35,671
FANNIN	58.6%	1,900	75.0%	57.4%	1,823	73.6%	-1.3%	-	\$ -
FAYETTE	51.7%	649	44.1%	53.2%	711	47.6%	3.5%	335	\$ 89,076
FISHER	65.1%	228	100.7%	57.5%	161	94.6%	-6.1%	-	\$ -
FLOYD	72.8%	366	57.8%	83.0%	696	99.3%	41.5%	-	\$ -
FOARD	53.7%	116	117.7%	71.6%	136	110.4%	-7.3%	-	\$ -
FORT BEND	42.6%	11,638	39.6%	42.4%	11,952	38.8%	-0.8%	9,604	\$ 2,830,281
FRANKLIN	55.7%	380	63.9%	61.3%	353	61.5%	-2.4%	49	\$ 13,779
FREESTONE	53.0%	880	63.7%	53.4%	836	57.4%	-6.2%	183	\$ 52,293
FRIO	80.2%	1,305	63.4%	82.5%	1,726	84.2%	20.8%	-	\$ -
GAINES	51.3%	682	52.4%	55.4%	740	51.7%	-0.7%	262	\$ 73,738
GALVESTON	45.9%	13,676	55.1%	53.1%	12,901	57.3%	2.2%	2,865	\$ 829,380
GARZA	70.9%	206	45.3%	71.4%	231	51.6%	6.3%	82	\$ 23,674
GILLESPIE	54.4%	621	44.0%	49.2%	643	44.5%	0.4%	369	\$ 93,342
GLASSCOCK	45.0%	68	58.6%	36.0%	40	43.9%	-14.7%	24	\$ 6,905
GOLIAD	51.6%	270	52.9%	54.5%	216	43.9%	-9.0%	128	\$ 36,316
GONZALES	74.5%	1,876	85.1%	77.3%	1,761	78.4%	-6.7%	-	\$ -
GRAY	56.4%	1,266	73.9%	61.2%	1,236	71.3%	-2.7%	-	\$ -
GRAYSON	55.7%	6,066	63.1%	55.2%	6,017	60.8%	-2.3%	915	\$ 261,103
GREGG	62.4%	5,773	53.3%	63.8%	6,137	54.4%	1.1%	1,766	\$ 502,646
GRIMES	70.0%	1,268	53.2%	68.1%	1,285	52.6%	-0.7%	426	\$ 120,851
GUADALUPE	42.6%	4,483	62.2%	43.8%	4,504	58.6%	-3.6%	878	\$ 248,736
HALE	75.8%	3,399	82.2%	70.3%	3,514	85.4%	3.3%	-	\$ -
HALL	64.8%	345	118.0%	67.5%	374	127.4%	9.4%	-	\$ -
HAMILTON	58.0%	379	70.1%	57.1%	416	76.1%	6.0%	-	\$ -
HANSFORD	56.3%	218	38.2%	59.5%	236	38.6%	0.4%	193	\$ 53,436
HARDEMAN	78.1%	338	72.3%	83.2%	470	95.2%	22.9%	-	\$ -
HARDIN	44.6%	1,714	54.7%	42.1%	1,575	51.9%	-2.7%	548	\$ 158,237
HARRIS	63.9%	260,160	61.6%	64.9%	267,176	60.8%	-0.8%	40,637	\$ 11,857,009
HARRISON	60.4%	3,244	55.5%	61.9%	3,109	52.5%	-3.0%	1,037	\$ 284,597
HARTLEY	61.0%	119	67.9%	61.8%	146	70.7%	2.8%	-	\$ -
HASKELL	72.9%	339	74.7%	76.4%	356	77.0%	2.3%	-	\$ -
HAYS	48.5%	6,048	50.0%	49.2%	5,828	49.1%	-0.9%	2,479	\$ 698,935
HEMPHILL	40.8%	106	35.1%	40.3%	114	42.2%	7.1%	75	\$ 21,362
HENDERSON	66.3%	2,814	54.3%	70.2%	2,800	52.8%	-1.5%	912	\$ 266,650
HIDALGO	83.6%	135,762	89.2%	88.7%	138,355	82.8%	-6.5%	-	\$ -
HILL	66.4%	1,730	52.9%	64.6%	1,960	62.1%	9.1%	251	\$ 71,485
HOCKLEY	61.5%	1,548	67.9%	64.8%	1,389	63.0%	-4.8%	154	\$ 44,054
HOOD	47.2%	1,450	57.4%	47.5%	1,430	51.9%	-5.5%	499	\$ 132,766
HOPKINS	65.1%	2,146	63.4%	66.7%	2,190	63.3%	-0.1%	232	\$ 64,844
HOUSTON	69.6%	1,114	73.5%	78.1%	1,465	80.4%	6.9%	-	\$ -
HOWARD	60.5%	2,145	84.7%	60.8%	1,943	75.0%	-9.7%	-	\$ -

County	2013-2014			2016-2017			Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Additional Students if 70% Met	Additional Dollars if 70% Met
	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP			
HUDSPETH	86.3%	425	86.1%	92.5%	452	96.5%	10.4%	-	\$ -
HUNT	62.6%	3,659	54.2%	59.7%	3,685	55.6%	1.4%	953	\$ 256,315
HUTCHINSON	56.2%	802	55.4%	47.4%	660	51.8%	-3.6%	232	\$ 66,722
IRION	35.7%	52	55.5%	38.6%	44	79.3%	23.7%	-	\$ -
JACK	55.5%	480	80.7%	61.2%	555	77.9%	-2.9%	-	\$ -
JACKSON	50.0%	615	51.2%	53.5%	619	48.0%	-3.2%	284	\$ 81,260
JASPER	62.0%	2,257	75.0%	61.9%	2,015	68.7%	-6.3%	37	\$ 10,891
JEFF DAVIS	48.9%	36	*	47.6%	41	*	*	*	*
JEFFERSON	67.9%	12,884	55.3%	65.5%	12,454	54.5%	-0.8%	3,552	\$ 1,013,189
JIM HOGG	77.8%	778	100.4%	77.8%	818	100.1%	-0.3%	-	\$ -
JIM WELLS	68.9%	4,145	86.4%	79.4%	4,076	74.8%	-11.7%	-	\$ -
JOHNSON	51.6%	6,505	49.4%	52.3%	6,556	46.7%	-2.7%	3,266	\$ 921,942
JONES	64.4%	1,137	91.9%	66.7%	1,012	85.8%	-6.2%	-	\$ -
KARNES	61.7%	757	65.9%	73.1%	810	59.8%	-6.1%	138	\$ 38,586
KAUFMAN	51.3%	4,890	50.0%	48.9%	4,752	48.9%	-1.1%	2,049	\$ 581,272
KENDALL	25.7%	534	37.8%	23.6%	508	35.8%	-2.0%	485	\$ 140,288
KENT	51.4%	49	88.1%	30.7%	19	70.5%	-17.6%	-	\$ -
KERR	60.4%	1,490	48.2%	59.4%	1,468	49.6%	1.5%	603	\$ 175,767
KIMBLE	60.5%	100	40.9%	69.2%	132	54.1%	13.1%	39	\$ 11,162
KING	42.5%	25	69.6%	*	*	*	*	*	*
KINNEY	58.3%	131	44.9%	58.2%	117	43.2%	-1.7%	73	\$ 20,446
KLEBERG	67.8%	2,467	95.7%	71.5%	2,673	88.0%	-7.7%	-	\$ -
KNOX	66.6%	456	105.1%	67.8%	415	107.7%	2.5%	-	\$ -
LA SALLE	82.8%	354	40.2%	87.0%	415	43.0%	2.8%	261	\$ 76,337
LAMAR	63.4%	2,630	61.3%	69.4%	2,807	62.8%	1.5%	322	\$ 92,753
LAMB	70.2%	809	49.3%	77.5%	1,613	91.4%	42.1%	-	\$ -
LAMPASAS	57.0%	714	45.2%	32.2%	692	47.8%	2.6%	322	\$ 92,859
LAVACA	40.7%	350	50.4%	41.1%	395	53.2%	2.8%	125	\$ 35,385
LEE	62.2%	715	52.4%	63.6%	713	51.2%	-1.2%	262	\$ 75,049
LEON	56.9%	767	60.6%	56.8%	788	60.1%	-0.4%	129	\$ 37,209
LIBERTY	65.0%	4,042	55.4%	65.3%	4,570	55.9%	0.5%	1,151	\$ 331,132
LIMESTONE	72.5%	1,527	65.8%	67.1%	1,909	96.0%	30.2%	-	\$ -
LIPSCOMB	60.0%	162	41.2%	65.1%	195	47.7%	6.5%	91	\$ 24,484
LIVE OAK	45.5%	323	53.5%	60.8%	461	61.5%	8.1%	63	\$ 18,097
LLANO	62.9%	484	56.3%	71.6%	615	63.4%	7.1%	64	\$ 18,458
LUBBOCK	58.1%	16,548	76.6%	62.8%	17,812	75.1%	-1.5%	-	\$ -
LYNN	59.2%	493	86.4%	53.8%	445	86.5%	0.1%	-	\$ -
MADISON	73.9%	880	54.6%	74.1%	954	58.6%	4.0%	185	\$ 53,801
MARION	74.7%	465	63.4%	69.8%	516	70.0%	6.6%	0	\$ 14
MARTIN	54.4%	177	47.0%	53.7%	182	41.7%	-5.3%	124	\$ 35,852
MASON	53.5%	136	49.4%	51.7%	135	57.2%	7.8%	30	\$ 8,560
MATAGORDA	68.9%	2,930	80.3%	71.2%	3,170	83.3%	3.0%	-	\$ -
MAVERICK	75.2%	7,657	85.5%	85.9%	7,529	76.8%	-8.7%	-	\$ -
MCCULLOCH	66.4%	588	77.4%	73.1%	638	84.1%	6.7%	-	\$ -
MCLENNAN	63.1%	12,386	56.8%	59.4%	13,074	54.3%	-2.5%	3,791	\$ 1,107,367
MCMULLEN	23.0%	27	67.0%	*	*	*	*	*	*
MEDINA	61.3%	2,516	57.8%	63.8%	2,936	63.4%	5.5%	307	\$ 85,630
MENARD	68.0%	107	68.9%	72.2%	97	69.1%	0.1%	1	\$ 390
MIDLAND	46.8%	7,188	80.6%	52.2%	7,910	80.9%	0.3%	-	\$ -
MILAM	69.1%	1,625	66.5%	70.3%	1,749	72.6%	6.1%	-	\$ -
MILLS	62.3%	188	60.1%	56.3%	214	71.4%	11.3%	-	\$ -
MITCHELL	53.1%	532	88.3%	63.8%	444	83.4%	-4.9%	-	\$ -
MONTAGUE	50.5%	732	65.3%	55.9%	912	75.6%	10.3%	-	\$ -
MONTGOMERY	44.3%	15,972	52.8%	43.4%	16,801	50.6%	-2.2%	6,453	\$ 1,706,719
MOORE	66.1%	1,890	85.0%	65.9%	1,955	89.0%	3.9%	-	\$ -
MORRIS	74.3%	726	55.1%	75.8%	694	57.4%	2.3%	152	\$ 43,950
MOTLEY	79.3%	90	102.2%	75.2%	87	109.2%	7.0%	-	\$ -

County	2013-2014			2016-2017			Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Additional Students if 70% Met	Additional Dollars if 70% Met
	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP			
NACOGDOCHES	68.9%	4,450	71.5%	68.0%	4,213	67.9%	-3.7%	133	\$ 36,967
NAVARRO	71.1%	3,662	67.6%	71.3%	3,412	64.7%	-2.8%	278	\$ 79,222
NEWTON	69.8%	701	65.6%	74.0%	831	73.6%	8.0%	-	\$ -
NOLAN	62.4%	1,367	91.1%	64.0%	1,244	77.4%	-13.7%	-	\$ -
NUECES	62.7%	18,640	64.0%	70.0%	19,226	63.8%	-0.3%	1,881	\$ 561,658
OCHILTREE	57.3%	458	46.0%	62.5%	483	47.8%	1.8%	224	\$ 65,611
OLDHAM	41.3%	131	81.9%	43.1%	120	81.9%	0.0%	-	\$ -
ORANGE	55.6%	3,544	57.4%	50.6%	3,736	66.3%	8.8%	209	\$ 54,707
PALO PINTO	66.8%	1,443	64.2%	67.1%	1,411	59.9%	-4.3%	237	\$ 66,465
PANOLA	51.7%	718	52.6%	50.9%	1,021	73.4%	20.8%	-	\$ -
PARKER	37.9%	2,360	44.5%	37.0%	2,134	42.5%	-2.0%	1,384	\$ 392,027
PARMER	75.9%	1,047	71.6%	77.4%	1,212	83.5%	11.9%	-	\$ -
PECOS	60.3%	538	43.1%	64.0%	615	45.1%	1.9%	340	\$ 98,579
POLK	70.2%	3,111	85.3%	70.2%	3,092	89.2%	3.9%	-	\$ -
POTTER	65.3%	12,867	72.2%	67.9%	13,610	74.4%	2.2%	-	\$ -
PRESIDIO	89.5%	986	61.9%	89.7%	697	53.9%	-8.0%	209	\$ 60,968
RAINS	58.1%	397	55.6%	58.5%	410	58.2%	2.7%	83	\$ 24,154
RANDALL	32.5%	1,104	57.6%	32.2%	1,089	52.3%	-5.3%	369	\$ 108,175
REAGAN	58.5%	250	69.4%	63.1%	299	73.3%	4.0%	-	\$ -
REAL	73.3%	169	75.3%	72.0%	187	71.9%	-3.4%	-	\$ -
RED RIVER	70.9%	832	70.5%	70.0%	771	74.3%	3.7%	-	\$ -
REEVES	63.5%	950	86.8%	68.0%	1,082	84.1%	-2.6%	-	\$ -
REFUGIO	59.7%	312	58.8%	64.2%	342	61.6%	2.8%	46	\$ 12,990
ROBERTS	24.3%	28	73.6%	21.5%	22	63.9%	-9.6%	2	\$ 542
ROBERTSON	63.1%	1,097	66.8%	64.2%	1,072	64.7%	-2.1%	87	\$ 24,865
ROCKWALL	29.7%	1,884	44.6%	29.6%	2,053	46.4%	1.8%	1,045	\$ 301,204
RUNNELS	57.2%	588	65.3%	61.9%	664	68.0%	2.7%	20	\$ 5,376
RUSK	64.8%	2,388	57.3%	67.4%	2,679	61.8%	4.5%	357	\$ 103,955
SABINE	73.5%	427	52.3%	70.2%	432	51.9%	-0.4%	151	\$ 44,036
SAN AUGUSTINE	88.6%	572	66.8%	92.5%	602	68.3%	1.5%	15	\$ 4,516
SAN JACINTO	70.3%	1,013	53.4%	70.9%	1,024	51.9%	-1.5%	357	\$ 102,396
SAN PATRICIO	63.7%	4,266	58.6%	65.6%	4,082	55.7%	-2.9%	1,046	\$ 304,107
SAN SABA	61.7%	295	68.6%	62.8%	277	71.2%	2.6%	-	\$ -
SCHLEICHER	48.8%	104	56.6%	59.5%	158	69.1%	12.5%	2	\$ 603
SCURRY	59.0%	1,041	79.1%	57.1%	924	71.3%	-7.7%	-	\$ -
SHACKELFORD	49.7%	132	61.1%	52.1%	129	59.5%	-1.6%	23	\$ 6,848
SHELBY	74.9%	1,842	56.1%	76.8%	1,848	56.6%	0.5%	436	\$ 123,288
SHERMAN	64.7%	189	46.2%	61.1%	150	44.2%	-2.0%	88	\$ 25,043
SMITH	62.4%	8,971	49.3%	60.2%	8,554	49.1%	-0.2%	3,653	\$ 1,072,874
SOMERVELL	51.0%	260	48.0%	46.2%	264	48.6%	0.6%	116	\$ 33,288
STARR	91.3%	12,919	98.5%	97.8%	13,054	88.7%	-9.8%	-	\$ -
STEPHENS	64.2%	632	91.1%	68.6%	449	70.5%	-20.7%	-	\$ -
STERLING	44.6%	39	42.0%	45.4%	32	42.5%	0.5%	21	\$ 5,867
STONEWALL	56.8%	78	88.0%	63.1%	52	72.3%	-15.7%	-	\$ -
SUTTON	52.1%	287	80.7%	58.2%	287	84.7%	4.0%	-	\$ -
SWISHER	70.8%	508	61.7%	71.0%	579	67.4%	5.7%	22	\$ 6,734
TARRANT	58.4%	70,351	43.3%	60.3%	76,435	48.6%	5.3%	33,612	\$ 9,804,676
TAYLOR	50.9%	6,035	52.8%	49.8%	6,233	51.4%	-1.5%	2,261	\$ 614,562
TERRELL	35.8%	23	*	50.7%	36	*	*	*	*
TERRY	71.6%	1,151	79.8%	79.6%	1,607	103.9%	24.1%	-	\$ -
THROCKMORTON	54.9%	142	84.2%	62.3%	133	108.5%	24.3%	-	\$ -
TITUS	77.0%	2,021	44.9%	75.0%	2,183	53.8%	8.9%	655	\$ 188,948
TOM GREEN	57.4%	5,459	71.9%	56.0%	5,428	68.0%	-3.9%	156	\$ 43,025
TRAVIS	61.2%	36,327	52.6%	56.6%	40,010	62.1%	9.4%	5,123	\$ 1,494,676
TRINITY	65.4%	878	81.3%	69.5%	1,020	91.2%	9.9%	-	\$ -
TYLER	59.0%	1,063	69.0%	60.7%	1,277	76.6%	7.6%	-	\$ -
UPSHUR	58.7%	1,619	51.4%	60.8%	1,996	61.8%	10.5%	263	\$ 74,250

County	2013-2014			2016-2017			Change in Ratio of SBP to NSLP Participation	Additional Students if 70% Met	Additional Dollars if 70% Met
	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP	% FR Eligible	FR Breakfast ADP	FR Students in SBP per 100 in NSLP			
UPTON	56.6%	152	55.0%	59.8%	188	62.3%	7.3%	23	\$ 6,463
UVALDE	76.5%	2,154	61.7%	76.1%	1,658	50.0%	-11.6%	662	\$ 195,547
VAL VERDE	72.4%	4,880	73.1%	70.7%	2,598	42.9%	-30.3%	1,644	\$ 488,093
VAN ZANDT	57.8%	2,008	49.0%	54.2%	2,092	55.5%	6.5%	546	\$ 156,983
VICTORIA	63.8%	2,901	39.8%	67.3%	3,199	42.5%	2.7%	2,070	\$ 595,242
WALKER	57.9%	2,825	80.6%	61.0%	2,679	80.2%	-0.4%	-	\$ -
WALLER	72.3%	3,124	57.6%	73.7%	3,102	52.3%	-5.3%	1,050	\$ 301,723
WARD	48.8%	381	50.7%	63.4%	429	46.9%	-3.7%	211	\$ 59,578
WASHINGTON	59.2%	1,272	54.7%	60.6%	1,340	56.0%	1.3%	335	\$ 97,650
WEBB	82.9%	31,582	70.5%	89.0%	33,930	70.6%	0.2%	-	\$ -
WHARTON	52.6%	1,935	51.1%	67.4%	1,977	50.9%	-0.2%	744	\$ 220,027
WHEELER	53.3%	271	59.2%	59.3%	246	57.8%	-1.4%	52	\$ 14,377
WICHITA	57.7%	6,122	65.9%	59.7%	5,491	60.1%	-5.8%	904	\$ 261,839
WILBARGER	68.9%	555	49.4%	58.8%	789	75.7%	26.4%	-	\$ -
WILLACY	87.3%	3,343	96.9%	99.0%	3,048	88.9%	-8.0%	-	\$ -
WILLIAMSON	31.8%	12,847	51.6%	30.5%	13,299	54.0%	2.4%	3,937	\$ 1,107,142
WILSON	43.5%	1,415	52.1%	42.1%	1,449	54.2%	2.1%	424	\$ 122,435
WINKLER	50.4%	877	112.7%	63.2%	691	90.1%	-22.6%	-	\$ -
WISE	50.8%	2,014	64.8%	49.5%	1,538	45.9%	-18.9%	808	\$ 229,819
WOOD	62.1%	1,357	52.1%	59.8%	1,354	54.5%	2.4%	386	\$ 111,198
YOAKUM	57.6%	890	114.3%	52.5%	1,044	111.7%	-2.6%	-	\$ -
YOUNG	60.4%	764	53.6%	60.9%	786	59.6%	6.0%	137	\$ 29,470
ZAPATA	78.2%	2,269	102.7%	90.1%	1,482	59.6%	-43.0%	258	\$ 75,531
ZAVALA	79.9%	783	47.9%	96.9%	904	46.7%	-1.2%	452	\$ 132,075

ENDNOTES

Design and photo credits

Icons used in this report designed by Good Ware from Flaticon.

Photo on pg. 7 by Aaron Burden on Unsplash.

Photo on pg. 8 courtesy of Dallas Independent School District.

Photo on pgs. 20-21 by Caroline Atwood on Unsplash.

Introduction

- 1 USDA FNS National Level Annual Summary Tables: FY 1969-2017 State Level Tables: FY 2013-2017, School Breakfast, Meals Served & Cash Payments. <https://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/child-nutrition-tables>.
- 2 Food Research and Action Center. School Breakfast Scorecard 2016-2017.
- 3 Ibid.
- 4 Ibid.
- 5 Ibid.
- 6 Fletcher, J. & Frisvold, D. The Relationship between the School Breakfast Program and food insecurity. *The Journal of Consumer Affairs* 51(3), 481-500.

School Breakfast Program 101

- 1 Texas Education Agency; Division of Research and Analysis. 2017. Enrollment in Texas Public Schools 2016-17. Access here: https://tea.texas.gov/acctres/enroll_index.html.
Center for Public Policy Priorities. Community Eligibility: Feeding All Your Students for Free. Access here: http://forabettertexas.org/images/FN_2015_07_ComEligibility_Factsheet.pdf.
- 2
- 3 Ibid.

Benefits of Breakfast

- 1 Adolphus, K., Lawton, C. L., & Dye, L. (2013). The effects of breakfast on behavior and academic performance in children and adolescents. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 7. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2013.00425
- 2 Anzman-Frascad, S., Carmichael Djang, H., Halmo, M. M., Dolan, P. R., & Economos, C. D. (2015). Estimating impacts of a Breakfast in the Classroom program on school outcomes. *AMA Pediatrics* 169 (1):71-77.
- 3 Brown, J. L., Beardslee, W. H., & Prothrow-Stith, D. (2008). Impact of school breakfast on children's health and learning: An analysis of the scientific research. Retrieved from http://www.sodexofoundation.org/hunger_us/Images/Impact%20of%20School%20Breakfast%20Study_tcm150-212606.pdf
- 4 Ibid.
- 5 Ibid.

- 6 Hartline-Graft, H. (2014). Breakfast for health. Retrieved from <http://frac.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/08/breakfastforhealth.pdf>
- 7 Ibid.
- 8 Ibid.
- 9 Brown, J. L., Beardslee, W. H., & Prothrow-Stith, D. (2008). Impact of school breakfast on children's health and learning: An analysis of the scientific research. Retrieved from http://www.sodexofoundation.org/hunger_us/Images/Impact%20of%20School%20Breakfast%20Study_tcm150-212606.pdf
- 10 Augustine-Thottungal, R., Kern, J., Key, J., & Sherman, B. (2013). Ending childhood hunger: A social impact analysis. Retrieved from <https://www.nokidhungry.org/pdfs/school-breakfast-white-paper.pdf>

Free and Reduced-Price Meals

- 1 Texas Education Agency; Division of Research and Analysis. 2017. Enrollment in Texas Public Schools 2016-17. Access here: https://tea.texas.gov/acctres/enroll_index.html

Community Eligibility Provision (CEP)

- 1 Center for Public Policy Priorities. Community Eligibility: Feeding All Your Students for Free. Access here: http://forabettertexas.org/images/FN_2015_07_ComEligibility_Factsheet.pdf.

Breakfast in the Legislature

- 1 Rodriguez, E., Thompson, S. (2005). H.B. 2578. Texas Legislature, 75th Session. Retrieved from <http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/tlodocs/79R/billtext/pdf/HB02578l.pdf#navpanes=0>
- 2 Lucio, E. (2007). S.B. 417. Texas Legislature, 80th Session. Retrieved from <http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/tlodocs/80R/billtext/pdf/SB00417l.pdf#navpanes=0>
- 3 Rodriguez, Dutton, Keffer, Leibowitz, et al. (2007). H.B. 454. Texas Legislature, 80th Session. Retrieved from <http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/tlodocs/80R/billtext/pdf/HB00454E.pdf#navpanes=0>
- 4 Rodriguez, E. (2009). H.B. 275. Texas Legislature, 81st Session. Retrieved from <http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/Search/DocViewer.aspx?ID=81RHB002751B&QueryText=breakfast&DocType=B>
- 5 Lucio, E. (2009). S.B.910. Texas Legislature, 81st Session. Retrieved from <http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=81R&Bill=SB910>
- 6 Lucio, E. (2011). S.B. 88. Texas Legislature, 82nd Session. Retrieved from <http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/Search/DocViewer.aspx?ID=82RSB000881B&QueryText=breakfast&DocType=B>
- 7 Lucio, E. (2013). S.B. 376. Texas Legislature, 83rd Session. Retrieved from <http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/Search/DocViewer.aspx?ID=82RSB000881B&QueryText=breakfast&DocType=B>

Where are we now?

- 1 Food Research and Action Center. School Breakfast Score Card 2016-2017.
- 2 Texas Hunger Initiative analysis of Texas Department of Agriculture data (2016-2017).
- 3 Food Research and Action Center. School Breakfast Score Card 2016-2017.
- 4 Ibid.
- 5 Food Research and Action Center. Community Eligibility Database 2016-2017.

Where do we go from here?

- 1 Houston Independent School District Research and Accountability (2012). First Class Breakfast Program: Findings Related to Student Performance, 2010-2011 (Research Educational Program Report). Retrieved from http://www.houstonisd.org/cms/lib2/TX01001591/Centricity/Domain/8269/PE_DistrictPrograms/Breakfast-Report-2010-2011.pdf
- 2 Texas Department of Agriculture (2018). Local School Wellness Policies. Retrieved from <http://squaremeals.org/Programs/SchoolBreakfastProgram/LocalWellnessPolicies.aspx>
- 3 Hartline-Graft, H. (2014). Breakfast for Health. Retrieved from <http://frac.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/08/breakfastforhealth.pdf>
- 4 Bhattacharya, J., Currie, J., & Haider, S. (2004). Breakfast of Champions: The School Breakfast Program and the Nutrition of Children and Families. *The Journal of Human Resources* 41(3). Retrieved from <http://www.nber.org/papers/w10608.pdf>
- 5 Adolphus, K., Lawton, C. L., & Dye, L. (2013). The Effects of Breakfast on Behavior and Academic Performance in Children and Adolescents. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 7. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2013.00425
- 6 Brown, J. L., Beardslee, W.H., & Prothrow-Stith, D. (2008). Impact of School Breakfast on Children's Health and Learning: An Analysis of the Scientific Research. Retrieved from http://www.sodexofoundation.org/hunger_us/Images/Impact%20of%20School%20Breakfast%20Study_tcm150-212606
- 7 Nolen, E. and Krey, K. (2015). The Effect of Universal-Free School Breakfast on Milk Consumption and Nutrient Intake.
- 8 Feeding America (2015). Map the Meal Gap. Retrieved from <http://map.feedingamerica.org/county/2015/child/texas>.
- 9 Oklahoma Department of Education (2017). Oklahoma ESSA Consolidated State Plan. Retrieved from http://sde.ok.gov/sde/sites/ok.gov.sde/files/documents/files/OK_consolidatedStateplan_web.pdf
- 10 Ibid.
- 11 Ibid.
- 12 Food Research and Action Center. School Breakfast Program. Retrieved from <http://www.frac.org/programs/school-breakfast-program>
- 13 Hunger Free Colorado. Breakfast After the Bell. Retrieved from <https://www.hungerfreecolorado.org/policy-and-advocacy/breakfast-after-the-bell-bill/#what>
- 14 Commonwealth of Virginia Department of Education. (2016). Increasing Student Participation in the School Breakfast Program—2016-2017 Application for State Funding for Alternative Breakfast Service Models. Retrieved from http://www.doe.virginia.gov/administrators/superintendents_memos/2016/162-16.shtml



BAYLOR
UNIVERSITY



TEXASHUNGER
INITIATIVE
BAYLOR UNIVERSITY