IV. PROGRAM PARTICIPATION AND OUTREACH

The number of children served by the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) is substantially lower than the number who receive free or reduced-price meals through the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) during the school year. Recently, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has expressed a renewed commitment to expanding the availability of summer meals to children from low-income families (Food and Nutrition Service 2002d). Thus, one key research focus of this study was an exploration of the factors that affect the participation of sponsors and children. The study (1) explored staffs' views on barriers to participation; (2) described the activities currently used to increase sponsors' and children's participation, referred to broadly as "outreach"; (3) considered the outcomes of sponsors' outreach efforts by analyzing the characteristics of new sponsors relative to continuing sponsors; and (4) examined issues of sponsor retention by obtaining state administrators' perspectives on sponsor retention, comparing the characteristics of current and former sponsors, and asking former sponsors why they left the SFSP.

The exploration produced the following key findings:

- *It is important to place the SFSP's participation challenges in a realistic context.* State administrators emphasized that comparisons with the NSLP must recognize that the SFSP is available primarily in low-income areas and does not always provide transportation, whereas the NSLP is available everywhere, provides meals to a "captive audience" of children who are required to attend school, and benefits from transportation of students to and from school.

- *State administrators believed that lack of transportation, lack of activities, and lack of knowledge about the program were the major barriers to children's participation; they believed that low reimbursement rates and time-consuming paperwork discouraged potential sponsors from participating.*

- *Many sponsors believed their local areas were well covered, and most site supervisors felt they could serve more children at their sites.* Many site supervisors and sponsors felt they were meeting current demand in their communities; however, they also reported that lack of transportation and other barriers may have limited some children's participation at established sites.

- *State administrators cited personal contact as the most successful approach to recruiting new sponsors.* One-on-one meetings enable state agencies to respond to sponsors' concerns about the complexities of managing the SFSP, present the positive aspects of the program, and provide assurance of assistance from the state.

- *Most sponsors conducted activities to increase participation at their sites, and most site supervisors believed that publicity about their sites was adequate.* Typical outreach activities included publicity through media channels and neighborhood flyers, collaboration with schools, and direct mail or telephone recruitment of parents.

- *Of the 10 percent of sponsors that were new, one-half were school districts and one-third were nonprofit organizations*. The proportion of new sponsors that were nonprofit organizations was twice as large as the proportion of continuing sponsors that were nonprofits. New sponsors were smaller than continuing sponsors, and fewer offered breakfast and supper.

- *About 8 percent of sponsors left the SFSP between 2000 and 2001. Former sponsors disproportionately were small, new, or nonprofit organizations.* Nearly all these sponsors left the program by choice, and their sites usually were not picked up by other sponsors. Inadequate reimbursement rates and time-consuming paperwork were the main reasons why sponsors left; each reason was cited by about 45 percent of former sponsors. Low participation levels were a contributing factor for about 40 percent of former sponsors.

A. STAFFS' VIEWS ON PARTICIPATION LEVELS

Staff at all levels of the SFSP, from state administrators to site supervisors, cited a substantial number of barriers they believed impeded children's participation. In addition, state and sponsor staff cited issues they believed discouraged sponsors' participation. Many sponsors, however, felt there was little unmet demand in the areas they served, and most site supervisors reported they had the capacity to serve more children. This seemingly contradictory pattern of findings may indicate that most unserved children live in areas that have no SFSP sponsors (and thus no SFSP sites), or it may indicate that current sponsors and sites are not addressing barriers faced by children in the areas they serve; it also is possible both factors are at work. Although other types of research are necessary to assess the relative importance of barriers to sponsors' participation versus children's participation, staffs' views provide important insights into the types of barriers that exist at each level.

1. State Administrators' Views on Participation

State administrators typically have detailed knowledge of both SFSP rules and day-to-day operations, as well as extensive experience in attempts to expand the program. These staff also must overcome diverse challenges, ranging from supporting large numbers of sponsors with varied needs to finding and assisting sponsors in heavily rural areas. To tap this range of experience about SFSP participation, state administrators were asked the following open-ended question: "In your opinion, what are the reasons that so few children participate in the Summer Food program as compared to the National School Lunch Program?" Because the wording of the question mentioned "children," some respondents focused on issues related to the family's decision to send their child to an existing SFSP site. Other respondents also discussed sponsors' barriers to participation, as sponsors are necessary if children are to have sites to which to go.

a. Limitations of Direct Comparisons of the SFSP and the NSLP

An important theme that several administrators mentioned in response to the open-ended question is that comparisons of the SFSP and the NSLP are not entirely appropriate. First, the

NSLP operates in almost every school district; by contrast, the function of the SFSP's area eligibility rules is to target areas with high concentrations of poverty, even though not all low-income children live in high-poverty areas. About one-fifth of state administrators noted that area eligibility rules limit the availability of sites to some children; five administrators (9 percent) commented that sites or sponsors were not always available where children lived (Table IV.1). Second, a few administrators reported that the SFSP cannot be expected to serve children who are served during the summer by other programs, such as the NSLP or the Child and Adult Care Food Program. Third, because the NSLP is offered while children are at school, it operates in a setting that children must attend (administrators referred to the children as "a captive audience"), and that offers transportation services. Five state administrators (9 percent) noted that SFSP attendance is voluntary, and nearly half of all administrators surveyed mentioned the lack of transportation as a barrier to participation, particularly in rural areas.

b. Factors that Limit Participation

More state administrators mentioned lack of transportation than any other factor as the factor limiting children's participation in the SFSP. Other frequently cited factors included a lack of activities at program sites and ignorance about the program's existence. Given that nearly all sites offer some activities (see Chapter II), it is interesting that about one-quarter of state administrators reported lack of activities as a problem. These administrators may have been thinking in terms of the need to ensure that new sponsors are able to offer activities, may have believed the range of activities to be too limited to attract children, or may have been concerned that some open sites offered activities only for some children. Other, less frequently mentioned factors included children's attitudes, particularly about attending school sites during the summer; stigma; a limited variety of foods ("always sandwiches"); and an operating schedule for many SFSP sites that did not cover the entire summer.

Many of the administrators who focused on factors limiting sponsors' participation cited low reimbursement rates ("it is not worth it for sponsors to run the program for 3 months"); a paperwork burden associated with running the SFSP that made it difficult to attract schools as sponsors; and other challenges to convincing schools to participate, such as the desire of school officials to leave buildings unoccupied, so staff could perform maintenance on the buildings or take time off. Some state administrators also mentioned security or liability issues as factors, including neighborhood safety, liability with respect to operating outdoor sites, and concerns that schools running open sites cannot monitor who enters the school. Only two state administrators mentioned lack of outreach to sponsors; state administrators focused on administrative requirements and reimbursement rates as making the program unattractive.[1]

---

[1]Some state administrators simply made such comments as, "It is a well-kept secret." These responses were categorized as families' lack of knowledge, but they might have referred to potential sponsors.

TABLE IV.1

STATE ADMINISTRATORS' VIEWS ON WHY PARTICIPATION IS LOW

Reasons for Low Participation (Relative to NSLP)[a]	Number of State Agencies	Percentage of State Agencies
Child Participation Issues		
Transportation problems	26	48.1
Need activities in conjunction with meals	14	25.9
Lack of knowledge about the program	12	22.2
Area eligibility rules limit availability	11	20.4
Children want to stay home/avoid school	6	11.1
Attendance is not required[b]	6	11.1
Lack of sponsors/sites where children live	5	9.3
Stigma	5	9.3
Lack of variety in foods offered	5	9.3
Programs not open long enough	4	7.4
Children attend alternate programs	3	5.6
Sponsor Participation Issues[c]		
Sponsors' difficulty breaking even due to reimbursement rates or rules	8	14.8
Schools do not want to participate due to paperwork, requirements	7	13.0
Schools have other priorities or do not want to participate for unspecified reasons	6	11.1
Security or liability concerns at sites	6	11.1
Sponsor application requirements are discouraging	4	7.4
Staffing problems	4	7.4
Insufficient outreach to potential sponsors	2	3.7
Too much paperwork	2	3.7
Other	7	13.0
Total	**54**	—

SOURCE: SFSP Implementation Study, State Administrator Census (2001).

NOTE: This table reflects coding of responses to an open-ended question.

[a]Multiple responses allowed.

[b]In comparison, children are required to attend school, where the NSLP is offered.

[c]Although the question was worded in such a way as to inquire why few *children* participate in the SFSP, many answers addressed the issue of why potential *sponsors* do not participate.

NSLP = National School Lunch Program.

2. Sponsors' and Former Sponsors' Views on Participation and Program Expansion

SFSP sponsors and former sponsors provided an additional level of understanding about the challenges to participation that the SFSP must overcome. Because they direct or closely monitor site operations, sponsors may learn about day-to-day barriers that limit children's participation. Some also responded in terms of barriers that sponsors face, perhaps drawing on their experiences in deciding whether to expand their sites, or their decisions to enter or leave the SFSP. Because barriers to both sponsors' and children's participation may affect program attrition, this section discusses the perceptions of current and former sponsors.

a. Barriers to Participation

As Table IV.2 shows, 93 percent of current sponsors and 91 percent of former sponsors identified specific barriers to participation in the SFSP. When asked about the "main barriers to increased participation," sponsors cited many of the same challenges that state administrators mentioned; also like state administrators, they identified barriers that affected children's participation directly and barriers that affected it indirectly, by first affecting the participation of sponsors.

About half the current and former sponsors mentioned resource and logistical constraints as key barriers to participation. As was the case with state administrators, the most commonly mentioned barrier was a lack of transportation (mentioned by 23 percent of current sponsors and 39 percent of former sponsors). One-tenth of current sponsors mentioned lack of capacity at current facilities and/or the need for additional site locations. Other resource and logistical barriers, cited by a smaller number of sponsors, included lack of support from schools or community groups, inadequate numbers of staff or volunteers, and inadequate funding.

About 1 in 3 current and former sponsors identified lack of outreach, interest, or demand as limiting participation. Sixteen percent of current sponsors considered insufficient or poorly targeted outreach an important barrier. Fourteen percent cited a lack of demand for the program, indicating that the community need is being met through the SFSP or through other programs, so that expansion is unwarranted. In addition, 9 percent of current sponsors and 12 percent of former sponsors mentioned low levels of parental motivation and the role of stigma as deterrents to children's participation.

b. Sponsors' Interest in Expanding the Number of Sites or the Length of the Summer Session

Most sponsors were not interested in increasing participation by expanding the number of sites or the length of their summer session (Table IV.3). About half the sponsors (59 percent of all sponsors and 47 percent of sponsors operating open sites) were "not too interested" or "not at

TABLE IV.2

SPONSORS' IDENTIFICATION OF THE MAIN BARRIERS
TO INCREASED PARTICIPATION

Main Barriers to Increased Participation	Percentage of Current Sponsors	Standard Error	Percentage of Former Sponsors	Standard Error
Resource/Logistical Constraints	48	(5.6)	58	(5.2)
Transportation/distance of children from site(s)	23	(4.0)	39	(5.3)
Lack of capacity or additional locations for sites needed	10	(3.4)	7	(2.1)
Need more schools as sites, more support and coordination from schools and other community groups	8	(3.0)	1	(1.0)
Lack of staff or volunteers	6	(2.8)	1	(0.8)
Weather, heat, or lack of air-conditioning	5	(2.2)	1	(0.6)
Insufficient funding	5	(2.1)	10	(3.4)
Lack of activities or no funding for activities	3	(1.5)	3	(1.3)
Outreach/Interest/Demand Constraints	38	(5.3)	35	(5.1)
Need more or better-targeted outreach	16	(4.4)	18	(3.8)
Lack of interest or demand, competition from other programs, or need is being met	14	(4.2)	7	(2.7)
Parent/caregiver motivation; stigma/not wanting handouts	9	(3.0)	12	(3.8)
Program tied to summer school or participation falls after summer school ends	1	(1.1)	1	(0.8)
Program Rules	14	(4.1)	14	(3.6)
Enrolled program or eligibility requirements	8	(3.6)	1	(0.8)
Paperwork or program rules	6	(2.1)	13	(3.5)
Other[a]	9	(3.1)	10	(3.3)
No Barriers Reported	7	(3.2)	9	(2.7)
Sample Size	**124**	—	**130**	—

SOURCE: SFSP Implementation Study, Former Sponsor and Sponsor Surveys (2001).

NOTE: Tabulations are weighted to be representative of sponsors and former sponsors nationally. These tabulations represent coding of responses to an open-ended question. Multiple responses were allowed.

[a]Includes safety issues, illegal immigrants' fear of government programs, children's lack of interest or comfort at the site, lack of foods children like, and language or cultural barriers.

TABLE IV.3

SPONSORS' INTEREST IN EXPANDING THE NUMBER OF SITES

Interest Level in Expanding the Number of Sites	Percentage of Sponsors	Standard Error	Percentage of Open Sponsors[a]	Standard Error	Percentage of Enrolled Sponsors[b]	Standard Error
Very Interested	20	(3.7)	26	(4.7)	6	(4.1)
Somewhat Interested	22	(4.1)	27	(5.2)	11	(6.3)
Not too Interested	20	(4.9)	18	(5.0)	24	(10.4)
Not at All Interested	39	(6.0)	29	(6.9)	59	(11.3)
Sample Size	**126**	—	**95**	—	**31**	—

SOURCE: SFSP Implementation Study, Sponsor Survey (2001).

NOTE: Tabulations are weighted to be representative of sponsors nationally.

[a]Sponsors that have only open sites or a combination of open and enrolled sites.

[b]Sponsors that have enrolled, camp, or National Youth Sports Program sites.

all interested" in expanding the number of their summer food sites.[2] Only 20 percent of all sponsors indicated that they were "very interested" in operating more sites; 26 percent of open sponsors were "very interested" in operating more sites. Fully 83 percent of sponsors operating enrolled or camp sites were "not too interested" or "not at all interested" in expanding.

Sponsors who did not wish to expand most commonly mentioned lack of demand as the explanation (Table IV.4). In this group, half of all sponsors (52 percent) and nearly three-quarters of open-site sponsors (72 percent) explained that their area already was well covered. Additional frequently mentioned reasons included lack of available locations for sites (mentioned by 41 percent of all sponsors), insufficient staff (mentioned by 33 percent), reluctance of schools to provide food service or staff during the summer (mentioned by 15 percent), and difficulty finding a partner to help with outreach (mentioned by 12 percent). Nineteen percent of all sponsors indicated that they did not wish to expand their food program to other locations because they were a camp or single-site program.

Twenty-seven percent of sponsors asked about their willingness to increase the length of their summer session reported that their program did run all summer; 51 percent were unwilling to do so, and 23 percent were willing (Table IV.5).[3,4] Many sponsors who did not want to extend their program calendar cited external constraints as factors (for example, school districts' plans to perform kitchen maintenance during the off-season or firmly established summer school schedules). Compared with sponsors whose main purpose is to feed children, many SFSP programs associated with structured activity programs (such as summer school, NYSP, or residential camp) have less flexibility in establishing operating dates. In addition to these reasons, some sponsors who did not want to extend the session also cited staffing constraints (in particular, staff's desire for vacation time), inadequate financial resources, and their belief that an extended program would not be cost-effective because participation usually dropped considerably during the late summer or after scheduled activities had ended.

At the same time, 27 percent of open sponsors and 13 percent of enrolled sponsors were willing to extend the summer session. Technical assistance targeted to sponsors willing to

---

[2]To illuminate some analyses, we divide sponsors into "open sponsors," which have at least one open site, and "enrolled sponsors," which have only enrolled, camp, or National Youth Sports Program (NYSP) sites. Enrolled and camp sponsors have structured activity programs that require more-extensive resources and thus are likely to face more capacity constraints; in addition, serving meals is generally not their primary mission. Thus, we would expect these sponsors to have less interest in outreach and expansion.

[3]The survey did not ask why those who were willing to extend their session had not done so.

[4]Based on weighted tabulations of the characteristics of sponsors who reported that they already operated all summer (n = 42), 25 percent actually were open for at least 70 days (10 weeks), 47 percent were open for 60 to 69 days, and 28 percent were open for fewer than 60 days. This finding suggests widely varying interpretations of "all summer."

TABLE IV.4

REASONS FOR SPONSORS' LACK OF INTEREST
IN EXPANDING THE NUMBER OF SITES

	Percentage of Sponsors	Standard Error	Percentage of Open Sponsors	Standard Error
Reasons				
Lack of demand, area is well covered	52	(8.0)	72	(8.2)
Lack of available site locations	41	(7.4)	46	(9.1)
Insufficient staff	33	(7.1)	24	(8.6)
Camp/single-site program[a] (n = 60)	19	(6.2)	7	(4.7)
School food services not interested or not able to provide summer staff	15	(5.1)	21	(8.2)
Cannot find partner to help with outreach	12	(4.4)	19	(7.3)
Schools offer NSLP or are open year-round	9	(3.4)	14	(5.7)
Funding too low[a] (n = 60)	7	(4.5)	1	(0.5)
Already operating at or near maximum capacity[a] (n = 60)	6	(5.1)	2	(1.2)
Too much paperwork[a] (n = 60)	2	(1.2)	3	(2.1)
Main Reason (n = 59)				
Lack of demand, area is well covered	39	(8.7)	54	(10.9)
Camp/single-site program[a]	19	(6.2)	7	(4.7)
Insufficient staff	11	(4.9)	15	(8.1)
Lack of available site locations	10	(3.7)	11	(4.5)
Funding too low[a]	7	(4.5)	1	(0.5)
Already operating at or near maximum capacity[a]	6	(5.1)	2	(1.2)
Schools offer NSLP or are open year-round	3	(2.3)	6	(4.2)
School food services not interested or not able to provide summer staff	3	(2.7)	0	(0.0)
Too much paperwork[a]	2	(1.2)	3	(2.1)
Cannot find partner to help with outreach	1	(1.3)	2	(2.3)
Sample Size	**61**	—	**37**	—

SOURCE: SFSP Implementation Study, Sponsor Survey (2001).

NOTES: The sample is restricted to sponsors who reported that they were "not too interested" or "not at all interested" in expanding the number of their SFSP sites. Tabulations are weighted to be representative of sponsors nationally.

Open sponsors are sponsors that have only open sites or a combination of open and enrolled sites. Enrolled sponsors are not shown separately because of the small sample size.

[a]These answers were given in response to a question about "any other reason" why the sponsor was not interested in expanding the number of sites.

NSLP = National School Lunch Program.

TABLE IV.5

SPONSORS' VIEWS ON INCREASING THE LENGTH OF THE SUMMER SESSION

	Percentage of Sponsors	Standard Error	Percentage of Open Sponsors[a]	Standard Error	Percentage of Enrolled Sponsors[b]	Standard Error
Willingness to Increase Session Length						
Yes	23	(4.2)	27	(5.9)	13	(6.8)
No	51	(5.7)	40	(6.6)	73	(8.9)
Program already runs all summer	27	(4.9)	33	(6.1)	14	(6.2)
Sample Size	**125**	—	**95**	—	**30**	—
Reason for Unwillingness to Increase Session Length[c]						
School or summer school schedule, school district decision, need to clean kitchens during break time, or space constraints	32	(6.6)				
Grant funds regulate or require the number of weeks; schedule based on another program's length of operation	24	(7.9)				
Staff need vacation time, employees' other commitments, lack of staff	22	(7.0)				
Financial constraints, cannot afford it	20	(6.4)				
Decrease in participation (in late summer or after activities end)	7	(3.7)				
Already as long as can be	5	(2.7)				
Other	9	(4.4)				
Sample Size	**57**	—				

SOURCE: SFSP Implementation Study, Sponsor Survey (2001).

NOTE: The bottom panel of the table is restricted to sponsors that were unwilling to increase the length of the summer session. Tabulations are weighted to be representative of sponsors nationally.

[a]Open sponsors are sponsors that have only open sites or a combination of open and enrolled sites.

[b]Enrolled sponsors are sponsors that have enrolled, camp, or National Youth Sports Program sites.

[c]These answers were constructed from responses to an open-ended question about why the sponsor would not be willing to increase the length of the summer session.

expand the number of sites or extend the length of the program may be an effective way to increase program participation.

3. Site Supervisors' Views on Capacity Constraints and Barriers to Participation

Eighty-five percent of site supervisors did not believe that program capacity constraints or enrollment limits prevented interested children who live near their site from receiving services (Table IV.6). According to the site supervisors, although 18 percent of sites were unable to serve additional children, about half estimated they could serve 1 to 50 additional children, and one-third estimated they could serve more than 50 additional children. Although most site supervisors did not see capacity constraints or enrollment limits as preventing children from receiving services, it is not clear whether they held this belief because all interested children were being served or because other barriers prevented local children from attending the site.

Supervisors of open sites and supervisors of enrolled sites (including camps) had different perceptions about capacity or enrollment constraints.[5] Open sites often can adjust their capacity to serve more children as necessary (for example, by ordering more meals). Not only are enrolled sites reimbursed only for meals served to enrolled children, but those sites generally provide structured activity programs in addition to feeding programs that may create capacity constraints preventing them from increasing enrollment. Only 8 percent of supervisors of open sites reported that capacity constraints or enrollment limits prevented children from being served (Table IV.6). By contrast, one-quarter of supervisors of enrolled sites believed that interested children were not being served.

Family barriers may prevent some children from participating in the SFSP, even at open sites with the capacity to serve them. Two-thirds of site supervisors identified at least one family barrier limiting participation at their site (Table IV.7). Lack of transportation, reported by 33 percent, was the most commonly cited barrier.[6] Twenty-six percent of site supervisors believed that insufficient program publicity prevented some children and parents from becoming aware of the program. Other barriers, mentioned by at least one-tenth of site supervisors, included limited hours of program operations (a problem for working parents who need all-day care for their children), unappetizing food, lack of activities, and site locations in unsafe neighborhoods. Fewer than 10 percent mentioned embarrassment or stigma, and fewer than 4 percent perceived low levels of parents' or children's motivation to be a significant barrier.

Supervisors of open sites mentioned more and somewhat different barriers than did supervisors of enrolled sites. (As with sponsors, enrolled sites are defined here to include camp and NYSP sites.) Supervisors at open sites were much more likely than those at enrolled sites to mention lack of transportation (36 percent versus 17 percent), lack of publicity (27 percent

---

[5]Camp and NYSP sites are included with enrolled sites.

[6]About half the supervisors of rural sites (49 percent), in particular, reported transportation as a barrier (n = 57). Rural sites were classified as rural based on interviewer observation.

TABLE IV.6

SITE CAPACITY CONSTRAINTS ON PARTICIPATION

	Percentage of Sites	Standard Error	Percentage of Open Sites	Standard Error	Percentage of Enrolled Sites[a]	Standard Error
Capacity Constraints or Enrollment Limits Prevent Participation						
Yes	11	(2.9)	8	(3.1)	25	(8.6)
No	85	(3.5)	88	(3.8)	73	(8.7)
Don't know	4	(1.5)	4	(1.7)	2	(1.6)
Number of Additional Children Site Could Serve in Existing Facility						
0	18	(3.9)	17	(4.6)	21	(6.6)
1 to 25	25	(4.8)	20	(5.3)	51	(11.9)
26 to 50	23	(3.6)	27	(4.0)	6	(4.1)
51 to 100	18	(4.0)	19	(4.5)	14	(8.1)
≥101	16	(3.4)	18	(4.0)	7	(4.4)
Don't know	1	(0.3)	0	(0.2)	2	(1.6)
Median	29.8	(6.8)	39.5	(8.4)	9.0	(5.1)
Mean	77.2	(11.5)	84.5	(13.8)	41.7	(15.8)
Sample Size	**162**	—	**120**	—	**42**	—

SOURCE: SFSP Implementation Study, Site Supervisor Interview (2001).

NOTE: Tabulations are weighted to be representative of sites nationally.

[a]Enrolled sites include camp and National Youth Sports Program sites.

TABLE IV.7

SITE SUPERVISORS' VIEWS ON BARRIERS TO CHILDRENS' PARTICIPATION AT SITE

Barriers	Percentage of Sites	Standard Error	Percentage of Open Sites	Standard Error	Percentage of Enrolled Sites[a]	Standard Error
Lack of Transportation	33	(6.0)	36	(7.0)	17	(8.3)
Lack of Publicity	26	(4.5)	27	(6.3)	17	(8.9)
Limited Hours	17	(3.9)	18	(4.5)	10	(5.4)
Children Do Not Like the Food	16	(3.2)	18	(3.5)	6	(5.8)
Lack of/Types of Activities	12	(3.8)	14	(4.5)	0	(0.3)
Unsafe Neighborhood	11	(3.6)	13	(4.2)	0	(0.0)
Embarrassment/Stigma	10	(2.5)	11	(6.8)	4	(4.1)
Limited Capacity/Enrolled Site[b,c]	8	(3.2)	6	(2.8)	17	(9.4)
Money[b]	8	(2.8)	6	(3.1)	16	(11.0)
Motivation (of Parents or Children)[b,d]	4	(2.2)	3	(2.2)	7	(6.9)
Other[b,e]	4	(1.8)	2	(1.5)	11	(7.3)
No Barriers[b]	33	(4.2)	31	(4.7)	39	(9.7)
Sample Size	**162**	—	**120**	—	**42**	—

SOURCE: SFSP Implementation Study, Site Supervisor Interview (2001).

NOTE: Multiple responses allowed; will not sum to 100 percent. Tabulations are weighted to be representative of sites nationally.

Sample sizes for specific items are slightly less than shown (ranging from 150 to 162 for the full site sample), because of missing data.

[a]Includes camp and National Youth Sports Program sites.

[b]These responses were volunteered.

[c]Includes enrolled sites, no activities for nonenrolled children, and limited capacity.

[d]Includes lack of parental motivation, home neglect, parents missing the registration deadline, and children staying home to watch television.

[e]Includes distance to the site, other time commitments (job/family), nonenrolled children's suspicions about religious groups, and smaller children's feelings of intimidation by high school students.

versus 17 percent), limited hours (18 percent versus 10 percent), children's dislike of the food (18 percent versus 6 percent), lack of activities (14 percent versus less than 1 percent), an unsafe neighborhood (13 percent versus 0 percent), and stigma (11 percent versus 4 percent). Not surprisingly, supervisors at enrolled sites were more likely to mention that children were prevented from attending because the site had limited capacity or was enrolled (17 percent versus 6 percent at open sites), or because of the cost of the program (16 percent versus 6 percent at open sites).

B. EFFORTS TO EXPAND THE PROGRAM

Because the SFSP always has served significantly fewer children than do the free and reduced-price components of the NSLP, efforts to expand the availability of summer meals are of particular interest. This section describes the outreach activities currently used to increase sponsors' and children's participation.

1. State Agency Outreach

Most state agencies conduct extensive outreach for the SFSP, very often in cooperation with partner organizations. All of them conduct some outreach to attract new sponsors ranging from one or two mailings to very extensive activities, depending on the size of the state and number of staff available. Many state agencies also provide general information about the SFSP to anyone interested (for example, through brochures or a Web site), publicize the program to potential sponsors and the public at large, and develop materials for sponsors' use in publicizing the program.

State administrators most frequently mentioned personal contacts as their most successful approach to recruiting new sponsors. Their belief in the usefulness of this method is consistent with the fact that they also believe the SFSP's complex paperwork and financial management requirements discourage sponsors from participating (see Section A.1 of this chapter). Personal contacts enable the state administrators to present the positive aspects of the program, and to reassure potential sponsors that help will be available.

a. Partner Organizations

About 9 out of 10 state administrators reported that their agencies work with other organizations on outreach (Table IV.8). More than half collaborated with nutrition or antihunger advocacy groups or food banks. Many of these groups are affiliated with the Food Research and Action Center (FRAC) and may have learned about the SFSP through FRAC's Campaign to End Childhood Hunger.[7]

---

[7]Several state administrators mentioned FRAC or the Campaign to End Childhood Hunger by name.

TABLE IV.8

STATE AGENCIES' WORK WITH PARTNER ORGANIZATIONS

	Number of State Agencies	Percentage of State Agencies
State Works with Other Organizations on Outreach		
Yes	49	90.7
No	5	9.3
Types of Partner Organizations[a]		
Nutrition or antihunger advocacy group or food bank	28	51.9
Community-based organization and coalition	18	33.3
Department of agriculture (federal or state level) or cooperative extension	9	16.7
Business organization or media	9	16.7
School and school district	7	13.0
WIC, Food Stamp Program, or other federal nutrition program	7	13.0
Department of education (includes Title 1 programs)[b]	6	11.1
Local government or local government groups (mayor's groups, others)	6	11.1
Religious organizations	4	7.4
State or local parks and recreation department	4	7.4
Local health department	3	5.6
Other state agencies	8	14.8
Other[c]	14	25.9
None	5	9.3
Total	**54**	—

SOURCE: SFSP Implementation Study, State Administrator Census (2001).

[a]Multiple responses allowed.

[b]Counted only if the state agency is not part of the State Department of Education.

[c]Includes migrant programs; statewide organizations of human services professionals, Upward Bound programs, and Housing Authorities; children's advocates; and foundations.

WIC = Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children.

Many state agencies (33 percent) work with community-based organizations or statewide coalitions of these groups; examples of community groups mentioned include Community Action Agencies, YMCAs, and Boys and Girls Clubs. Other common types of partners include state departments of agriculture or cooperative extension agents (mentioned by 17 percent) and business and media groups, such as Chambers of Commerce or radio stations that run public service announcements (mentioned by 17 percent). State agencies also work with other state agencies, particularly departments of education (when the state agency is not part of that department), school districts, local offices of the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children or of the Food Stamp Program, local government groups, parks and recreation departments at the state or local level, local health departments, and religious organizations.

b.   Approaches to Recruiting New Sponsors

State administrators reported using a wide range of approaches to recruit new sponsors (Table IV.9).[8]   The four most commonly mentioned approaches were general mailings (mentioned by 43 percent); presentations about the SFSP at conferences of groups that may include potential sponsors (mentioned by 39 percent); publicity about the SFSP through press releases, public service announcements, or newspaper articles (37 percent); and one-on-one recruiting efforts (28 percent). In addition to the general mailings, 12 state administrators (22 percent) mentioned using targeted mailings, such as mailings to all school districts serving low-income areas, and 5 administrators (9 percent) mentioned sending letters signed by a prominent person, such as the governor or the head of the state's department of education, in order to attract attention.[9]

Other activities were mentioned by only a few state administrators but may be of interest to others. For example, six state administrators reported offering toll-free numbers to enable callers to obtain information about the SFSP. Four state agencies encouraged current sponsors to spread the word to potential sponsors, and the administrator of one state agency mentioned personalized invitations to potential sponsors to attend informational meetings and training. Four state agencies showed an outreach video (prepared by the Food and Nutrition Service [FNS]), and two had Web sites about their program.

---

[8]The question on recruitment methods was open-ended. Responses should therefore be seen as a lower bound on the number of agencies using a particular method, as state administrators may not have provided an inclusive list. (Many did mention a wide range of outreach activities.)

[9]It is possible that some of the state administrators who mentioned "mailings" used some of these approaches. The "general mailings" category includes only state administrators who did not mention mailings targeted to specific audiences or signed by a prominent individual.

TABLE IV.9

STATE AGENCIES' EFFORTS TO ATTRACT SPONSORS

	Number of State Agencies	Percentage of State Agencies
Types of Outreach to Attract New Sponsors[a]		
Mailings, Including Letters, Flyers, Brochures[b]	23	42.6
Presentations at Conferences or Meetings of Relevant Groups	21	38.9
General Publicity About Program in Public Service Announcements, Articles, Press Releases	20	37.0
One-on-One Contact with Potential Sponsors	15	27.8
Outreach to Partner Organizations or Groups of Potential Sponsors	13	24.1
Targeted Letters (to School Districts or Groups of Potential Sponsors)	12	22.2
Working with Advocates to Promote Program	9	16.7
Research/Development of Lists of Potential Sponsors	8	14.8
Meetings with Groups of Potential Sponsors	6	11.1
Toll-Free Number/Hotline	6	11.1
Letters Signed by a Prominent Person	5	9.3
Notices in School Food Service Organizations' Newsletters	4	7.4
Outreach Video	4	7.4
Word-of-Mouth from Other Sponsors	4	7.4
Web Site	2	3.7
Personal Invitations to Outreach Events and Training	1	1.9
Working with USDA or Other State Agencies	1	1.9
Other[c]	7	13.0
Most Successful Types of Outreach to Attract New Sponsors/Increase Participation[a]		
Focus on New Sponsors		
Personal contacts	18	33.3
Outreach to schools	13	24.1
Mailings (especially to schools)	7	13.0

TABLE IV.9 *(continued)*

	Number of State Agencies	Percentage of State Agencies
Presentations at conferences	4	7.4
Working with advocates, nutrition groups	4	7.4
Focus on New Participants		
Word-of-mouth[d]	6	11.1
Flyers, posters, banners	4	7.4
Public service announcements, television, radio, newspaper	4	7.4
Working with existing sponsors to find new sites	4	7.4
More/better activities with meals	2	3.7
Toll-free number/hotline	2	3.7
Publicity to community groups	2	3.7
Bookmarks, Frisbees	2	3.7
Door-to-door canvassing	1	1.9
Other	2	3.7
Don't Know	1	1.9
Total	**54**	—

SOURCE: SFSP Implementation Study, State Administrator Census (2001).

NOTE: Questions on outreach strategies were open-ended, and state administrators provided varying levels of detail in their responses. Thus, tabulations should be interpreted as representing lower bounds on the number of state agencies using each strategy.

[a]Multiple responses allowed.

[b]Does not include targeted letters or letters signed by a prominent person, which are listed separately.

[c]Includes billboards, advertisements on buses, and advertisements in movie theatres; outreach to mothers at WIC clinics; and outreach to camp programs for low-income children. Some of these approaches may be targeted to recruiting participants rather than potential new sponsors.

[d]Word-of-mouth could have been cited in the context of recruiting new sponsors but seemed most often to refer to recruiting participants for existing sponsors.

USDA = U.S. Department of Agriculture; WIC = Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children.

c. Most Successful Outreach Approaches

State administrators who were asked for their opinion on their most successful outreach approaches for attracting new sponsors or increasing participation emphasized one-on-one recruitment of sponsors and outreach to schools (Table IV.9).[10] One-third believed that personal contacts with potential sponsors was their most successful strategy. The emphasis on one-on-one recruitment is consistent with the belief that the SFSP is challenging to operate: sponsors must therefore be "sold" on participation; according to one state administrator, the key was to "identify and work with them and make them understand the program." In addition, state administrators wanted to ensure that new sponsors were aware of the frequent need for additional funding sources, on the one hand, and of the help available from the state, on the other. To quote another administrator, "You have to find the right person, at the right time, and get them the right funding in order to have a successful sponsorship." Another state agency hired a consultant well known in the school food service community to make personal recruitment visits to school districts in low-income areas.

About one-quarter of the state administrators believed that outreach to schools was the most successful strategy. This belief reflects the fact that many state agencies see School Food Authorities (SFAs) as ideal sponsors because these organizations are accustomed to operating child nutrition programs. Because most SFSP state agencies also administer the NSLP, they usually can easily obtain the information to determine which school districts that are not sponsors are likely to have schools that qualify as eligible SFSP sites.

No one method for encouraging children's participation was mentioned frequently as the most successful, but a few state administrators each mentioned a few approaches. This pattern probably reflects the fact that state agencies focus most of their energies on outreach to sponsors. In addition, the most effective outreach method may vary from place to place. Particularly interesting approaches included door-to-door canvassing in the community, with door-hangers (flyers shaped to fit over doorknobs) left for people who were not home, and placement of advertisements for the program on subways and buses.

2. Sponsors' Efforts to Increase Participation at Their Sites

Seventy-one percent of current sponsors reported that they had used one or more strategies to increase participation at their sites in 2001 or 2000 (Table IV.10). They used a wide variety of outreach activities, including partnering with other community organizations and agencies to

---

[10]Although asked to identify their most successful outreach activity, the question was open-ended, and many administrators provided multiple responses. Some mentioned only sponsor-focused activities or only participation-focused activities; others mentioned both types. Some of the activities mentioned, such as mailings, may appear here in part because the state agency did not conduct any other form of outreach; by definition, then, the cited activity also was the most successful.

TABLE IV.10

SPONSORS' STRATEGIES TO INCREASE PARTICIPATION

Strategies[a]	Percentage of All Sponsors	Standard Error	Percentage of Open Sponsors[b]	Standard Error	Percentage of Enrolled Sponsors[c]	Standard Error
Flyers, Posters, Signs, Outreach to Families	28	(4.8)	35	(6.4)	13	(6.9)
Advertisements Through Newspapers, Radio, Television	24	(4.5)	31	(5.9)	8	(4.9)
Work with Organizations Other than Schools	12	(3.1)	14	(3.8)	6	(5.2)
Unspecified Increased Publicity	12	(3.8)	14	(4.6)	8	(7.0)
Improve the Program[d]	9	(3.1)	12	(4.4)	3	(1.9)
Work with Schools	7	(2.8)	7	(2.4)	9	(7.2)
Recruit/Open More Sites	5	(2.1)	7	(2.8)	2	(2.4)
Word of Mouth	6	(2.9)	6	(3.8)	4	(4.0)
Door-to-Door/Home Visits	4	(1.7)	2	(1.7)	8	(5.7)
Other	5	(2.1)	6	(2.8)	4	(2.7)
No Strategies Reported	29	(5.1)	14	(4.1)	59	(11.8)
Sample Size	**124**	—	**95**	—	**29**	—

SOURCE: SFSP Implementation Study, Sponsor Survey (2001).

NOTES: Tabulations are weighted to be representative of sponsors nationally.

[a]Categories constructed from open-ended responses to a question about what, if anything, the sponsor had done in 2000 or 2001 to increase program participation.

[b]Sponsors that have only open sites or a combination of open and enrolled sites.

[c]Sponsors that have enrolled, camp, or National Youth Sports Program sites.

[d]Includes such strategies as securing or providing transportation assistance, increasing staff/volunteers, improving meal quality, and offering more programs/activities.

promote the program. All sponsors are required to advertise the availability of free meals at their sites, but they may not have considered these announcements as efforts to increase participation.

a. Outreach Activities

Sponsors used many strategies to increase participation, ranging from flyers, posters, and signs targeted to parents and/or children (mentioned by 28 percent); to newspaper, radio, or television advertisements (mentioned by 24 percent); to improving the program to make it more attractive to their community's children (mentioned by 9 percent) (Table IV.10). More than 1 in 10 sponsors also mentioned collaborating with other organizations to increase participation, and more than 1 in 10 just generally "increased publicity." Five percent of sponsors attempted to recruit and open additional sites to increase the number of children served. As expected, sponsors with open sites reported more efforts to increase program coverage than did sponsors with enrolled sites.

Most former sponsors (81 percent) also attempted to increase participation at their sites during the last year they operated the program (Table IV.11). Half the former sponsors that did not attempt to bolster participation cited lack of need, and half cited a lack of resources or enrollment limits that limited their capacity to expand.

b. Partner Organizations

Many sponsors reported collaborating with other organizations to promote and support the SFSP (Table IV.12). About half of current sponsors and 62 percent of former sponsors indicated that they worked with other organizations.

About three-quarters of current sponsors and two-thirds of former sponsors that worked with partners worked with more than one organization. More than half of current sponsors collaborated with community-based organizations, and almost half reported working with schools; about 40 percent of former sponsors worked with each group. Other common types of partners were media groups (partners to 20 percent of current sponsors and 26 percent of former sponsors) and religious organizations (partners to 17 percent of current sponsors and 32 percent of former sponsors). A smaller share of sponsors also worked with business organizations, antihunger advocacy groups, local governments, parks and recreation departments, local health departments, and housing authorities or public housing complexes.

Sponsors reported that their partner organizations performed a range of functions. The most commonly reported functions were informing residents about specific SFSP sites (mentioned by 88 percent of sponsors and 77 percent of former sponsors), placing advertisements or making public service announcements (mentioned by 83 and 82 percent, respectively), and providing activities for children at the sites (51 and 55 percent, respectively). Partner organizations provided the following types of assistance to at least 20 percent of sponsors: providing flyers, posters, promotional materials, or gifts; helping to identify areas in need of sites; providing assistance with forms and application requirements; providing staff or volunteers to help at the sites; and arranging special media events, such as a kick-off event.

TABLE IV.11

FORMER SPONSORS' EFFORTS TO INCREASE PARTICIPATION

	Percentage of Former Sponsors	Standard Error
Attempted to Increase Participation at Their Site(s) in Their Last Year in Program	81	(4.1)
Sample Size	**130**	—
Reasons for No Attempt to Increase Participation		
No need	48	(12.2)
Lack of resources (including staff, space) or enrollment limits	49	(12.1)
Other[a]	3	(2.6)
Sample Size	**24**	—

SOURCE: SFSP Implementation Study, Former Sponsor Survey (2001).

NOTE: Tabulations are weighted to be representative of former sponsors nationally.

[a]Includes lack of interest by school, transportation limitations, and having joined program too late.

TABLE IV.12

SPONSORS' WORK WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS
TO PROMOTE AND SUPPORT THE SFSP

	Percentage of Current Sponsors	Standard Error	Percentage of Former Sponsors	Standard Error
All Current and Former Sponsors				
Percentage that Worked with Other Organizations	48	(6.0)	62	(5.1)
Sample Size	**126**	—	**131**	—
Current and Former Sponsors that Worked with Other Organizations				
Number of Other Organizations Worked with				
1	23	(5.6)	36	(6.8)
2	32	(6.7)	35	(6.2)
3 to 4	36	(7.3)	29	(7.1)
>5	10	(3.7)	1	(0.5)
Mean	2.5	(0.4)	2.0	(0.1)
Percentage that Worked with:				
Community-based organization	61	(6.7)	38	(6.4)
Schools or department of education	50	(7.3)	39	(6.6)
Media	20	(5.8)	26	(6.1)
Religious organization	17	(5.0)	32	(6.8)
Business organization	—	—	9	(5.9)
Nutrition or antihunger advocacy group	6	(2.9)	4	(2.9)
Other organizations[a]	44	(6.9)	29	(6.6)
Percentage Reporting that Partner Organizations:				
Informed residents about specific SFSP sites[b]	88	(5.1)	77	(6.9)
Placed advertisements or made public service announcements[c]	83	(5.3)	82	(5.2)
Provided activities for children at sites[c]	51	(7.5)	55	(7.1)
Provided flyers, posters, promotional materials, or gifts[c]	36	(6.7)	22	(5.7)
Helped to identify areas in need of sites[b]	35	(6.1)	31	(6.0)
Provided assistance with forms and application requirements[c]	25	(5.8)	17	(4.8)
Provided volunteer staff to help at the sites[c]	25	(6.0)	41	(6.8)
Provided special media events, such as a kick-off[c]	24	(5.9)	18	(5.1)
Provided additional funds[c]	14	(5.3)	13	(4.5)
Provided assistance in finding food service vendors[c]	7	(3.6)	10	(3.4)
Provided other support[c,d]	9	(4.1)	0	(0.0)
Sample Size	**71**	—	**79**	—

SOURCE: SFSP Implementation Study, Sponsor and Former Sponsor Surveys (2001).

135

TABLE IV.12 *(continued)*

_____

NOTE: Tabulations are weighted to be representative of sponsors and former sponsors nationally.

[a]Includes other government or government agency, housing authority, public housing complex, recreation or parks department, job corps program, and national organizations (nonhunger).

[b]n = 69.

[c]n = 70.

[d]Includes food preparation, staffing, transportation, and providing the site or facilities.

3. Sites' Efforts to Increase Participation

Most site supervisors (85 percent) believed that publicity about their site was adequate (Table IV.13). Most often, sponsors are responsible for site publicity, although site staff also may be involved. Site supervisors reported that their sponsors had collaborated with schools (mentioned by 80 percent of supervisors); placed flyers, posters, and signs (mentioned by 75 percent); produced radio or television "spots" or newspaper advertisements (61 percent); and worked with other organizations (60 percent). Many supervisors at enrolled sites or camp sites also mentioned special events held to promote the program (mentioned by 36 percent of supervisors of enrolled sites, compared with 13 percent of supervisors of open sites).

C. NEW SPONSORS

When state agencies provided lists of sponsors for the Sponsor-Site Database, they indicated which sponsors were new in the sense that the sponsors had participated in the program in 2001 but not in 2000. Out of 4,372 sponsors on the combined lists, 440 were marked as new (10 percent). Examining the characteristics of new sponsors relative to continuing sponsors gives an indication of the types of sponsors that have recently been recruited through the types of outreach efforts described in the previous section. One caveat to keep in mind is that some of the sponsors counted as new in our definition may have been SFSP sponsors before 2000.

As with other sponsors, about half of all new sponsors were SFAs (Table IV.14). About one-third of new sponsors were nonprofit organizations, whereas just under one-sixth of continuing sponsors were nonprofits. By contrast, government and camp sponsors were less common among new sponsors than among continuing sponsors. These trends may indicate the effects of recent moves to reduce SFSP regulatory requirements for school and nonprofit sponsors discussed in Chapter I.

New sponsors were less likely than continuing sponsors to offer both breakfast and supper. This difference largely may reflect the smaller proportion of new sponsors that were camps. New sponsors also tended to be smaller than continuing sponsors. They operated an average of three sites, and 61 percent operated only one site. By contrast, continuing sponsors operated an average of nine sites, and 48 percent operated only one site. New sponsors also served fewer total meals; about 80 percent served 10,000 meals or fewer, compared with 57 percent of continuing sponsors. The average duration of new sponsors' programs was slightly shorter than that of continuing sponsors; in particular, new sponsors' programs were more likely to operate for fewer than 4 weeks (20 percent of new sponsors versus 13 percent of continuing sponsors).

New sponsors may run small programs because they are small organizations with limited capacity to administer many sites or because they want to acquire some experience with only modest financial risk by trying out the SFSP on a small scale initially. Given the data available, it is not possible to determine which explanation is the more likely; however, it seems plausible that both factors are at work. As discussed in Chapter III, state agencies recognized that new sponsors need special attention; most state agencies provided new sponsors with more-extensive training than that given to continuing sponsors, and they were aware that these sponsors had more difficulty with some issues. The next section discusses the states' effectiveness in retaining sponsors, and why some sponsors leave the SFSP.

TABLE IV.13

SITE SUPERVISORS' VIEWS ON PUBLICITY EFFORTS

	Percentage of Sites	Standard Error	Percentage of Open Sites	Standard Error	Percentage of Enrolled Sites	Standard Error
Site Supervisors Believed Publicity Was Adequate	85	(3.6)	87	(3.5)	74	(11.3)
Publicity Efforts Currently Used to Promote Site[a]						
Working with schools	80	(5.0)	82	(5.3)	73	(11.8)
Flyers, posters, signs	75	(4.3)	79	(4.9)	51	(11.4)
Radio or television "spots," newspaper advertisements	61	(5.3)	62	(5.9)	55	(11.9)
Working with other organizations	60	(4.6)	62	(4.7)	55	(10.5)
Special events[b]	17	(3.8)	13	(4.0)	36	(10.5)
Word-of-mouth[b]	9	(2.5)	8	(2.7)	11	(5.9)
Letters, telephone calls to parents and children[b]	3	(1.7)	2	(1.0)	12	(7.9)
Other[b,c]	4	(2.3)	4	(2.7)	1	(1.2)
Sample Size	**161**	—	**120**	—	**41**	—

SOURCE: SFSP Implementation Study, Site Supervisor Interview (2001).

NOTE: Tabulations are weighted to be representative of sites nationally. Enrolled sites include camp and National Youth Sports Program sites.

[a]Because of missing data, sample sizes for specific items range from 147 to 161. Multiple responses allowed; will not sum to 100 percent.

[b]Response was volunteered.

[c]Includes outreach via the Internet, bilingual publicity, offering more activities, incentives for children, and door-to-door canvassing.

TABLE IV.14

COMPARISON OF SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS
OF NEW AND CONTINUING SPONSORS

	Percentage of New Sponsors	Percentage of Continuing Sponsors
Type of Sponsor		
Government	8.6	14.8
School	47.7	48.5
Camp/Upward Bound	8.2	17.3
NYSP	2.5	3.6
Nonprofit organization	32.5	15.8
Missing	0.5	0.0
Meals Offered		
Breakfast	61.4	73.2
Lunch	96.8	98.4
Supper	11.6	21.6
Any snack	16.4	15.1
Number of Sites Sponsored		
1	60.5	48.4
2 to 5	29.8	26.8
6 to 10	4.3	9.6
11 to 50	5.2	12.3
51 to 100	0.2	1.6
>100	0.0	1.3
Median	1.0	2.0
Mean	2.9	8.7
Total Meals Served		
<1,000	12.7	4.8
1,000 to 10,000	67.1	52.1
10,001 to 20,000	11.6	18.0
20,001 to 100,000	7.1	19.7
≥100,001	0.9	4.9
Missing	0.7	0.6
Median	3,780	8,035
Mean	8,718	32,412

TABLE IV.14 *(continued)*

	Percentage of New Sponsors	Percentage of Continuing Sponsors
Program Duration (Calendar Weeks)		
<4	20.2	12.5
4 to <8	43.0	51.8
8 to <12	28.2	29.7
≥12	3.6	3.3
Missing	5.0	2.7
Median	6.7	6.9
Mean	7.1	7.6
Total	**440**	**3,932**

SOURCE: SFSP Implementation Study, Sponsor-Site Database (2001).

NYSP = National Youth Sports Program.

D. SPONSORS THAT LEAVE THE PROGRAM

Based on the sample frame compiled for the survey of former sponsors and the ineligibility rates found in the survey, an estimated 330 sponsors (about 8 percent of year 2000 sponsors) left the SFSP between 2000 and 2001. This section describes the actions state agencies take to retain sponsors, the differences between the characteristics of former sponsors and current sponsors, and the reasons why sponsors left the program.

1. State Agencies' Strategies to Promote Sponsor Retention

If the SFSP is to grow, it is important not just to recruit new sponsors but to keep existing sponsors in the program. To gain insight into how state agencies address this issue, state administrators were asked an open-ended question on what their agency was doing to retain sponsors. Although a few administrators noted they did not have the resources to focus on sponsor retention, the rest mentioned one or more strategies.

State administrators most frequently emphasized that their role as providers of technical assistance was key to retaining sponsors (Table IV.15). Nearly 40 percent emphasized the amount of assistance available, noting that they would provide one-on-one assistance to sponsors who needed it or were ready to provide assistance on a wide range of topics, and about 35 percent reported that their agency tried to provide high-quality customer service, with an emphasis on a warm, supportive relationship.[11]

About one-quarter of the state agencies recognized sponsors' efforts by giving out awards, hosting special dinners, hosting conferences, or using some combination of these approaches. FNS gives "Summer Sunshine" awards to outstanding sponsors, and some states have encouraged participation in this program or have their own system for providing recognition. The awards sometimes are given out at a conference or a dinner at which sponsors can share their experiences and ideas for improving the program. At these meetings, which generally are held at the end of the summer, some state agencies obtain feedback about sponsors' concerns or ways to improve their services. One state administrator mentioned that each sponsor was given an individualized report card recognizing its program's strengths and offering suggestions on how to improve.

About 10 to 20 percent of state administrators each reported that their agencies (1) provided ongoing encouragement and reminders about why the program is important, (2) attempted to reduce the paperwork burden, (3) strove to communicate effectively with sponsors, (4) conducted outreach, and (5) improved training and technical assistance in response to sponsors' feedback. Five state administrators also mentioned following up with sponsors that left the program to understand what had gone wrong.

---

[11]Many agencies emphasized both the quantity and quality of technical assistance available; 61 percent of agencies mentioned one or both of these responses.

TABLE IV.15

STATE AGENCIES' EFFORTS TO RETAIN SPONSORS

Strategies	Number of State Agencies	Percentage of State Agencies
Provide Technical Assistance, Including Individualized Help[a]	21	38.9
Provide Good Customer Service[a]	19	35.2
Motivate Sponsors with Conferences, Lunches, Awards Workshops	14	25.9
Attempt to Reduce/Simplify Paperwork, Including Application	9	16.7
Conduct Outreach (to the Community and Sponsors)	8	14.8
Provide Good Training/Improve Training	8	14.8
Encourage Sponsors/Remind Sponsors of Program's Good Points	7	13.0
Maintain Good Communication with Sponsors	7	13.0
Follow Up with Sponsors that Leave	5	9.3
Be Flexible About Application Deadlines	2	3.7
Have Sponsors Partner with Other Sponsor Organizations	2	3.7
Work with Special Sponsor Group and Related Professional Groups	2	3.7
Try to Make Monitoring Positive	1	1.9
Work Efficiently so Sponsors Are Reimbursed Quickly	1	1.9
Other	5	9.3
Nothing	2	3.7
Total	**54**	—

SOURCE: SFSP Implementation Study, State Administrator Census (2001).

NOTE: Responses to open-ended question. Multiple responses allowed.

[a]Sixty-one percent of state administrators had responses in one or both of these categories.

Some strategies mentioned by only one or two state administrators may be of interest. For example, two state agencies helped new sponsors learn by partnering them with more-experienced sponsors. One state administrator reported that the agency worked hard to make monitoring a positive experience for sponsors, with the emphasis on educating the sponsors about the program. Others mentioned flexibility with application deadlines as a useful strategy.

2.   Characteristics of Former Sponsors and Current Sponsors

Despite the state agencies' efforts, some sponsors leave the SFSP each year. Understanding how former sponsors and current sponsors differ may help state and national officials to enrich retention strategies and provide more-targeted technical assistance. Sponsors that left the program between 2000 and 2001 were disproportionately nonprofit organizations (48 percent of former sponsors, but only 18 percent of current sponsors were nonprofit organizations), indicating that nonprofit organizations were more likely than schools, governments, or camps to leave (Table IV.16). However, one-third of former sponsors were schools; 13 percent were government sponsors; and 6 percent were camp, Upward Bound, or NYSP sponsors.

More than one-quarter (28 percent) of former sponsors left the program after operating for only 1 year. By comparison, new sponsors accounted for about 10 percent of the total sponsor population (see Section C), which suggests that new sponsors are at a relatively high risk of leaving the program. However, about one-third of former sponsors had been in the program for 6 years or longer.

Smaller sponsors were more likely than large sponsors to leave the program between 2000 and 2001. About half of both current and former sponsors operated a single site (59 percent of former sponsors and 50 percent of current sponsors), but relatively few former sponsors operated more than 10 sites (5 percent of former sponsors, compared with 14 percent of current sponsors). In addition, former sponsors had substantially lower average daily attendance relative to current sponsors (217 and 626 children, respectively); however, this difference was largely a function of the number of sites sponsored, as each group had a similar ratio of average daily attendance to average number of sites operated.

Former sponsors were more likely than current sponsors to have operated only open sites (74 percent versus 55 percent) or only enrolled sites (17 percent versus 11 percent). However, current sponsors were more likely to offer both open and enrolled sites (13 percent of current sponsors did so, versus 4 percent of former sponsors)—a reflection of their generally larger size.

Former sponsors were as likely as current sponsors to operate rural sites; sponsors with at least one rural site accounted for slightly more than half of both groups. In addition, similar proportions of both groups reported feeding migrant children. However, former sponsors disproportionately reported operating mobile sites (11 percent, compared with 3 percent of current sponsors). Operating mobile sites may pose unique challenges that increase the likelihood of a sponsor's leaving the program, but more information would be needed to confirm this explanation.

TABLE IV.16

COMPARISON OF SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS
OF FORMER SPONSORS AND CURRENT SPONSORS

	Percentage of Former Sponsors	Standard Error	Percentage of Current Sponsors	Standard Error
Type of Sponsor[a]				
Government	13	(4.1)	14	—
School	33	(4.8)	48	—
Camp/Upward Bound	5	(2.6)	16	—
NYSP	1	(0.7)	4	—
Nonprofit organization	48	(5.3)	18	—
Number of Years as Sponsor				
First year (new this year)	28	(5.1)	2[b]	(1.0)
2 to 5	38	(5.1)	41	(5.6)
≥ 6	34	(5.1)	57	(5.6)
Unknown (but >1)	0	—	0	(0.4)
Number of Sites Sponsored[a]				
1	59	(4.9)	50	—
2 to 5	30	(4.6)	27	—
6 to 10	6	(1.6)	9	—
11 to 50	5	(1.4)	12	—
51 to 100	0	(0.0)	2	—
101 to 200	>0	(0.3)	1	—
201 to 300	0	(0.0)	0	—
>300	0	(0.0)	0	—
Median	1.0	—[c]	2.0	—
Mean	3.5	(0.6)	8.1	—
Average Daily Attendance				
<100	60	(4.8)	32	(5.7)
100 to 500	33	(4.5)	53	(5.7)
501 to 1,000	3	(1.0)	7	(1.6)
1,001 to 5,000	3	(1.1)	7	(1.4)
>5,000	1	(0.4)	2	(0.5)
Median	72	(9)	145	(23)
Mean	217	(40)	626	(1,235)
Types of Sites				
All open	74	(4.5)	55	(5.2)
All enrolled	17	(3.9)	11	(3.9)
Combination of open and enrolled	3	(1.2)	13	(2.8)
Camp or Upward Bound sites	5	(2.6)	19	(5.0)
NYSP sites	1	(0.7)	2	(1.2)

TABLE IV.16 (*continued*)

	Percentage of Former Sponsors	Standard Error	Percentage of Current Sponsors	Standard Error
Location				
Any rural sites	57	(5.4)	56	(5.6)
Any migrant sites	7	(2.8)	9	(2.6)
Any mobile sites	11	(3.2)	3	(1.4)
Meals Offered[a]				
Breakfast	57	(5.0)	72	—
Lunch	95	(3.0)	98	—
Supper	18	(4.0)	21	—
Any snack	29	(4.8)	15	—
Type of Meal Preparation				
Self-preparation on site	46	(5.3)	63	(4.8)
Self-preparation at central kitchen	24	(4.0)	14	(3.1)
Self-preparation on site or at central kitchen	—	—	5	(1.7)
SFA as vendor	17	(4.0)	6	(1.9)
Private vendor	13	(3.5)	13	(3.8)
Sample Size—Surveys	**131**	**—**	**126**	**—**
Total—Sponsor-Site Database			**4,372**	

SOURCE: SFSP Implementation Study, Former Sponsor and Sponsor Surveys, and the Sponsor-Site Database (2001).

NOTE: Tabulations are weighted to be representative of former sponsors and sponsors nationally. Sponsor data are from the survey, except where noted.

[a]These sponsor data are from the Sponsor-Site Database, which is a census, so they have no standard errors.

[b]As discussed in Chapter II, the Sponsor-Site Database indicated that 10 percent of sponsors were new, but the survey found a smaller proportion.

[c]Standard error of median cannot be computed due to the skewness of the data.

NYSP = National Youth Sports Program; SFA = School Food Authority.

Former sponsors were less likely than current sponsors to serve breakfast but were more likely to serve snacks. These differences probably are related to the fact that former sponsors were less likely than current sponsors to be schools or camps and were more likely to be nonprofit organizations. Moreover, fewer former sponsors than current sponsors prepared meals themselves; they were more likely than current sponsors to employ SFAs to provide vended meals. Again, this difference probably reflects the relatively large proportion of former sponsors that were nonprofit organizations.

This study examined sponsors that left the SFSP in only one year, 2001. However, a previous study of sponsors that left in 1996 and 1997 also found that sponsors that left were more likely to be small sponsors and nonprofit organizations (U.S. General Accounting Office 1998).

3. Reasons Why Former Sponsors Left the Program

This section describes the perspectives of state administrators and of former sponsors on why sponsors leave the SFSP.

a. Perspectives of State Administrators

State administrators reported that, averaged across states, about 10 percent of sponsors left the SFSP between 2000 and 2001 (Table IV.17).[12] On average, seven sponsors per state did not return to the SFSP. Five state administrators indicated that no sponsors left during that period. Only three states lost more than 20 percent of their sponsors; these states were ones with relatively few sponsors, however, so a loss from the program of even one sponsor represented a large percentage of the state's sponsors.

According to the state administrators' reports, nearly all sponsors that left the program did so voluntarily and stopped participating completely. Although a few sponsors (fewer than 1 out of 10, on average) became sites themselves, thus operating for another sponsor, more than three-quarters of the state administrators did not report any sponsors making such a change.

Only a very small number of sponsors were asked by the state agency to leave. State administrators from only 11 states reported that any 2000 sponsors were asked not to reapply or were not approved for 2001; in general, there was only one "problem sponsor" per state. On average, fewer than one-half of 1 percent of a state's sponsors were dropped by the state (about 4 percent of sponsors that left). Five of the 11 state agencies that dropped at least 1 sponsor cited the result of administrative reviews of the sponsor, which found the sponsor to be seriously deficient. Other reasons cited by more than one state administrator included the failure of

---

[12]This average does not adjust for the different sizes of state programs. However, it is similar to the nationwide average of 8 percent (reported in the beginning of Section D).

TABLE IV.17

STATE ADMINISTRATORS' VIEWS ON WHY
SPONSORS LEFT THE PROGRAM

	Number of State Agencies	Percentage of State Agencies
Number of Sponsors that Left Between 2000 and 2001		
0	5	9.3
1 to 2	10	18.5
3 to 5	10	18.5
6 to 10	17	31.5
11 to 20	11	20.4
≥21	1	20.4
Mean	7.3	1.8
Median	6.5	—
Range	0-31	—
Percentage of Sponsors that Left		
0	5	9.3
>0 to 5	8	14.8
>5 to 10	19	35.2
>10 to 15	14	25.9
>15 to 20	5	9.3
>20	3	5.6
Mean	9.7	—
Median	9.5	—
Range	0-22	—
Percentage of Sponsors in 2000 that Left by Choice[b]		
0	5	9.3
1 to 10	31	57.4
11 to 20	16	29.6
21 to 30	2	3.6
Mean	8.7	—
Median	9.0	—
Range	0-22	—

TABLE IV.17 (*continued*)

	Number of State Agencies	Percentage of State Agencies
Percentage of Sponsors in 2000 that Changed from Being a Sponsor to Being a Site[b]		
0	43	79.6
1 to 10	10	18.5
11 to 20	1	1.8
Mean	0.6	—
Median	0	—
Range	0-11	—
Percentage of Sponsors in 2000 that Were Not Approved or Were Asked Not to Reapply[b]		
0	43	79.6
1 to 5	10	18.5
6 to 10	1	1.8
Mean	0.35	—
Median	0.0	—
Range	0-6	—
Reasons Not Approved or Asked Not to Reapply (n = 11)[a]		
Seriously deficient in reviews in previous year	5	45.4
Did not meet eligibility requirements	3	27.3
Missed application deadline	2	18.2
Poor performance/management	2	18.2
Did not pass health inspection	1	9.1
Owed excess advance funds	1	9.1
Program experienced loss of its other funding for 2001	1	9.1
Total	**54**	—

SOURCE: SFSP Implementation Study, State Administrator Census (2001).

[a]Multiple answers allowed.

[b]The five states that did not lose any sponsors in 2001 are included in the 0-percent category for this question.

sponsors to meet eligibility requirements, missed application deadlines, and poor performance or management of the program.

b. Perspectives of Former Sponsors

About 13 percent of former sponsors indicated that they had been dropped by the state (4 percent) or were no longer eligible (9 percent) (Table IV.18). The percentage who mentioned being dropped by the state is consistent with state reports. Former sponsors cited the following reasons for their program being dropped by the state: failure to meet deadlines, problems with meal counts or claiming procedures, noncompliance with monitoring, and existence of competing sites. These explanations were similar to the ones provided by state administrators. Sponsors dropped between 2000 and 2001 were a diverse group, including schools, nonprofit organizations, and Upward Bound programs.

Reasons for Leaving the Program. Former sponsors' reasons for leaving the program varied extensively. Most sponsors provided multiple explanations for leaving; on average, about three reasons were provided.

Nearly half (47 percent) of all former sponsors mentioned funding issues—usually that reimbursement rates were too low to warrant continued participation, or that it was less expensive to operate a feeding program outside the SFSP. Others mentioned internal funding problems. More former sponsors (20 percent) cited the reimbursement rate structure as their main reason for leaving than any other reason.

About two-fifths (44 percent) of the former sponsors attributed their exit from SFSP partly to the paperwork involved. In particular, former sponsors reported that the required paperwork and daily accounting were too difficult or too time-consuming (40 percent), or that the application process was too difficult or too time-consuming (25 percent). Paperwork was the third most commonly cited main reason for leaving.

Participation issues were the third most commonly cited reason for leaving (and lack of participation was the second most common main reason); 40 percent of former sponsors cited participation issues. More than one-quarter indicated that their sites' participation levels were too low. One-fifth of former sponsors indicated that their target area had too few income-eligible children for the program to be worthwhile or cost-effective. A small number (5 percent) believed that other feeding programs in their area precluded their continued participation. Lack of participation may be an indicator of insufficient need for the program, or it may indicate that the former sponsor was not successful in conducting outreach or addressing other barriers that prevent interested families from participating.

Fourteen percent of former sponsors acknowledged difficulty with program regulations and policies. (This fraction does not include the 9 percent of sponsors that were no longer eligible, or the 4 percent dropped by the state.) About 9 percent indicated that they had problems with meal count procedures, or that too many of their meals had been disqualified. Some also mentioned difficulties in adequately separating the administration of various food programs or adhering to health care and sanitation regulations.

TABLE IV.18

REASONS FORMER SPONSORS CITED FOR LEAVING THE PROGRAM

Reason Cited	Percentage Citing Reason	Standard Error	Percentage Citing as Main Reason	Standard Error
Dropped by State[a]	4	(2.0)	2	(0.9)
No Longer Eligible (n = 130)	9	(2.6)	5	(7.0)
Funding Issues	47	(5.2)		
Inadequate reimbursement rates or cheaper to run program outside of SFSP	45	(5.2)	20	(4.3)
Not enough internal funding/financial problems	5	(1.9)	4	(1.7)
Paperwork	44	(5.3)		
Paperwork too difficult or too time-consuming	40	(5.2)	11	(3.0)
Application process too difficult or too time-consuming	25	(4.6)	1	(0.5)
Participation Issues	40	(5.1)		
Lack of participation	28	(5.1)	13	(4.6)
Not enough eligible children to be worthwhile	20	(4.1)	8	(3.1)
Competing programs, other local alternatives	5	(2.5)	5	(2.4)
Difficulty with Program Regulations or Policies	14	(3.2)		
Meals disqualified/problems with meal counts	9	(2.5)	4	(1.7)
Difficulty separating various food programs	5	(1.9)	—	—
Health and sanitation requirements	3	(1.6)	—	—
Other Administrative Issues	13	(3.1)		
Insufficient staff	13	(3.1)	4	(1.8)
Other administrative or operational issues[b]	9	(2.2)	5	(1.7)
State-Related Issues	13	(3.4)		
Inadequate technical assistance or training	11	(3.2)	2	(1.4)
Poor relationship with state office	6	(1.9)	3	(1.4)
Change in Sponsor or Site Designation	12	(3.5)		
Prefer to feed children through NSLP/other program	10	(2.7)	4	(1.8)
Sponsor became a site	8	(2.9)	1	(0.9)
Site, vendor, or school district became sponsor	4	(2.0)	4	(1.9)
Site Issues	9	(2.8)		
Construction or remodeling of site facility	6	(2.5)	6	(2.6)
Summer school or program calendar changes	4	(2.0)	2	(0.9)
Other[c]	3	(1.8)	—	—
Sample Size	**131**	—	**128**	—

SOURCE: SFSP Implementation Study, Former Sponsor Survey (2001).

TABLE IV.18 *(continued)*

_____

[a]Reasons include failure to meet deadlines, problems with meal counts/claiming procedures, noncompliance with monitoring, and competing sites.

[b]Frequently mentioned responses include program manager having left, organization dissolved, problems with deadlines, vendors, poor relationships with other organizations, and internal or personal problems with organization or staff.

[c]Frequently mentioned responses include difficulty with security, children, and food quality or selection.

NSLP = National School Lunch Program.

Some former sponsors (13 percent) reported that they left for administrative reasons, most often because they had insufficient staff to operate the SFSP. Thirteen percent of former sponsors attributed their exit at least in part to issues with their state program administrators. Eleven percent stated that their training or technical assistance was insufficient, and 6 percent expressed dissatisfaction with their relationship with the state office.

Slightly more than 12 percent of former sponsors reported changes in status as the reason for leaving. One-tenth switched to feeding children through the NSLP or another non-SFSP feeding program. Eight percent became sites, preferring the daily feeding operations to the sponsor-level paperwork and program coordination. An additional 4 percent reported that a site or school district in their area had assumed sponsorship for the program.

Nine percent of sponsors dropped out of the program, perhaps temporarily, at least in part because of site or facility issues. For example, 6 percent of former sponsors reported that their departure was due to site construction or facility remodeling. Most of these sponsors indicated an intention to return to the program after construction was completed. Changes to the summer school or other program calendar adversely affected program viability for some sponsors (4 percent); cancellation of summer school or other activities may have forced them to close the feeding program.

Changes to Encourage Former Sponsors to Return to the Program. About 4 percent of former sponsors reported no desire whatsoever to serve as an SFSP sponsor in the future; 3 percent indicated they would definitely reapply regardless of changes made or not made to the program (Table IV.19). The remaining 92 percent would consider becoming a sponsor again if specific program changes were instituted. Almost one-third of this group believed that reimbursement rates should be raised to make the program more attractive. Nineteen percent reported that they would return if demand increased, and 26 percent indicated that operational changes or a reduction in the program's administrative burden would encourage them to return. For example, some former sponsors mentioned reduced paperwork, streamlined reporting, electronic filing of forms, or more realistic deadlines as administrative changes that could result in their return to the SFSP.

Some sponsors suggested changes to program regulations and policies that might facilitate their return. Sixteen percent suggested that meal service requirements be reduced. In particular, the sponsors were interested in more-flexible meal pattern requirements, reimbursements for meals that were prepared but not served, or permission for participants to take meals off site. A small fraction of sponsors mentioned the need for easing income restrictions on participants or creating a "severe needs" classification to increase the cost-effectiveness of the program.[13]

---

[13]Congress authorized higher federal payments for schools determined to be in "severe need" in order to encourage schools in especially needy areas to participate in the School Breakfast Program. Schools may qualify for higher severe need reimbursements if a specified percentage of their NSLP meals are served free or at a reduced price.

TABLE IV.19

CHANGES THAT COULD INDUCE FORMER SPONSORS
TO RETURN TO THE PROGRAM

	Percentage of Former Sponsors	Standard Error
Interest in Returning to the Program		
No Interest or Wants to Be a Site Only	4	(1.7)
Interested or Plans to Reapply; No Program Changes Necessary	3	(1.6)
Would Consider Returning if One or More Changes Made	92	(2.3)
Sample Size	**118**	—
Changes that Could Induce Return[a,b]		
Higher Reimbursement Rates	32	(5.3)
Increased Participation/Need or Closing of an Alternative Program	19	(4.4)
Administrative or Operational Changes	26	(5.2)
Less paperwork, streamlined reporting, or easier deadlines	20	(4.9)
Additional staff	5	(2.3)
Other administrative or operational issues[c]	1	(0.8)
Changes to Program Regulations or Policies	20	(4.4)
Ease meal count restrictions, reimburse for food prepared but not served, allow meals off site, increase meal flexibility	16	(4.2)
Ease income restrictions or allow severe-needs classification	4	(1.7)
Improved Technical Assistance, Training, Responsiveness of State	9	(3.5)
Site or Facility Issues	24	(5.6)
Improved or additional transportation for children	9	(5.0)
Add or reschedule summer school or other activities	8	(2.5)
Completed construction or remodeling of site facility	5	(2.6)
Other site or facility issues[d]	5	(1.9)
Other (unspecified)	1	(0.5)
Sample Size	**106**	—

SOURCE: SFSP Implementation Study, Former Sponsor Survey (2001).

NOTE: Multiple responses allowed; will not sum to 100 percent. Tabulations are weighted to be representative of former sponsors nationally.

[a]Asked of former sponsors who reported they would consider returning to the program if one or more changes were made.

TABLE IV.19 *(continued)*

_____

[b]Categories constructed in response to an open-ended question about what would have to happen or what would have to be changed for the organization to again become a sponsor.

[c]Includes attaining nonprofit organization status and making internal organizational improvements.

[d]Includes obtaining a central kitchen, obtaining refrigerated trucks, improving vended food, improving security, and being able to maintain longer operating hours.

Nine percent of former sponsors suggested changes in state-sponsor interactions. They reported that they would consider returning to the program if the state agency improved its technical assistance, enhanced training, or improved responsiveness.

About one-quarter (24 percent) of sponsors indicated that local changes to their facility or site would have to be made before they would consider serving as sponsors again. Concurrent with perceptions of state, sponsor, and site staff, availability of transportation was cited as critical to resumed sponsorship for 9 percent of former sponsors. Other site-related issues, such as reintroducing or rescheduling summer school (8 percent), completing construction or remodeling (5 percent), and acquiring a central kitchen (an example of "other site or facility issues" cited by 5 percent), are largely out of the hands of national and state program administrators. Annual attrition for these reasons is probably unavoidable.

Status of Sites Run by Former Sponsors. The majority of sites operated by former sponsors were not picked up by another sponsor in 2001 (Table IV.20). This finding illustrates the importance of sponsor retention. Overall, 70 percent of former sponsors reported that none of their sites had been assumed by another sponsor, and an additional 7 percent indicated that only some of their sites had been picked up. Single-site former sponsors and rural sponsors were particularly likely to report that no other sponsor picked up their sites. Sites operated by nonprofit organizations were most likely to have coverage within 1 year after their exit; fully 41 percent of these sponsors had some or all of their sites picked up.

TABLE IV.20

FORMER SPONSOR SITES PICKED UP BY ANOTHER SPONSOR

Share Picked Up	Percentage of All Former Sponsors	Standard Error	Percentage of Single-Site Former Sponsors	Standard Error	Percentage of Rural Former Sponsors	Standard Error	Percentage of Nonprofit Former Sponsors	Standard Error
All	22	(4.2)	14	(5.5)	15	(4.0)	34	(7.2)
Some	7	(2.1)	n.a.	—	10	(3.4)	7	(2.9)
None	70	(4.6)	86	(5.5)	76	(5.1)	59	(7.4)
Sample Size	**129**	—	**57**	—	**72**	—	**59**	—

SOURCE: SFSP Implementation Study, Former Sponsor Survey (2001).

NOTE: Tabulations are weighted to be representative of former sponsors nationally.

n.a. = not applicable.