

2015-2016 School Year

MONTANA SCHOOL
BREAKFAST
REPORT CARD

MONTANA FOOD BANK NETWORK

School Breakfast in Montana

Why breakfast?



Health: Eating breakfast decreases stomachaches, headaches, and trips to the school nurse. Higher breakfast participation is also linked to lower obesity rates.

Education: Students who eat breakfast are better able to participate in complex thinking and problem solving, and score higher on vocabulary and reading tests.

Classroom Behavior: Children who eat breakfast have fewer discipline referrals and better attendance than those who skip breakfast.

Food Insecurity: School breakfast provides nutritious meals to students who need it most.

Welcome to the 2015-2016 report on the School Breakfast Program in Montana. Every year, the Montana Food Bank Network (MFBN) compiles data collected by the Office of Public Instruction (OPI) in order to analyze program growth statewide and measure district level participation. Every school day, the School Breakfast Program reaches thousands of Montana children, providing the food and nourishment they need to learn, grow, and thrive. Participation in School Breakfast continues to grow across the state consistently, but there is always work to do and opportunities to improve.

- 45% of Montana students, or **67,541** children, qualified for free or reduced price (FRP) meals
- Nearly **39%** of FRP students regularly ate school breakfast, up from 34% last school year
- Statewide, **53** FRP students ate breakfast for every 100 eating school lunch
- **88%** of schools that offer lunch also offer breakfast
- Meals served through the School Breakfast Program increased by nearly **13%** from the 2014-2015 school year

Through the dedication and hard work of OPI and schools around the state, Montana has seen an increase in the number of FRP students who are eating breakfast. According to the Food and Research Action Center's (FRAC) *School Breakfast Report Card*, nearly 10% more FRP students ate breakfast in 2015-2016, as compared to the previous year. **This means that close to 2,300 more FRP students ate breakfast and experienced the benefits that school breakfast provides.**

While Montana has made notable progress in increasing the number of students who are eating breakfast, the program continues to reach only 39% of students enrolled in free or reduced price meals. To further increase participation, schools can consider adopting an alternative serving model.

After the Bell

Great for older students who are often not hungry until later in the morning.

Allows students to socialize or use their morning recess to maximize physical activity time.

Can be served either in the classroom or in between classes for older students.

Can be combined with other alternative models to optimize breakfast service.

Grab N' Go

Good option for middle and high school students.

Great for students who might not have the time to sit down and eat a traditional breakfast.

Schools with no cafeteria or one that serves a multi-use room.

Schools which have a recess before school. Students can take their breakfast out with them while they play or chat with their friends.

Breakfast in the Classroom

Good option for middle and elementary school aged students.

Maximizes the opportunity for children to eat breakfast because it is served during their time in the classroom.

Can be combined with classroom curriculum time.

Can be customized to meet the needs of the school.

Grab N' Go at DeSmet School

Grab N' Go breakfast is often a successful model for serving breakfast to older students, allowing them to take a meal with them to eat it outside of the cafeteria. DeSmet School in Missoula, MT has combined Grab N' Go with Breakfast in the Classroom to make breakfast work for all their students who range from kindergarten through eighth grade.

To understand how to successfully implement an alternative breakfast model, DeSmet's principal, school clerk, and food service director met with staff from OPI and Montana Food Bank Network. At the time, over 90% of their middle school students were eligible for free or reduced price meals. Both the administration and food service staff prioritized breakfast to meet the needs of their students. The group discussed how new serving options would help to increase participation among older students at their school. They wanted to make breakfast part of the school day but were unsure about how to serve the food in the middle school classrooms. DeSmet adopted the idea to serve breakfast Grab N' Go style, for students to take and eat in their first period classroom.

Each day, the food service staff prepares breakfast in the DeSmet kitchen. They pre-portion and pack the meals into individual bags, so students can easily take breakfast with them on the way to class. The bags are arranged on two wheeled carts and taken to central areas in both the elementary and middle schools. There are also two separate carts with computers and keypads where students enter their personal identification number on a keypad to account for each meal. After each student puts their backpacks away, they line up behind the carts, punch in their personal identification number. They then take breakfast with them to the first period class. There, they take the first ten minutes to eat breakfast with their classmates and start their school day.

Students and teachers alike love Grab N' Go combined with Breakfast in the Classroom. Since its implementation in 2013-2014, their breakfast participation has continued to grow. Teachers have reported that the way breakfast is served works well for their students and their classroom. They encourage their students to eat breakfast every day, even if they are a little late to class. Many teachers have noted that students are paying better attention in class and have fewer behavioral problems since the switch to an alternative model.

Former principal Shelly Andres says, "Don't be afraid to invest in making a great breakfast program. We have overcome some initial challenges, but the school and staff believe that helping all students eat a nutritious breakfast is the best way for them to start their day. Having breakfast each morning makes a huge difference in the lives of our students."



Breakfast Serving Model:

Served Grab N' Go, in combination with Breakfast in the Classroom

Grade School: Teachers read a story while students eat

Middle School: Students watch news while they eat

Equipment:

Carts to transport the meals

Hot food storage container to keep food warm during meal service

Keypads for students to enter their number for meals counts

Numbers:

FRP: DeSmet participates in CEP- all meals are served at no cost

FRP Breakfast Participation:

SY 2012-13 47%

SY 2013-2014: 56%

SY 2014-2015: 81%

What's In a Number?

The data in this report is intended to help the public and other stakeholders understand how the breakfast program in their area compares to other programs around the state.

The information in this report is based on school meal data from the Montana Office of Public Instruction. While there are numerous ways to measure successful programs, our report ranks districts using FRAC's model of comparing the number of free and reduced price students eating lunch with those who eat breakfast. FRAC encourages schools to aim for a ratio for 70 FRP students eating breakfast for every 100 eating lunch.

- During the 2015-2016 school year, 54 of 212 school districts in Montana achieved this impressive feat. Congratulations on your hard work!
- An additional 29 districts were close to this ratio with between 60 and 69 FRP students eating breakfast for every 100 eating lunch.

Many of the top performing schools also participated in the Community Eligibility Provision (CEP), which allows high need schools to serve meals at no cost to all students. CEP helps maximize the number of students eating both breakfast and lunch. Of the 47 districts participating in CEP, 34 have adopted the provision for all schools and 13 districts adopted the provision for a portion of the district. These partial districts have two separate categories for participation: one represents schools not participating in CEP, and the other represents schools who are participating in CEP. This differentiation helps to demonstrate the impact of CEP on participation. Additionally, because CEP schools do not collect FRP applications, these schools do not have a standard FRP rate.

The data in this report features all school districts in Montana* that operate the School Breakfast Program (SBP), allowing for comparison of how breakfast impacts students across the state. Find your local districts to see how many students in your area are eating breakfast, and how your school compare to others in Montana.

**Districts with less than 35 students, 10 FRP students, or 100% FRP rates were excluded for confidentiality reasons.*

New This Year: Fiscal Impact of School Breakfast

You may have noticed more data is included in this year's report. For the 2015-2016 school year, we have added the number of additional students who would need to eat breakfast to meet the threshold of 70 FRP students eating breakfast for every 100 eating lunch.

The report also shows the increased amount of reimbursements possible if schools meet this recommended threshold. For many districts, it represents the opportunity to increase revenue by thousands of dollars.

Montana schools districts miss out on an average of nearly \$14,000 per year, or more than \$2.5 million statewide, because of underutilized breakfast programs.

It is our hope that this data helps expand the potential of breakfast to meet the needs of thousands of students across Montana. In addition, we hope that it provides a basis to consider the School Breakfast Program as a financial asset to schools.

Breakfast Data Key:

Number of FRP Students: The number of students enrolled in free or reduced price schools meals

FRP Rate: The percentage of students enrolled in free or reduced price school meals; Districts participating in the Community Eligibility Provision have their rate listed as CEP

% of FRP Students Participating in SBP: The percentage of free or reduced price students participating in the School Breakfast Program

SBP to NSLP Ratio: The number of students participating in the School Breakfast Program out of every 100 students participating in the National School Lunch Program

FRP SBP NSLP Ratio: The number of free or reduced price students participating in the School Breakfast program out of every 100 students participating in the National School Lunch Program **Rankings are based on this ratio**

Additional FRP in SBP if 70 per 100 in NSLP: Number of additional students needed to meet the desired goal of 70 free or reduced price students eating breakfast for every 100 eating lunch.

Additional Reimbursement if 70 SBP per 100 in NSLP: Minimum possible federal reimbursement amount if the desired goal of 70 free or reduced price students eating breakfast for every 100 eating lunch is met

County	District	# of FRP Students	FRP Rate	% of FRP Participating in SBP	SBP to NSLP Ratio	FRP SBP to NSLP Ratio	Additional FRP in SBP if 70 per 100 in NSLP	Additional Reimbursement if 70 FRP SBP per 100 in NSLP	Rank (out of 212)
MONTANA	State Total	67,541	45%	39%	43	53	8389	\$2,486,212	N/A
Beaverhead	Dillon Elem	409	39%	21%	21	34	91	\$26,001.05	183
Big Horn	Hardin Elem	1746	CEP	77%	104	104	N/A	N/A	5
Big Horn	Wyola Elem	128	CEP	80%	90	90	N/A	N/A	23
Big Horn	Northern Cheyenne Elem	217	CEP	56%	70	70	N/A	N/A	50
Big Horn	Pryor PS	104	CEP	38%	57	57	9	\$2,774.52	97
Big Horn	Lodge Grass Elem	377	CEP	28%	45	45	59	\$16,743.92	152
Blaine	St Paul Mission School	100	CEP	55%	80	80	N/A	N/A	34
Blaine	Turner Elem	26	33%	66%	74	72	N/A	N/A	49
Blaine	Chinook Elem	147	38%	43%	37	60	10	\$2,928.93	83
Blaine	Hays-Lodge Pole K-12	231	CEP	70%	59	59	30	\$8,707.36	90
Blaine	Harlem Elem	465	CEP	39%	51	51	69	\$20,681.05	127
Broadwater	Townsend K-12	267	40%	30%	25	41	56	\$16,426.64	157
Carbon	Fromberg K-12	68	CEP	74%	92	92	N/A	N/A	18
Carbon	Belfry K-12	27	59%	63%	64	70	N/A	N/A	51
Carbon	Red Lodge PS	135	28%	28%	42	46	19	\$5,541.21	147
Carbon	Bridger K-12	101	53%	31%	36	41	22	\$6,271.15	158
Carbon	Joliet Elem	92	26%	20%	12	29	26	\$7,365.52	199
Carter	Ekalaka Elem	65	50%	38%	51	54	8	\$1,016.98	110
Cascade	Great Falls Elem	3656	41%	24%	30	39	720	\$208,965.97	166
Cascade	Great Falls EI CEP	1905	93%	64%	97	97	N/A	N/A	14
Cascade	Vaughn Elem	79	CEP	64%	78	77	N/A	N/A	37
Cascade	Ulm Elem	45	38%	78%	45	77	N/A	N/A	39
Cascade	MT School for Deaf & Blind	45	83%	43%	75	75	N/A	N/A	41
Cascade	Great Falls Cent. Catholic HS	11	9%	69%	88	85	N/A	N/A	25
Cascade	Belt Elem	93	30%	52%	42	60	8	\$2,396.08	85
Cascade	Our Lady Of Lourdes School	28	19%	18%	29	25	9	\$2,407.65	205
Cascade	Centerville Elem	118	49%	47%	42	58	11	\$2,640.51	91
Cascade	Cascade Elem	102	35%	39%	36	53	13	\$3,429.25	116
Cascade	Sun River Valley Elem	105	42%	37%	38	47	18	\$4,490.03	145

County	District	# of FRP Students	FRP Rate	% of FRP Participating in SBP	SBP to NSLP Ratio	FRP SBP to NSLP Ratio	Additional FRP in SBP if 100 in NSLP	Additional Reimbursement if 70 FRP SBP per 100 in NSLP	Rank (out of 212)
Chouteau	Geraldine PS	56	57%	44%	52	63	3	\$824.90	79
Chouteau	Highwood K-12	25	25%	25%	22	29	9	\$2,507.17	198
Chouteau	Big Sandy K-12	74	45%	46%	50	56	9	\$2,376.87	101
Chouteau	Fort Benton Elem	101	37%	34%	35	48	16	\$4,488.35	139
Custer	Kinsey Elem	14	24%	46%	58	59	1	\$296.87	86
Custer	Kircher Elem	19	61%	23%	25	31	6	\$1,470.06	191
Custer	Miles City PS	654	41%	20%	18	29	184	\$51,724.55	197
Dawson	Richey High School	13	20%	34%	37	38	4	\$951.58	168
Dawson	Glendive Elem	351	26%	42%	33	53	46	\$13,270.91	112
Deer Lodge	Anaconda Elem	648	57%	32%	49	55	59	\$17,153.71	107
Fallon	Plevna K-12	19	23%	38%	36	48	3	\$822.13	140
Fallon	Baker K-12	132	27%	10%	9	15	45	\$12,959.39	209
Fergus	Roy K-12	14	35%	42%	25	53	2	\$510.74	114
Fergus	Denton Elem	27	35%	33%	26	48	4	\$1,201.90	137
Fergus	Moore Elem	42	44%	27%	22	34	12	\$3,542.07	185
Fergus	Grass Range Elem	33	65%	19%	19	23	13	\$3,583.64	207
Fergus	Lewistown Elem	465	37%	34%	31	45	86	\$24,708.01	149
Flathead	Marion Elem	69	61%	65%	62	75	N/A	N/A	42
Flathead	Olney-Bissell Elem	50	65%	60%	73	69	1	\$73.74	56
Flathead	Kila Elem	77	48%	32%	33	42	16	\$4,523.95	156
Flathead	Swan River Elem	70	42%	29%	23	36	19	\$5,303.59	179
Flathead	West Valley Elem	135	23%	35%	32	49	20	\$5,765.62	133
Flathead	Cayuse Prairie Elem	79	32%	18%	18	25	26	\$1,102.14	203
Flathead	Kalispell PS	1519	31%	21%	27	36	309	\$89,828.47	177
Flathead	Kalispell PS CEP	905	CEP	48%	65	65	30	\$8,858.92	69
Flathead	Somers Elem	244	47%	37%	36	48	42	\$11,732.20	143
Flathead	Whitefish High School	467	27%	22%	25	38	89	\$25,785.96	169
Flathead	Bigfork High School	352	36%	16%	18	26	93	\$26,892.78	202
Flathead	Columbia Falls High School	968	47%	36%	45	53	101	\$29,592.60	113
Flathead	Evergreen Elem	663	CEP	35%	46	46	125	\$37,038.42	148
Gallatin	Willow Creek Elem	27	49%	50%	65	73	N/A	N/A	47
Gallatin	Three Forks Elem	238	36%	40%	47	65	7	\$1,921.60	72

County	District	# of FRP Students	FRP Rate	% of FRP Participating in SBP	SBP to NSLP Ratio	FRP SBP to NSLP Ratio	Additional FRP in SBP if 70 per 100 in NSLP	Additional Reimbursement if 70 FRP SBP per 100 in NSLP	Rank (out of 212)
Gallatin	Monforton Elem	83	20%	21%	13	29	25	\$7,175.91	200
Gallatin	West Yellowstone K-12	106	37%	25%	31	34	28	\$8,343.74	186
Gallatin	Manhattan Christian School	93	21%	14%	9	20	33	\$8,932.21	208
Gallatin	Manhattan HS	121	19%	8%	6	12	46	\$13,446.21	211
Gallatin	Belgrade Elem	1226	35%	31%	38	52	132	\$38,395.10	123
Gallatin	Bozeman HS	942	21%	22%	16	29	272	\$77,973.86	195
Glacier	East Glacier Park Elem	35	CEP	57%	65	65	2	\$418.32	73
Glacier	Cut Bank Elem	415	55%	35%	39	50	59	\$16,917.51	129
Glacier	Browning Elem	2169	CEP	47%	64	64	94	\$28,282.08	76
Golden Valley	Lavina K-12	45	60%	69%	72	82	N/A	N/A	28
Golden Valley	Ryegate K-12	35	69%	71%	74	83	N/A	N/A	27
Granite	Drummond Elem	104	48%	22%	27	41	17	\$4,298.14	160
Granite	Phillipsburg K-12	83	49%	27%	16	36	21	\$5,959.26	178
Hill	Rocky Boy Elem	486	CEP	62%	82	82	N/A	N/A	29
Hill	Box Elder Elem	424	CEP	56%	68	68	8	\$2,298.44	61
Hill	North Star HS	77	46%	50%	62	58	8	\$1,935.85	92
Hill	Havre Elem	918	47%	36%	37	51	119	\$35,111.17	126
Jefferson	Montana City Elem	40	8%	27%	21	35	11	\$3,024.69	180
Jefferson	Clancy Elem	67	25%	19%	12	25	23	\$6,650.81	206
Jefferson	Boulder Elem	177	45%	18%	28	32	38	\$10,992.61	190
Jefferson	Whitehall Elem	184	39%	16%	23	32	45	\$13,248.49	189
Judith Basin	Geyser PS	38	66%	68%	64	77	N/A	N/A	38
Judith Basin	Stanford K-12	35	34%	36%	31	44	7	\$2,028.09	153
Judith Basin	Hobson K-12	31	30%	33%	21	40	8	\$2,197.89	165
Lake	Arlee Elem	114	63%	75%	116	113	N/A	N/A	2
Lake	Arlee Elem CEP	213	CEP	69%	80	80	N/A	N/A	33
Lake	St Ignatius K-12	82	49%	39%	140	163	N/A	N/A	1
Lake	St Ignatius CEP	368	CEP	51%	76	75	N/A	N/A	40
Lake	NKWUSM School	31	CEP	74%	99	99	N/A	N/A	10
Lake	Ronan High School	189	55%	32%	57	69	1	\$379.17	60

County	District	# of FRP Students	FRP Rate	% of FRP Participating in SBP	SBP to NSLP Ratio	FRP SBP to NSLP Ratio	Additional FRP in SBP if 70 per 100 in NSLP	Additional Reimbursement if 70 FRP SBP per 100 in NSLP	Rank (out of 212)
Lake	Charlo Elem	164	58%	32%	30	43	31	\$9,039.04	155
Lake	Ronan HSCEP	947	CEP	43%	50	50	160	\$47,842.20	128
Lake	Poison High School	812	50%	29%	26	36	202	\$60,302.48	173
Lake	Valley View Elem	27	87%	39%	53	56	3	\$588.04	100
Lewis & Clark	Helena Elem	2828	33%	27%	41	52	268	\$76,367.80	122
Lewis & Clark	Helena Elem CEP	246	CEP	61%	98	98	N/A	N/A	12
Lewis & Clark	Augusta High School	58	69%	45%	56	57	6	\$1,605.17	93
Lewis & Clark	Lincoln K-12	76	65%	25%	29	36	18	\$4,400.94	175
Lewis & Clark	East Helena Elem	550	46%	33%	36	45	100	\$29,055.41	151
Liberty	Chester-Joplin-Inverness PS	100	42%	40%	29	52	13	\$3,670.30	120
Lincoln	Troy Elem	262	CEP	76%	101	101	N/A	N/A	7
Lincoln	Trego Elem	19	CEP	84%	100	100	N/A	N/A	9
Lincoln	Fortine Elem	11	85%	49%	67	67	1	\$79.47	64
Lincoln	Fortine Elem CEP	44	CEP	62%	82	82	N/A	N/A	32
Lincoln	Eureka Elem	375	54%	39%	66	62	19	\$5,317.97	80
Lincoln	Libby K-12	596	51%	33%	45	50	79	\$23,170.22	131
Madison	Alder Elem	11	65%	109%	112	108	N/A	N/A	4
Madison	Harrison K-12	34	45%	44%	45	55	4	\$1,153.62	102
Madison	Ennis K-12	96	28%	46%	48	61	6	\$1,685.67	81
Madison	Sheridan Elem	90	48%	33%	47	54	9	\$2,187.94	109
Madison	Twin Bridges K-12	70	31%	22%	25	30	21	\$5,761.89	194
McCone	Circle High School	71	33%	27%	23	35	19	\$4,301.69	181
Meagher	White Sulphur Springs Elem	140	66%	28%	33	40	29	\$8,199.01	162
Mineral	Superior Elem	173	CEP	65%	98	98	N/A	N/A	11
Mineral	Alberton K-12	91	CEP	83%	98	98	N/A	N/A	13
Mineral	St Regis K-12	111	CEP	68%	87	87	N/A	N/A	24
Missoula	DeSmet Elem	96	CEP	73%	92	92	N/A	N/A	17
Missoula	Potomac Elem	44	48%	70%	80	84	N/A	N/A	26
Missoula	Bonner Elem	223	59%	50%	54	65	9	\$2,770.80	75
Missoula	Clinton Elem	94	51%	41%	47	55	11	\$3,043.66	103
Missoula	Seeley Lake Elem	113	57%	30%	44	52	12	\$3,420.62	124

County	District	# of FRP Students	FRP Rate	% of FRP Participating In SBP	SBP to NSLP Ratio	FRP SBP to NSLP Ratio	Additional FRP in SBP if 70 per 100 in NSLP	Additional Reimbursement if 70 FRP SBP per 100 in NSLP	Rank (out of 212)
Missoula	Target Range Elem	198	36%	42%	50	57	19	\$5,592.96	96
Missoula	Lolo Elem	230	40%	25%	25	36	54	\$15,164.37	176
Missoula	Hellgate Elem	560	37%	38%	43	50	85	\$24,699.81	130
Missoula	Frenchtown K-12	559	44%	35%	32	48	91	\$26,416.30	142
Missoula	Missoula Elem	1743	30%	30%	45	59	97	\$28,500.58	89
Missoula	Missoula Elem CEP	2153	CEP	40%	59	59	159	\$47,202.93	88
Musselshell	Meistone Elem	38	38%	22%	20	25	15	\$3,720.42	204
Musselshell	Roundup PS	328	51%	35%	35	48	54	\$15,201.86	144
Park	Arrowhead School	26	67%	58%	58	70	N/A	N/A	53
Park	Gardiner Elem	32	19%	9%	8	10	15	\$456.90	212
Park	Livingston SD	672	44%	23%	25	37	135	\$39,537.52	172
Petroleum	Winnett K-12	56	67%	85%	103	103	N/A	N/A	6
Phillips	Whitewater K-12	26	52%	83%	85	96	N/A	N/A	15
Phillips	Dodson K-12 CEP	47	CEP	58%	65	65	2	\$496.17	71
Phillips	Saco High School	29	64%	46%	49	56	3	\$765.29	99
Phillips	Malta K-12	206	43%	42%	36	55	24	\$6,988.81	106
Pondera	Heart Butte Elem	199	CEP	55%	74	74	N/A	N/A	44
Pondera	Valier Elem	86	56%	40%	43	53	11	\$3,155.00	119
Pondera	Conrad Elem	204	38%	23%	22	29	65	\$19,122.30	196
Powell	Deer Lodge Elem	287	43%	29%	29	40	64	\$17,592.39	164
Prairie	Terry K-12	73	49%	24%	16	30	24	\$7,027.30	193
Ravalli	Victor K-12	218	CEP	78%	109	109	N/A	N/A	3
Ravalli	Darby K-12 CEP	143	CEP	66%	90	90	N/A	N/A	20
Ravalli	Darby K-12	76	47%	36%	92	74	N/A	N/A	45
Ravalli	Lone Rock Elem	100	45%	26%	28	35	27	\$7,519.77	182
Ravalli	Corvallis K-12	551	42%	40%	50	60	38	\$11,069.92	84
Ravalli	Stevensville Elem	433	43%	30%	42	49	54	\$14,054.69	132
Ravalli	Florence-Carlton K-12	289	35%	20%	21	30	75	\$21,204.64	192
Ravalli	Hamilton K-12	710	44%	26%	36	45	102	\$28,872.40	150
Richland	Lambert Elem	36	27%	49%	65	70	N/A	N/A	54
Richland	Rau Elem	11	16%	39%	28	53	1	\$374.39	118
Richland	Savage Elem	20	16%	66%	35	57	3	\$812.19	94

County	District	# of FRP Students	FRP Rate	% of FRP Participating in SBP	SBP to NSLP Ratio	FRP SBP to NSLP Ratio	Additional FRP in SBP if 70 per 100 in NSLP	Additional Reimbursement if 70 FRP SBP per 100 in NSLP	Rank (out of 212)
Richland	Fairview Elem	63	21%	37%	29	41	17	\$4,131.28	159
Roosevelt	Wolf Point HS	148	68%	33%	69	100	N/A	N/A	8
Roosevelt	Wolf Point HS CEP	589	CEP	35%	43	43	128	\$31,872.83	154
Roosevelt	Frontier Elem	80	63%	77%	92	90	N/A	N/A	21
Roosevelt	Bainville K-12	22	13%	86%	79	82	N/A	N/A	31
Roosevelt	Brockton PS	163	CEP	48%	64	64	8	\$2,284.49	77
Roosevelt	Culbertson High School	85	30%	34%	39	52	10	\$3,075.20	125
Roosevelt	Froid High School	36	33%	23%	28	28	12	\$3,637.65	201
Roosevelt	Poplar High School	811	CEP	50%	65	65	29	\$8,535.72	70
Rosebud	St Labre Indian HS	553	81%	63%	76	78	N/A	N/A	36
Rosebud	Ashland Elem	68	CEP	62%	70	70	N/A	N/A	52
Rosebud	Lame Deer Elem	603	CEP	49%	66	66	17	\$4,894.34	65
Rosebud	Colstrip Elem	210	32%	44%	42	57	21	\$5,982.53	95
Sanders	Dixon Elem	56	CEP	63%	82	82	N/A	N/A	30
Sanders	Noxon Elem	45	60%	60%	58	66	2	\$479.74	67
Sanders	Noxon Elem CEP	65	CEP	71%	74	75	N/A	N/A	43
Sanders	Trout Creek Elem	38	79%	54%	73	74	N/A	N/A	46
Sanders	Hot Springs K-12	127	64%	39%	47	53	17	\$4,115.92	117
Sanders	Thompson Falls Elem	305	62%	27%	34	40	61	\$17,333.36	163
Sanders	Plains Elem	253	58%	28%	27	34	75	\$20,417.53	184
Sheridan	Westby K-12	14	21%	49%	52	60	1	\$312.55	82
Sheridan	Medicine Lake K-12	37	33%	45%	37	55	5	\$1,343.58	105
Sheridan	Plentywood K-12	123	34%	37%	35	48	21	\$5,698.87	141
Silver Bow	Ramsay Elem	52	35%	55%	54	66	2	\$510.06	66
Silver Bow	Butte Elem	1481	39%	20%	38	40	220	\$64,054.03	161
Silver Bow	Butte Elem CEP	721	CEP	36%	55	56	62	\$18,249.71	98
Stillwater	Absarokee Elem	40	17%	26%	25	38	9	\$2,425.44	167
Stillwater	Park City Elem	98	29%	29%	24	38	25	\$6,846.75	170
Sweet Grass	Sweet Grass County HS	40	25%	39%	47	63	2	\$481.67	78
Teton	Dutton/Brady K-12	75	54%	71%	65	79	N/A	N/A	35

County	District	# of FRP Students	FRP Rate	% of FRP Participating in SBP	SBP to NSLP Ratio	FRP SBP to NSLP Ratio	Additional FRP in SBP if 70 per 100 in NSLP	Additional Reimbursement if 70 FRP SBP per 100 in NSLP	Rank (out of 212)
Teton	Fairfield Elem	117	38%	59%	44	69	1	\$372.10	58
Teton	Power Elem	35	37%	48%	35	49	7	\$2,013.23	135
Toole	Shelby Elem	203	45%	46%	43	67	4	\$1,018.63	62
Toole	Sunburst K-12	55	34%	33%	36	52	6	\$1,765.81	121
Valley	Frazer Elem	144	CEP	82%	91	91	N/A	N/A	19
Valley	Hinsdale Elem	28	42%	52%	51	65	1	\$289.29	74
Valley	Nashua K-12	32	29%	44%	38	53	5	\$1,142.04	115
Valley	Glasgow K-12	311	38%	46%	40	59	26	\$7,573.12	87
Wheatland	Judith Gap Elem	13	42%	86%	76	90	N/A	N/A	22
Wheatland	Harlowton PS	163	60%	59%	53	69	1	\$216.91	55
Wibaux	Wibaux K-12	58	36%	27%	18	33	18	\$4,157.47	188
Yellowstone	Lockwood Elem	623	51%	55%	67	73	N/A	N/A	48
Yellowstone	Morin Elem	37	82%	71%	96	95	N/A	N/A	16
Yellowstone	Independent Elem	47	15%	52%	56	69	1	\$108.95	57
Yellowstone	Custer K-12	17	24%	53%	42	49	4	\$996.84	136
Yellowstone	Elysian Elem	89	31%	46%	38	55	11	\$3,166.04	104
Yellowstone	Canyon Creek Elem	52	27%	31%	20	36	15	\$4,357.68	174
Yellowstone	Billings High School	5899	36%	28%	45	53	640	\$187,350.53	111
Yellowstone	Billings HS CEP	654	CEP	58%	67	67	16	\$4,787.94	63
Yellowstone	Elder Grove Elem	101	19%	40%	23	47	19	\$5,591.77	146
Yellowstone	Huntley Project K-12	378	46%	35%	32	48	59	\$16,851.08	138
Yellowstone	Shepherd Elem	291	35%	22%	23	33	73	\$20,824.30	187
Yellowstone	Laurel Elem	686	32%	24%	25	37	147	\$43,022.90	171



This report was created by the Montana Food Bank Network with data supplied by the Montana Office of Public Instruction. For more information about the report, contact MFBN at 406.721.3825

