

Maine Department of Education Child Nutrition Services Summer Food Service Program Data/Needs Analysis and Expansion Recommendations

Maeghan Purdy Hass

Summer Food Service Program

Outreach Coordinator Supervisor

Introduction

To increase knowledge of and participation in the SFSP, the Maine Department of Education Child Nutrition hired a statewide network of SFSP Outreach contractors with additional federal funds received, each representing one of the nine Superintendent Regions in Maine.

#1 Aroostook County

#2 Penquis (Penobscot, Piscataquis, and Somerset counties)

#3 Washington County

#4 Hancock County

#5 Mid-Coast (Knox, Lincoln, and Sagadahoc counties)

#6 Western Maine (Androscoggin, Franklin, and Oxford counties)

#7 Cumberland County

#8 Kennebec Valley (Kennebec and Waldo counties)

#9 York County

SFSP Outreach Coordinators

- Contractors (Outreach Coordinators) were hired from within the regions they serve.
- The contractors hired were local school district food service individuals familiar with their respective area's SFSP.
- Coordinators worked to engage community partners, conducted grassroots outreach using materials from the DOE, as well as conducted a data/needs analysis of their region.
- A data collection form/spreadsheet was created and dispersed for Coordinator use during the project and then self-organized for their own individual needs and capacities.
- Final data was received from eight of the nine SFSP Outreach Coordinators.
- The following slides show Conclusions/Recommendations and Data, in conjunction with the SFSP Outreach Coordinators efforts.

#1 Aroostook County

- Programs with delivery service saw growth in 2021. While other programs (without delivery) closed due to limited participation and staffing. Example: An increase from an average of 25 served per day to an average of 65 served per day when delivered by Eagle Lake Rec Department.
- Add SFSP feeding sites/delivery routes in Woodland area, Ashland School District (RSU 32), and in the Southwestern Aroostook area along US Route 1 from Houlton/Hodgdon to Danforth.
- The primary reason towns/districts do not run programs of their own is due to limited staffing, subsequently relying heavily on rec programs or volunteers to bring meals to the sites as some feeding sites are 30-35 minutes away from the preparation location.
- Further marketing of the SFSP, along with delivery options of a variety of meals, would increase recognition and participation.

#1 Aroostook County

School	School F&R % 2020	District	District F&R % 2020
Limestone Community School	81.16%	Limestone Public Schools	81.16%
Dawn F Barnes Elementary School	80.43%	Caswell Public Schools	80.43%
Opportunity Training Center	79.41%	Opportunity Training Center	79.41%
Van Buren Elementary School	75.76%	RSU 88/MSAD 24	75.09%
Van Buren District Secondary School	73.33%	RSU 88/MSAD 24	75.09%
Fort Fairfield Elementary School	72.46%	RSU 86/MSAD 20	66.27%
Houlton Elementary School	72.15%	RSU 29/MSAD 29	72.14%
Houlton Junior High School	72.15%	RSU 29/MSAD 29	72.14%
Houlton High School	72.14%	RSU 29/MSAD 29	72.14%
Houlton Southside School	72.12%	RSU 29/MSAD 29	72.14%
Mill Pond School	71.96%	RSU 70/MSAD 70	61.95%
Central Aroostook Jr-Sr High School	67.94%	RSU 42/MSAD 42	44.5%
Connor Consolidated School	65.12%	Connor Consolidated School-EUT	65.12%
Southern Aroostook School	63.92%	RSU 50	63.92%

#2 Penquis (Penobscot, Piscataquis, and Somerset counties)

- Delivery to homes by a mobile summer feeding unit may be helpful in reaching more children of the Penquis Region and provide additional/alternative employment opportunities.
- Expand SFSP feeding site locations within Penquis to include additional churches offering Vacation Bible School, farmers markets, food pantries, libraries, town offices, and drive-in or community-run theaters.
- The Penquis Outreach Coordinator was able to discuss the SFSP's mission with the owner of Center Theater in Dover-Foxcroft. Complimentary, a Summer Food Service Program informational sheet stating dates, times, and locations of local summer feeding sites was scanned into the theaters' credits and shown before all movies mid-July until the end of the summer months. Continuing this partnership would bring more SFSP awareness into the community.
- Marketing and promotion of the SFSP should start as early in the year as possible.

#2 Penquis (Penobscot, Piscataquis, and Somerset counties)

School District	F & R % 2020
RSU 41	92.54%
RSU 74	76.43%
RSU 54	72.50%
RSU 30	71.86%
MSAD 46	69.66%
Greenbush Public Schools	68.24%
RSU 67	66.35%
RSU 31/MSAD 31	65.91%
RSU 89	64.84%
RSU 83/MSAD 13	63.04%
East Millinocket Public Schools	61.13%
Millinocket Public Schools	59.33%
RSU 80/MSAD 4	58.10%
RSU 53	57.84%
RSU 49	57.01%
RSU 49	57.01%
Bangor Public Schools	54.69%
RSU 68	54.58%
RSU 19	54.17%
Greenville Public Schools	52.97%
RSU 64	49.67%
RSU 82/MSAD 12	43.54%
Brewer Public Schools	39.49%
RSU 26	25.79%

#3 Washington County

- High level of need within the county with limited resources/centers for children.
- Delivery to rural homes, mobile feeding units, and/or feeding at a future established summer camps would reach more children.
- Additional education is needed regarding proper P-EBT usage.
- (Ultimately, recommendations were formulated having not received any Coordinator collected Free & Reduced eligibility percentages, regional needs, etc. data from the Washington County SFSP Outreach Coordinator, save for individual and group meetings and emails, as communications ceased, and no further responses were received post July.)

#4 Hancock County

- The area is geographically widespread and individual ability to get to sponsored sites daily is not feasible to most Hancock County children and families.
- SFSP delivery services coordinated with local businesses, or partnerships between businesses/organizations to sponsor Summer Food Service Program feeding opportunities/mobile units is key in reaching more Maine children.
- State requirements mandating 50% or higher eligibility in school districts for a site to be sponsored puts an additional strain on those smaller communities that are associated with communities that have a heavy influence of financial stability.
- A sponsored site on MDI would be beneficial to those in need.

#4 Hancock County

School District	F & R % 2020
Deer Isle-Stonington CSD	60.86%
Sedgwick Public Schools	58.14%
RSU 24	56.3%
Airline CSD	56.1%
RSU 25	52.93%
Trenton Public Schools	51.95%
Hancock Public Schools	50.74%
Otis Public Schools	50.55%
Tremont Public Schools	48.78%
Brooklin Public School	44.07%
Penobscot Public Schools	43.48%
MSAD 76	40.63%
Blue Hill Public Schools	40.54%
Ellsworth Public Schools	38.52%
Brooksville Public Schools	37.29%
Surry Public Schools	32.89%
Southwest Harbor Public Schools	32.14%
Lamoine Public Schools	27.97%
Bar Harbor Public Schools	15.57%
Dedham Public Schools	14.77%
Mount Desert Public Schools	14.2%
Mt. Desert CSD	13.22%

Individual Schools	F & R % 2020
G Herbert Jewett School - RSU 25	91.55%
Mountain View School - RSU 24	63.18%
Deer Isle-Stonington Elementary/H.S.	60.86%
Cave Hill School - RSU 24	59.38%
Sedgewick Elementary School	58.15%
Airline CSD	56.1%
Miles Lane School - RSU 25	54.17%
Peninsula School	52.88%
Trenton Elementary School	51.95%
Bucksport Middle School - RSU 25	51.27%
Hancock Grammar School	50.74%
Sumner Memorial H.S. - RSU 24	50.56%
Beech Hill School	50.55%

#5 Mid-Coast (Knox, Lincoln, and Sagadahoc counties)

- Most of the areas are well covered with existing programs, especially with meals delivered by 'Lulu the Lunch Wagon'.
- Expansion of this style of program in the Region and adoption of this model across the state would increase SFSP reach.
- RSU 2 could benefit from a feeding site in Dresden. There are also areas such as Hallowell/Farmingdale area (also in RSU 2) that could benefit from a site, even though it is not reflected in their eligibility percentage.
- Staffing appears to be a barrier and need everywhere. The areas that are doing the best include sites at non-profit locations.

#5 Mid-Coast (Knox, Lincoln, and Sagadahoc counties)

School District	F & R % 2020
RSU 12	53.32%
RSU 13	52.13%
Wiscasset Public Schools	49.33%
RSU 40	44.05%
RSU 1	40.47%
RSU 8	37.79%
AOS 93	37.68%
RSU 2	35.61%
St. George Public Schools	34.98%
RSU 75	32.41%
AOS 98	32.24%
West Bath Public Schools	25.44%
Five Town Schools	20.28%

Individual Towns	F & R % 2020
Cushing	64.95%
Rockland	64.44%
Thomaston	64.25%
South Thomaston	64.25%
Dresden	53.33%
Waldoboro	51.16%
Bristol	50.51%
Bath	50.24%
Somerville	50%
Alna	49.33%
Westport	49.33%
Nobleboro	48.48%
Whitefield	47.37%
Warren	46.83%
Owls Head	45.83%

#6 Western Maine (Androscoggin, Franklin, and Oxford counties)

- It is imperative that additional marketing for and education on filling out and returning the Meal Benefit application be updated and dispersed state-wide as soon as readily available. There is field concern about losing funding due to low return rate and therefore eligibility percentages.
- Additional marketing and education on the program and meal sites is vital to the program's sustained success as many families in Maine still do not know about the SFSP.
- Delivery worked well for programs that offered such and staffing was not an issue there this summer.
- Other locations saw staffing issues and low participation potentially due to widespread rural communities within the region, lack of transportation to sites, no delivery option, etc.

#6 Western Maine (Androscoggin, Franklin, and Oxford counties)

School District	F & R % 2020
Lewiston Public Schools	99.16%
RSU 10	72.19%
RSU 56	63.32%
RSU 55	59.45%
RSU 73	58.70%
RSU 17	56.67%
Auburn Public Schools	53.50%
RSU 58	53.31%
RSU 4	50.17%
RSU 72	46.21%
RSU 9	44.60%
RSU 44	43.66%
Lisbon Public Schools	43.19%
RSU 16	35.31%
RSU 52	33.45%
RSU 78	32.52%

County	Individual School	F & R % 2020
Androscoggin	MacMahon Elementary School	99.21%
	Geiger Elementary School	99.19%
	Montello School	99.19%
	Connors Elementary School	99.17%
	Lewiston High School	99.15%
	Farwell Elementary School	99.09%
	Lewiston Middle School	99.09%
	Washburn School	96.18%
	Park Avenue Elementary School	81.37%
	Walton School	75.98%
	Spruce Mountain Middle School	65.50%
	Sherwood Heights Elementary School	63.54%
	Spruce Mountain Elementary School	62.76%
	Libby-Tozier School	58.23%
	Spruce Mountain Primary School	57.32%
	Sabattus Primary School	51.41%
	Spruce Mountain High School	51.16%
Elm Street School	48.31%	
Leeds Central School	48.17%	
Lisbon Community School	46.66%	

#6 Western Maine (Androscoggin, Franklin, and Oxford counties)

County	Individual School	F & R % 2020
Franklin	Phillips Elementary School	59.86%
	Cushing School	59.50%
	Strong Elementary School	59.06%
	Cape Cod Hill Elementary School	56.21%
	Academy Hill School	51.32%
	Mount Abram Regional High School	50.24%
	W.G. Mallett School	45.32%
	Mt. Blue Middle School	45.20%
	Kingfield Elementary School	43.90%
	Cascade Brook School	41.20%
	Mt. Blue High School	38.26%
	Rangely Lakes Regional School	32.52%

County	Individual School	F & R % 2020
Oxford	Mountain Valley High School	86.87%
	Meroby Elementary School	86.78%
	Rumford Elementary School	86.78%
	Mountain Valley Middle School	86.68%
	Harrison Elementary	81.42%
	T.W. Kelly Dirigo Middle School	79.89%
	Waterford Memorial School	70.00%
	Guy E. Rowe School	69.64%
	Paris Elementary School	69.60%
	Oxford Elementary School	69.52%
	Agnes Gray School	69.34%
	Sacopee Valley Middle School	62.60%
	Dirigo Elementary School	61.73%
	Sacopee Valley High School	59.46%
	Sacopee Valley Elementary School	55.90%
	Otisfield Community School	55.46%
	Woodstock Elem - Bryant Pond	54.41%
	Dirigo High School	53.15%
	Oxford Hills Middle School	50.38%
	Molly Ockett School	49.37%
Oxford Hills Comprehensive H. S.	46.59%	

#7 Cumberland County

- Additional site locations within the more sparsely populated areas of Cumberland County, i.e., Harrison (RSU 17), would be beneficial to those children in need of additional summer nutritional support.
- Identify opportunities for overlap or partnerships with existing community-oriented environments, i.e., community gardens, parks, and community/recreation centers.
- Further support from the DOE for SFSP sponsors creating and managing marketing/social media campaigns would be welcomed additions to most established programs and enticing to potential undecided future sponsors.
- Additional publicizing of and making available informational resources throughout the school year on the benefits of filling out the Meal Benefit application, and the negative impact not filling out the application could have on the school districts regardless of LD 1679 Universal Meals' standings, may be advantageous in overall Meal Benefit application return rate.

#7 Cumberland County

District	F & R % 2020
Arthur R. Gould School @ Long Creek Youth Development Center	100%
NFI North	100%
Youth Alternatives Inc	100%
Spurwink School Inc	72.04%
Westbrook Public Schools	63.87%
RSU 17 (Harrison Elementary School)	56.67%
Portland Public Schools	53.40%
RSU 61	52.22%
South Portland Public Schools	40%
RSU 6	36.66%
Sebago Public Schools	36.11%
RSU 75	32.41%
RSU 15	28.81%
RSU 14	28.68%
Brunswick Public Schools	25.92%
RSU 5	24.53%
Gorham Public Schools	16.14%
Long Island Public Schools	12.50%
Holy Cross School	12.38%
Scarborough Public Schools	10.34%
Yarmouth Schools	8.41%
Falmouth Public Schools	6.97%
Cape Elizabeth Public Schools	6.15%
RSU 51	5.79%

#8 Kennebec Valley (Kennebec and Waldo counties)

- Further education, marketing, and publicizing of the positive impact of the SFSP, as well as Universal Meals LD 1679, could assist in more confident community engagements and future partnerships.
- Feeding site locations and/or SFSP delivery is needed in more rural areas of Kennebec Valley, though eligibility percentages are less than 50%.
- Additional, constructive marketing and promotion of the SFSP's mission and feeding site locations at establishments that are frequented by young families and children, such as the local WIC office, pediatricians' office, etc., is essential in reaching the demographic that could benefit most from the Summer Food Service Program.

#8 Kennebec Valley (Kennebec and Waldo counties)

County	School	School F & R % 2020	District
Kennebec	George J Mitchell School	74.11%	Waterville Public Schools
	Farrington School	71.43%	Augusta Public Schools
	Albert S Hall School	69.17%	Waterville Public Schools
	Waterville Jr. High School	67.01%	Waterville Public Schools
	Clinton Elementary School	65.83%	RSU 49
	Albion Elementary School	62.61%	RSU 49
	Sylvio J Gilbert School	59.41%	Augusta Public Schools
	Windsor Elementary School	56.9%	RSU 12
	Lincoln School	56.49%	Augusta Public Schools
	Chelsea Elementary School	55.39%	RSU 12
	Waterville Sr. High School	54.93%	Waterville Public Schools
	Benton Elementary School	54.44%	RSU 49
	Vassalboro Community School	54.18%	Vassalboro Public Schools
	Winslow Elementary School	53.96%	Winslow Schools
	Cony Middle School	53.1%	Augusta Public Schools
	Libby-Tozier School	51.05%	RSU 4
	Carrie Ricker School	50.86%	RSU 4

County	School	School F & R % 2020	District
Waldo	East Belfast School	81.25%	RSU 71
	Walker Memorial School	78.16%	RSU 3
	Unity Elementary School	65.52%	RSU 3
	Troy Central School	65.28%	RSU 3
	Searsport Elementary	62.39%	RSU 20
	Mt View Middle School	61.03%	RSU 3
	Monroe Elementary School	59.7%	RSU 3
	Morse Memorial School	59.13%	RSU 3
	Mt. View Elementary School	57.39%	RSU 3
	Kermit S Nickerson School	56.38%	RSU 71
	Captain Albert W Stevens School	55.03%	RSU 71

#9 York County

- More rural areas of the county have fewer opportunities for sponsor locations, creating quite an access barrier. Home delivery and/or SFSP delivery to higher activity areas may increase participation.
- Even if there was an influx of participation, the staffing and resources very well could not meet the need.
- There continues to be some people and families, mostly with preschool age children, unfamiliar with the SFSP.
- A way to reach the underserved populations would be in further promoting, or even feeding, at local events; farmers markets, craft fairs, parades, plays, etc.
- Having SFSP materials available continually at community locations, perhaps including a questionnaire that could be left and then collected on a rolling basis, could provide better insight as to where the gap lies in some of these high-need areas, and the underutilization experienced at some sites.

#9 York County

School District	F & R % 2020
Biddeford Public Schools	52.97%
RSU 23	51.72%
Sanford Public Schools	50.22%
RSU 57	37.67%
Acton Public Schools	37.12%
RSU 6	36.66%
Saco Public Schools	30.52%
RSU 60	29.25%
Kittery Public Schools	28.53%
Wells-Ogunquit Community School District	20.96%
RSU 21	19.96%
RSU 35	18.96%
Dayton Public Schools	16.54%
York Public Schools	8.42%

Conclusions and Recommendations for Areas of Focus for SFSP 2022

- The engagement in the Summer Food Service Program is not solely that of what a district can provide, but also of who is able to be there to receive the support.
- Maine communities are geographically large and widespread with many levels of socioeconomic status. It is important to consider access to sponsored sites as an influencing factor in SFSP participation rates with respect to families' ability to get to those sites daily.
- Mobile feeding units, with the ability for home drop-offs, may assist rural families, some with limited or no transportation, in gaining access to the SFSP.

Conclusions and Recommendations for Areas of Focus for SFSP 2022

- School districts could coordinate with local businesses to increase SFSP participation.
- The DOE CN Team may be able to logistically assist/facilitate the partnership between businesses/organizations to sponsor Summer Food Service Program feeding opportunities.
- Local business could partner with a site/school that has a USDA approved kitchen and/or a mobile unit to transport meals to multiple locations.
- An example of this would be in community partnering of transportation and food service individuals. (i.e., Stanley Subaru and Northern Light Hospital)

Conclusions and Recommendations for Areas of Focus for SFSP 2022

- As noted particularly in Washington County, along with other perceived potential problematic occurrences of pandemic assistance/program misuse in other parts of Maine, further education on the appropriate usage and corresponding impact of use and misuse of all State programs is crucial and may assist in developing a more confident community stance on all State funded programs.
- SFSP rack cards and promotional material were well received, but the resources listed for finding participating sites were not accurate, possibly due from the information provided to the State of Maine by the school districts themselves. Accurate reporting and printing of marketing materials is crucial to the success of the program.

Conclusions and Recommendations for Areas of Focus for SFSP 2022

- Staffing continues to be a key barrier and need during Maine's Summer Food Service Program.
- Local community organizations, perhaps with a previously established volunteer base (i.e., food pantries, libraries, Chamber of Commerce offices, local school Key Clubs, ATV and recreation clubs, etc.), may be able to assist in the staffing of feeding sites and support in bringing potential sponsors and sites together to reach more Maine children and families.
- A network of volunteers specifically for Child Nutrition Programs could be established comprised of the previous volunteer possibilities, along with current and former/retired food service workers as they have unsurpassed knowledge of the children being served food preferences and program attendance behaviors.

Conclusions and Recommendations for Areas of Focus for SFSP 2022

- Menu updates, variation of meals, along with increased inclusion of fresh, local produce and food offerings would be well received by the children served and further support local farmers and partnerships in the community.
- Requiring New SFSP Sponsor and Experienced SFSP Sponsor trainings to include Brighton Training Group's pending Spring 2022 online modules "Promoting and Marketing Summer Meals" and "Boosting Menu Appeal in the SFSP" will be helpful to all sponsors in achieving increased program satisfaction.
- A Child Nutrition SFSP specific dashboard could be formed for the field's use in which to share SFSP highlights and positive recommendations, as well as negatives and unclear subjects, offer support in the inner workings of the SFSP, and menu ideas and variations, with the guidance and supervision on the dashboard through the Maine Department of Education Child Nutrition Team.

Conclusions and Recommendations for Areas of Focus for SFSP 2022

- Offering enrichment activities, such as cooking classes highlighting local produce found in the days SFSP meal, hosting a mobile library, or offering games/activities along with the SFSP may increase participation (when able to safely congregate due to COVID-19 concerns).
- Holding feeding sites at or near community gardens would further facilitate those partnerships and local produce use, as well as being an educational tool.

Conclusions and Recommendations for Areas of Focus for SFSP 2022

- It may be beneficial to do outreach for the SFSP year-round.
- In addition to providing materials to go home with children at schools regarding the SFSP from early Spring onward, a tangible presence at events and community establishments throughout the year might reach more people, carry over recognition, and drive participation into the forthcoming summer programs.
- Local schools should begin promoting community awareness of SFSP sponsored sites and/or mobile units simultaneously with television and radio ads to reinforce the program and increase participation.
- Social media, radio, and television marketing and promotion of the SFSP's mission is vital to the program's continued success.
- Amounts of printed materials could be limited in an effort to decrease waste, while digital media marketing and promotions could be increased as this route remains increasingly effective in how countless families and children in the demographic that would benefit from the Summer Food Service Program receive pertinent information.

Conclusions and Recommendations for Areas of Focus for SFSP 2022

- Along with rack cards for community/school/business distribution, business-card sized SFSP printed resources or refrigerator magnets to disperse to families with accurate summer meals site finding information may be helpful in program recognition and increase future participation.
- Larger text and logo on SFSP site signage, larger signage for site locations, additional signage local to sites, and easy to follow arrows or easily identifiable markers of the program would further facilitate ease of use, especially for those children and families in need of the program that may be unwilling to ask for assistance or directions to the feeding site.
- T-shirts on staff/volunteers at feeding sites coordinated with the SFSP signage and logo may aid in this effort as well.

Conclusions and Recommendations for Areas of Focus for SFSP 2022

- Before and during the months SFSPs are held, signage placement not only limited to the area within a few blocks of the SFSP feeding site, but SFSP signage and site location resources available at town offices, libraries, food pantries, coffeeshops, local general stores, movie theaters/drive-ins, doctors/pediatricians offices, farmers markets, gyms, rec centers, community gardens, beaches, parks, and playgrounds would all have a constructive impact on program visibility and therefore participation.
- Year-long promotional advertising, marketing, and outreach of the SFSP would increase program participation, in the children served as well as in staffing and/or volunteer rates through positive program visibility and service opportunities.

Thank you!!