

APPENDIX G

SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES FOR CHAPTER III

TABLE G.1

SPONSORS' REPORTS ON SFSP REIMBURSEMENTS
AND OTHER FUNDING SOURCES,
BY SCHOOL AND NONSCHOOL SPONSORS

	School Sponsor		Nonschool Sponsor	
	Percentage	SE	Percentage	SE
Sponsors in Nonpilot States				
Percentage of Administrative Costs State Agency Will Cover				
0 to 50	16	(6.6)	33**	(8.4)
51 to 75	7	(3.4)	18	(5.4)
76 to 99	26	(7.6)	26	(7.9)
100	51	(8.9)	23	(6.0)
Percentage of Operating Costs State Agency Will Cover				
0 to 50	0	(0.0)	24**	(8.7)
51 to 75	4	(3.1)	26	(7.9)
76 to 99	31	(9.7)	17	(5.1)
100	65	(10.0)	33	(8.4)
Sample Size	45	—	59	—
All Sponsors				
Expects State Agency to Cover All Costs	42	(8.1)	14**	(4.4)
Sample Size	61	—	60	—
If Not Expecting All Costs to Be Covered, Sources to Cover Differences Between Actual Costs and State Reimbursement				
Sponsor Funds	50	(10.0)	62	(7.5)
Parent Organization/Affiliation Funds	1	(1.0)	26**	(8.2)
Federal Funds	21	(8.1)	33	(9.8)
State Funds	28	(8.9)	29	(8.4)
Local Government Funds	11	(5.0)	24	(7.6)
Donations/Volunteers ^a	0	(0.0)	7	(4.2)
Other Sources ^b	6	(2.8)	22*	(7.8)
Sample Size	34	—	50	—

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

TABLE G.1 (continued)

NOTE: Tabulations are weighted to be representative of sponsors nationally. Because of missing data, sample sizes for specific responses are slightly lower.

^aCategory constructed from answers about “any other sources” that would help cover the difference between actual operating and administrative costs and the state’s reimbursement.

^bCategory combines two categories from the survey: (1) “other nonfederal funds,” and (2) “any other sources,” excluding donations and volunteers.

SE = standard error.

*Significantly different from school sponsors at the .05 level, chi-squared test.

**Significantly different from school sponsors at the .01 level, chi-squared test.

TABLE G.2

SPONSORS' REPORTS ON SFSP REIMBURSEMENTS
AND OTHER FUNDING SOURCES,
BY SPONSORS' EXPERIENCE

	Sponsor in Operation			
	2 to 5 Years		6 Years or More	
	Percentage	SE	Percentage	SE
Sponsors in Nonpilot States				
Percentage of Administrative Costs				
State Agency Will Cover				
0 to 50	21	(10.7)	29	(6.7)
51 to 75	9	(5.9)	15	(4.2)
76 to 99	26	(10.6)	25	(6.4)
100	43	(11.7)	31	(6.3)
Percentage of Operating Costs				
State Agency Will Cover				
0 to 50	17	(11.3)	11	(5.1)
51 to 75	20	(9.5)	15	(5.4)
76 to 99	22	(9.9)	23	(5.4)
100	41	(10.6)	51	(7.3)
Sample Size	26	—	75	—
All Sponsors				
Expects State Agency to Cover All Costs	22	(7.3)	33	(6.1)
Sample Size	35	—	82	—
If Not Expecting All Costs to Be Covered, Sources to Cover Differences Between Actual Costs and State Reimbursement				
Sponsor Funds	69	(9.1)	47	(7.8)
Parent Organization/Affiliation Funds	17	(9.4)	15	(6.0)
Federal Funds	34	(12.1)	24	(7.4)
State Funds	36	(11.2)	24	(7.2)
Local Government Funds	15	(8.7)	22	(6.0)
Donations/Volunteers ^a	0	(0.0)	8	(4.4)
Other Sources ^b	18	(9.7)	14	(4.5)
Sample Size	25	—	56	—

TABLE G.2 (continued)

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

NOTE: Tabulations are weighted to be representative of sponsors nationally. Because of missing data, sample sizes for specific responses are slightly lower.

^aCategory constructed from answers about “any other sources” that would help cover the difference between actual operating and administrative costs and the state’s reimbursement.

^bCategory combines two categories from the survey: (1) “other nonfederal funds,” and (2) “any other sources,” excluding donations and volunteers.

SE = standard error.

*Significantly different from 2-to-5 year sponsors at the .05 level, chi-squared test.

**Significantly different from 2-to-5 year sponsors at the .01 level, chi-squared test.

TABLE G.3
EXPERIENCED SPONSORS' COST-CONTROL STRATEGIES,
BY SCHOOL AND NONSCHOOL SPONSORS

	School Sponsors		Nonschool Sponsors	
	Percentage	SE	Percentage	SE
Any Strategy	79	(6.2)	68	(8.4)
Staffing				
Combined job functions	55	(7.3)	31*	(7.1)
Hired fewer people	47	(8.0)	18**	(4.6)
Had staff work fewer hours	41	(8.2)	17*	(4.7)
Had volunteers handle work usually done by paid staff	19	(6.6)	25	(7.2)
Let staff go	14	(4.9)	6	(2.5)
Reduced hourly pay	2	(1.6)	5	(3.3)
Meal Preparation				
Found less expensive vendors or suppliers of food or meal components	19	(5.7)	42*	(8.0)
Switched from mostly hot meals to mostly cold meals	7	(2.7)	12	(4.9)
Switched from vended sites to on-site cooking	6	(3.5)	8	(4.0)
Switched from on-site cooking to vended sites	1	(0.7)	5	(2.6)
Reduced food costs (found less expensive food, served fewer extra meals, changed meal plans) ^a	3	(2.0)	1	(0.5)
Program Administration				
Secured additional funds	4	(2.3)	26**	(7.4)
Reduced site monitoring	4	(2.9)	5	(2.9)
Reduced site training	3	(2.5)	3	(1.8)
Participation and Outreach				
Decreased number of sites	12	(4.5)	10	(4.2)
Reduced publicity and promotion efforts	4	(2.6)	8	(3.1)
Limited number of participants	0	(0.0)	8*	(3.5)
Other Strategy ^a	5	(3.7)	7	(3.5)
Sample Size	59	—	64	—

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

NOTE: The sample is restricted to sponsors reporting that they were not in their first year of SFSP participation. Sponsors were asked explicitly whether they used particular strategies to control costs, except where noted. Because of missing data, sample sizes for specific responses are slightly lower. Tabulations are weighted to be representative of sponsors nationally.

TABLE G.3 (continued)

^aCategories constructed from responses to an open-ended question about any other steps sponsors took during the past few years to control the costs of the SFSP.

SE = standard error.

*Significantly different from school sponsors at the .05 level, chi-squared test.

**Significantly different from school sponsors at the .01 level, chi-squared test.

TABLE G.4
EXPERIENCED SPONSORS' COST-CONTROL STRATEGIES,
BY SPONSORS' EXPERIENCE

	Sponsor in Operation			
	2 to 5 Years		6 Years or More	
	Percentage	SE	Percentage	SE
Any Strategy	72	(9.0)	15	(7.2)
Staffing				
Combined job functions	40	(9.1)	44	(6.7)
Hired fewer people	31	(8.2)	33	(5.6)
Had staff work fewer hours	33	(9.4)	25	(4.8)
Had volunteers handle work usually done by paid staff	26	(9.1)	20	(5.8)
Let staff go	10	(4.5)	10	(3.2)
Reduced hourly pay	2	(1.5)	5	(3.0)
Meal Preparation				
Found less expensive vendors or suppliers of food or meal components	29	(8.4)	32	(5.9)
Switched from mostly hot meals to mostly cold meals	3	(3.1)	15*	(4.2)
Switched from vended sites to on-site cooking	2	(1.9)	11	(4.2)
Switched from on-site cooking to vended sites	3	(2.6)	3	(1.5)
Reduced food costs (found less expensive food, served fewer extra meals, changed meal plans) ^a	0	(0.0)	3	(1.8)
Program Administration				
Secured additional funds	21	(8.5)	11	(3.8)
Reduced site monitoring	6	(4.4)	3	(1.5)
Reduced site training	3	(2.6)	3	(2.3)
Participation and Outreach				
Decreased number of sites	10	(5.6)	11	(3.4)
Reduced publicity and promotion efforts	7	(3.0)	5	(2.5)
Limited number of participants	3	(2.6)	5	(2.9)
Other Strategy ^a	7	(5.0)	5	(2.6)
Sample Size	35	—	87	—

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

NOTE: The sample is restricted to sponsors reporting that they were not in their first year of SFSP participation. Sponsors were asked explicitly whether they used particular strategies to control costs, except where noted. Because of missing data, sample sizes for specific responses are slightly lower. Tabulations are weighted to be representative of sponsors nationally.

TABLE G.4 (continued)

^aCategories constructed from responses to an open-ended question about any other steps sponsors took during the past few years to control the costs of the SFSP.

SE = standard error.

*Significantly different from 2-to-5 year sponsors at the .05 level, chi-squared test.

**Significantly different from 2-to-5 year sponsors at the .01 level, chi-squared test.