



The Limits of Data on Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility in Connecticut Robert Cotto, Jr., Ed.M.

March 2012

The practice of using free and reduced price meal (FRPM) eligibility as a proxy for poverty is pervasive in educational research and policymaking. More thorough consideration of the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) makes at least one thing clear: the statistics help us understand how many students are eligible for the program, but they have considerable limitations when used as an indicator of student need or socioeconomic status.¹

School lunch is an important part of schooling in America. The USDA reported that 31.7 million children received their lunch through the NSLP during Federal Fiscal Year 2010.² While policymakers tend to focus on eligibility for the NSLP, recent research has examined the quality of school meals, the practices of feeding children in schools, and the process of determining eligibility.³ Despite the extensive use of FRPM statistics, the program data have been not examined carefully in Connecticut.

The percent and number of students of students eligible for free or reduced price meals increased from 2006 to 2010. According to the Connecticut State Department of Education, 29.4% of students in schools that participated in the NSLP in Connecticut were eligible for free or reduced price lunch in October 2006.⁴ In total, there were 128,898 students eligible for free meals and 31,845 students eligible for reduced priced meals. By October 2010, students eligible for free or reduced price lunch made up 34.7% of all students in the state.⁵ That year there were 156,840 students eligible for free meals and 31,444 eligible for reduced price meals through the NSLP.⁶

The increased number and percentage of students eligible for the NSLP mirror national reports of increases in eligibility for the program.⁷ Several factors

were important in the increase in the number of students eligible for FRPM. Connecticut made changes in its reporting and procedures on directly certifying children who were also eligible for other federal programs, such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP—formerly known as food stamps), as eligible for FRPM.⁸ Second, as the nation's economy slowed and incomes declined, more families were eligible for programs such as SNAP⁹, and a greater portion of students in the state were eligible for the NSLP. In short, the NSLP may have been an increasingly important nutritional safety net for students.

However, the NSLP data are of *limited* utility as indicators of student need or socioeconomic status for the following reasons:

- Eligibility for free or reduced price meals does not entirely capture a student's access (or lack of access) to economic resources such as parental income, education level, and family wealth.¹⁰
- The combined percentage of students eligible for free and reduced meals does not show income differences between the two income categories: a family of four must have earned less than \$29,055 in annual gross income in 2011 to have qualified for free meals, while a family of four with income up to \$41,348 would have been eligible for reduced price meals.¹¹
- Districts and schools that have the same combined percentage of students eligible for FRPM may have substantial differences in the percentage of their students that are eligible for free meals.

- Participation rates in the NSLP may vary based on different certification procedures at the district level.¹²
- The Connecticut Education Data and Research website collects and reports FRPM data differently from the State Department of Education Bureau of Health, Nutrition, Family Services, and Adult Education.¹³ Thus, there are at least two sources of FRPM data with different numbers of eligible students reported for the same schools and districts.

Using the combined percentage of FRPM as a proxy for student need or socioeconomic status in research or policymaking could be misleading. For instance, Manchester Public Schools and Killingly Public Schools both had 49% of all students eligible for FRPM in October 2010 when both free and reduced price lunch are considered together. However, 41% of Manchester students were eligible for *free* meals, while only 34% of students in Killingly schools were eligible for *free* meals. In other words, Manchester had a greater percentage than Killingly Public Schools of students whose families have been certified to earn less than 130% of the federal poverty line, are certified for other federal programs such as SNAP, or fall into another category of eligibility such as children who are homeless.¹⁴ Using the combined percentage of students eligible for FRPM would obscure the difference in need between the districts.

Comparing Killingly and Manchester based on a combined percent of students eligible for FRPM could also obscure other important socioeconomic characteristics of students and families in the two towns. Differences in income above the FRPM guidelines, home resources, and parents' occupation and education levels are important considerations for student need.¹⁵

Relying only on the combined FRPM statistics could have adverse impacts on policies that rely on this data. For instance, using the combined percentage of FRPM as a proxy for student need in consequential policies such as the state's funding formula *may inadvertently tilt resources* away from districts and schools with higher proportions of students eligible for free meals or other unidentified student needs associated with low-income.¹⁶ In addition to the town-by-town differences, the state's magnet and charter schools in Connecticut tend to have substantial differences in the percentage of students eligible for free and

reduced price meals from the towns where they are located.¹⁷ With several exceptions, such as in Hamden and Stamford, charter and magnet schools tend to have a **lower portion of students eligible for free meals** and a **larger portion of students eligible for reduced meals** when compared to their home districts.¹⁸ Using FRPM data, in aggregate, for school funding would tilt resources towards schools and districts--either local, charter, regional, or magnet--with relatively lower portions of students eligible for free meals and higher portions of students eligible for reduced price meals.

We recommend caution in using FRPM statistics and consideration of alternative measures to indicate student need and/or socioeconomic status. At the very least, **disaggregating the FRPM statistics** will help distinguish severe (free) from profound (reduced price) need. However, disaggregating the statistics does not solve all the problems of using FRPM data.

Policymakers and researchers should disclose the limitations of the FRPM statistics in discussions about and research using this data. For instance, as of this writing, the Connecticut General Assembly is considering using 185% of the federal poverty level as its new indicator of "children living in poverty" for school funding purposes.¹⁹ While the intent would be to use HUSKY A data, which is collected differently from NSLP data, this metric could potentially mask severe poverty just as the aggregated FRPM data does. Connecticut researchers and policymakers will be better served in the long term by **developing reliable and cost-effective student need and/or socioeconomic status indicators** apart from FRPM status.²⁰

¹ Harwell, Michael and Lebeau, Brandon. "Student Eligibility for a Free Lunch as an SES Measure in Education Research." *Educational Researcher*. 2010 39: 120.

² "National School Lunch Program Fact Sheet." usda.gov. U.S. Department of Agriculture. October 2011. Web. 14 December 2011.

<<http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/lunch/AboutLunch/NSLPFactSheet.pdf>>

³ Sullivan-Catlin, Heather. "Book Review: Free for All: Fixing School Food in America." *Teaching Sociology* (2011): 39. 210. Web. 14 December 2011. Also see Weaver-Hightower, Marcus. "Why Education Researchers Should Take School Food Seriously." *Educational Researcher*. (2011): 40. 15. Web. 14 December 2011. Also see Gleason et. al. "Tightening Income Documentation in a Means-Tested Program: Who Stays Away?" *Evaluation Review* (2008) 32. 273. Web. 14 December 2011.

⁴ Connecticut State Department of Education. “Connecticut Schools Participating in the National School Lunch Program-Free and Reduced Price Lunch Eligibility October 2006.” SDE Bureau of Health, Nutrition, Family Services and Adult Education. 8 December 2011. Excel File. Alternatively, the CT State Department of Education reported on the Connecticut Education Data and Research database that 155,841 students, or 27.1% of total enrolled, were eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch in 2006-2007. *See* Connecticut State Department of Education. Student Need-Student Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch 2004-2011.” Connecticut Education and Data Research Data Tables. Mar. 2012. Web.

⁵ This percentage is based on a count generated by SDE on October 1, 2010. This percentage includes students in public schools, non-profit private schools, charter schools, magnets schools, and other state-affiliated schools.

⁶ Connecticut State Department of Education. “Connecticut Schools Participating in the National School Lunch Program-Free and Reduced Price Lunch Eligibility October 2010.” SDE Bureau of Health, Nutrition, Family Services and Adult Education. 8 December 2011. Excel File. Alternatively, the CT State Department of Education reported on the Connecticut Education Data and Research Database that 191,116 students, or 34.4% of total enrolled, were eligible for free or reduced price lunch. *See* Connecticut State Department of Education. Student Need-Student Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch 2004-2011.” Connecticut Education and Data Research Data Tables. Mar. 2012. Web.

⁷ Dillon, Sam. “Lines Grow Long for Free School Meals, Thanks to Economy.” *The New York Times*. 29 November 2011. Web. 1 December 2011.

⁸ Moore et. al. “Direct Certification in the National Lunch Program: State Implementation Progress School Year 2010-2011.” U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, Office of Research and Analysis. Report CN-11-DC. Alexandria, VA: October 2011. Web. *See* page 22. <<http://www.fns.usda.gov/ora/menu/published/CNP/FILES/DirectCert2011.pdf>> *See* page 15 of the cited report for an explanation of changes in reporting and procedures that altered certification statistics. About half of the percentage gain reported for Connecticut is due to the inclusion of data for one large LEA in SY 2010-2011 that did not submit VSR data in past years. That LEA did not submit VSR data in the past because all of its schools were operating in non-base years under Provisions 2 or 3; the LEA had no applications subject to verification, and did not submit VSR data to the State.

⁹ Moore et. al. 36. According to the report, “States and LEAs directly certified 1.9 million more children at the start of SY 2010–2011 than they did a year earlier, an increase of 23 percent. That growth was driven in part by a historic increase in SNAP participation.”

¹⁰ Harwell and LeBeau 124

¹¹ United States. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Services. “Notices-Child Nutrition Programs-Income Eligibility Guidelines.” *Federal Register*. Vol. 76, no. 58. 25 March 2011: 16724 – 16725. Income eligibility guidelines for 2011-2012 are based on federal poverty guidelines. Families must earn less than 130% of federal poverty guidelines for free meal eligibility. Families must earn less than 185% of federal poverty guidelines to be eligible for reduced price meals. Also *see* United States.

Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Services. “Notices-Child Nutrition Programs-Income Eligibility Guidelines.” *Federal Register*. Vol. 74, no. 58. 27 March 2009: 13410-13411. In 2009 and 2010, a family of four needed to earn less than \$40,793 to be eligible for reduced price meals. On the other hand, a family of four needed to earn less than \$28,665 to be eligible for free meals.

¹² Harwell and LeBeau 126

¹³ The Connecticut Department of Education CEDaR website combines the free and reduced price eligibility into one data point for schools and districts. The numbers from the CEDaR website do not match the data from the CT State Department of Education Bureau of Health, Nutrition, Family Services, and Adult Education. The two sources collect the FRPM information in different ways and the information is also used for different purposes.

¹⁴ *See* “Sample Child Nutrition Programs Application for Free or Reduced Price Meals or Free Milk.” Created by the Connecticut State Department of Education. June 2011. Web. <http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/LIB/sde/pdf/DEPS/Nutrition/Forms/Family_App.pdf>

¹⁵ Harwell and LeBeau 124 - 126

¹⁶ *See* Appendix B and C. Also *see* Baker, Bruce. “Review of Spend Smart: Fix Our Broken School Funding System.” National Education Policy Center. Boulder, CO: 11 April 2011. Web. <<http://nepc.colorado.edu/thinktank/review-spend-smart>> Baker discusses charters, not magnets and vocational technical schools, on page 8 and Appendix A1.

¹⁷ *See* Appendix B and C

¹⁸ *See* Appendix B and C

¹⁹ *See* Senate Bill 24, Sec. 1, (38) on definitions. The bill states, “Number of children in poverty” means the number of children, ages five to seventeen, inclusive, in families whose incomes are at or below one hundred eighty-five per cent of the federal poverty level, such number to be certified and submitted annually by the Commissioner of Social Services to the Commissioner of Education, on or before July first of the following fiscal year.’

²⁰ Harwell and LeBeau 126

APPENDIX A:

PARTICIPATION IN NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM, OCTOBER 1, 2010*

	#PAID	#FREE	#REDUCED	#TOTAL	%PAID	%FREE	%REDUCED
Ansonia Board of Education	963	1,574	349	2,886	33.4%	54.5%	12.1%
Ashford Board of Education	356	75	23	454	78.4%	16.5%	5.1%
Avon Board of Education	3,391	138	57	3,586	94.6%	3.8%	1.6%
Barkhamsted Board of Education	318	16	8	342	93.0%	4.7%	2.3%
Berlin Board of Education	2,843	212	68	3,123	91.0%	6.8%	2.2%
Bethany Board of Education	489	14	9	512	95.5%	2.7%	1.8%
Bethel Board of Education	2,516	315	107	2,938	85.6%	10.7%	3.6%
Bloomfield Board of Education	1,159	839	217	2,215	52.3%	37.9%	9.8%
Bolton Board of Education	723	73	28	824	87.7%	8.9%	3.4%
Bozrah Board of Education	190	23	18	231	82.3%	10.0%	7.8%
Branford Board of Education	2,738	510	190	3,438	79.6%	14.8%	5.5%
Bridgeport Board of Education	2,275	17,203	1,603	21,081	10.8%	81.6%	7.6%
Bristol Board of Education	5,458	2,230	522	8,210	66.5%	27.2%	6.4%
Brookfield Board of Education	2,714	121	51	2,886	94.0%	4.2%	1.8%
Brooklyn Board of Education	719	201	23	943	76.2%	21.3%	2.4%
Canterbury Board of Education	424	60	44	528	80.3%	11.4%	8.3%
Canton Board of Education	1,668	96	31	1,795	92.9%	5.3%	1.7%
Chaplin Board of Education	136	42	11	189	72.0%	22.2%	5.8%
Cheshire Board of Education	4,168	223	98	4,489	92.8%	5.0%	2.2%
Chester Board of Education	203	33	6	242	83.9%	13.6%	2.5%
Clinton Board of Education	1,746	242	48	2,036	85.8%	11.9%	2.4%
Colchester Board of Education	2,516	291	113	2,920	86.2%	10.0%	3.9%
Colebrook Board of Education	96	10	6	112	85.7%	8.9%	5.4%
Columbia Board of Education	447	51	14	512	87.3%	10.0%	2.7%
Coventry Board of Education	1,621	303	75	1,999	81.1%	15.2%	3.8%
Cromwell Board of Education	1,742	245	71	2,058	84.6%	11.9%	3.4%
Danbury Board of Education	5,814	3,824	1,060	10,698	54.3%	35.7%	9.9%
Darien Board of Education	2,307	31	11	2,349	98.2%	1.3%	0.5%
Deep River Board of Education	248	42	13	303	81.8%	13.9%	4.3%
Derby Board of Education	721	621	117	1,459	49.4%	42.6%	8.0%
East Haddam Board of Education	1,193	85	61	1,339	89.1%	6.3%	4.6%
East Hampton Board of Education	1,732	169	56	1,957	88.5%	8.6%	2.9%
East Hartford Board of Education	3,407	4,103	784	8,294	41.1%	49.5%	9.5%
East Haven Board of Education	2,935	1,058	393	4,386	66.9%	24.1%	9.0%
East Lyme Board of Education	2,751	228	108	3,087	89.1%	7.4%	3.5%
East Windsor Board of Education	861	376	86	1,323	65.1%	28.4%	6.5%
Ellington Board of Education	2,495	182	37	2,714	91.9%	6.7%	1.4%
Enfield Board of Education	4,115	1,237	381	5,733	71.8%	21.6%	6.6%
Essex Board of Education	449	26	18	493	91.1%	5.3%	3.7%
Fairfield Public Schools	9,322	698	240	10,260	90.9%	6.8%	2.3%
Farmington Public Schools	3,691	266	93	4,050	91.1%	6.6%	2.3%
Glastonbury Public Schools	5,867	362	103	6,332	92.7%	5.7%	1.6%
Granby Public Schools	1,663	108	39	1,810	91.9%	6.0%	2.2%
Greenwich Public Schools	7,476	827	253	8,556	87.4%	9.7%	3.0%
Griswold Public Schools	1,430	445	152	2,027	70.5%	22.0%	7.5%
Groton Public Schools	2,929	1,221	439	4,589	63.8%	26.6%	9.6%
Guilford Public Schools	3,421	142	92	3,655	93.6%	3.9%	2.5%
Hamden Public Schools	3,883	1,785	368	6,036	64.3%	29.6%	6.1%
Hampton Board of Education	118	19	9	146	80.8%	13.0%	6.2%
Hartford Public Schools	4,784	17,549	1,673	24,006	19.9%	73.1%	7.0%
Hebron Public Schools	926	43	20	989	93.6%	4.3%	2.0%

PARTICIPATION IN NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM, OCTOBER 1, 2010*

	#PAID	#FREE	#REDUCED	#TOTAL	%PAID	%FREE	%REDUCED
Kent Center School	241	38	8	287	84.0%	13.2%	2.8%
Killingly Public Schools	1,317	875	391	2,583	51.0%	33.9%	15.1%
Lebanon Public Schools	1,107	127	43	1,277	86.7%	9.9%	3.4%
Ledyard Public Schools	2,303	239	72	2,614	88.1%	9.1%	2.8%
Lisbon Public Schools	342	65	15	422	81.0%	15.4%	3.6%
Madison Public Schools	3,656	96	40	3,792	96.4%	2.5%	1.1%
Manchester Public Schools	3,694	2,959	592	7,245	51.0%	40.8%	8.2%
Mansfield Public Schools	1,995	368	92	2,455	81.3%	15.0%	3.7%
Marlborough Public Schools	525	34	6	565	92.9%	6.0%	1.1%
Meriden Public Schools	3,028	4,420	764	8,212	36.9%	53.8%	9.3%
Middletown Public Schools	2,970	1,863	365	5,198	57.1%	35.8%	7.0%
Milford Public Schools	5,534	975	409	6,918	80.0%	14.1%	5.9%
Monroe Public Schools	3,315	181	111	3,607	91.9%	5.0%	3.1%
Montville Public Schools	1,935	569	176	2,680	72.2%	21.2%	6.6%
Naugatuck Public Schools	2,654	1,412	439	4,505	58.9%	31.3%	9.7%
New Britain Public Schools	2,783	6,584	781	10,148	27.4%	64.9%	7.7%
New Fairfield Public Schools	2,398	235	110	2,743	87.4%	8.6%	4.0%
New Hartford School Lunch	533	30	12	575	92.7%	5.2%	2.1%
New Haven School Lunch	7,400	10,793	1,817	20,010	37.0%	53.9%	9.1%
Newington Public Schools	3,578	569	270	4,417	81.0%	12.9%	6.1%
New London School Lunch	1,063	2,440	501	4,004	26.5%	60.9%	12.5%
New Milford School Lunch	3,618	520	222	4,360	83.0%	11.9%	5.1%
Newtown School Lunch	4,692	254	102	5,048	92.9%	5.0%	2.0%
Norfolk School Lunch	108	8	4	120	90.0%	6.7%	3.3%
North Branford School Lunch	1,984	219	89	2,292	86.6%	9.6%	3.9%
North Canaan School Lunch	244	59	18	321	76.0%	18.4%	5.6%
North Haven School Lunch	3,046	363	138	3,547	85.9%	10.2%	3.9%
North Stonington Lunch	645	89	49	783	82.4%	11.4%	6.3%
Norwalk School Lunch	6,307	3,994	881	11,182	56.4%	35.7%	7.9%
Norwich School Lunch	1,139	2,296	422	3,857	29.5%	59.5%	10.9%
Old Saybrook School Lunch	1,423	180	51	1,654	86.0%	10.9%	3.1%
Orange School Lunch	1,233	25	20	1,278	96.5%	2.0%	1.6%
Oxford School Lunch	1,850	112	42	2,004	92.3%	5.6%	2.1%
Plainfield Board of Education	1,636	765	207	2,608	62.7%	29.3%	7.9%
Plainville School Lunch	1,515	544	186	2,245	67.5%	24.2%	8.3%
Plymouth School Lunch	1,287	338	110	1,735	74.2%	19.5%	6.3%
Pomfret School Lunch	390	43	6	439	88.8%	9.8%	1.4%
Portland School Lunch	1,228	149	26	1,403	87.5%	10.6%	1.9%
Preston School Lunch	372	44	16	432	86.1%	10.2%	3.7%
Putnam Board of Education	563	580	79	1,222	46.1%	47.5%	6.5%
Ridgefield School Lunch	3,580	46	25	3,651	98.1%	1.3%	0.7%
Rocky Hill School Lunch Program	2,307	214	69	2,590	89.1%	8.3%	2.7%
Salem Board of Education	367	28	9	404	90.8%	6.9%	2.2%
Salisbury Board of Education	277	23	11	311	89.1%	7.4%	3.5%
Scotland Board of Education	127	16	1	144	88.2%	11.1%	0.7%
Seymour School Lunch	1,685	431	115	2,231	75.5%	19.3%	5.2%
Sharon School Lunch	150	25	15	190	78.9%	13.2%	7.9%
Shelton School Lunch	4,752	630	214	5,596	84.9%	11.3%	3.8%
Simsbury School Lunch	4,459	267	74	4,800	92.9%	5.6%	1.5%
Southington School Lunch	6,115	495	176	6,786	90.1%	7.3%	2.6%
South Windsor Board of Education	4,029	359	134	4,522	89.1%	7.9%	3.0%
Sprague School Lunch	179	116	35	330	54.2%	35.2%	10.6%

PARTICIPATION IN NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM, OCTOBER 1, 2010*

	#PAID	#FREE	#REDUCED	#TOTAL	%PAID	%FREE	%REDUCED
Stafford School Lunch	1,299	403	143	1,845	70.4%	21.8%	7.8%
Stamford School Lunch	8,692	5,503	1,150	15,345	56.6%	35.9%	7.5%
Sterling Board of Education	330	122	35	487	67.8%	25.1%	7.2%
Stonington School Lunch	1,877	329	112	2,318	81.0%	14.2%	4.8%
Stratford School Lunch	4,526	1,884	721	7,131	63.5%	26.4%	10.1%
Suffield School Lunch	2,278	144	68	2,490	91.5%	5.8%	2.7%
Thomaston School Lunch	900	174	76	1,150	78.3%	15.1%	6.6%
Thompson School Lunch	901	247	113	1,261	71.5%	19.6%	9.0%
Tolland School Lunch	2,655	127	27	2,809	94.5%	4.5%	1.0%
Torrington School Lunch	2,572	1,588	339	4,499	57.2%	35.3%	7.5%
Trumbull School Lunch	5,897	290	149	6,336	93.1%	4.6%	2.4%
Vernon School Lunch	2,358	1,065	173	3,596	65.6%	29.6%	4.8%
Voluntown Public Schools	237	39	10	286	82.9%	13.6%	3.5%
Wallingford Board of Education	5,312	703	190	6,205	85.6%	11.3%	3.1%
Waterbury School Lunch	3,664	13,205	1,503	18,372	19.9%	71.9%	8.2%
Waterford School Lunch	2,622	525	135	3,282	79.9%	16.0%	4.1%
Watertown School Lunch	2,462	365	163	2,990	82.3%	12.2%	5.5%
Westbrook School Lunch	843	81	21	945	89.2%	8.6%	2.2%
West Hartford School Lunch	8,161	1,496	446	10,103	80.8%	14.8%	4.4%
West Haven School Lunch	2,819	3,066	560	6,445	43.7%	47.6%	8.7%
Weston School Lunch	2,287	40	20	2,347	97.4%	1.7%	0.9%
Westport School Lunch	5,557	133	25	5,715	97.2%	2.3%	0.4%
Wethersfield School Lunch	3,349	543	192	4,084	82.0%	13.3%	4.7%
Willington Board of Education	403	71	16	490	82.2%	14.5%	3.3%
Wilton School Lunch	3,020	26	6	3,052	99.0%	0.9%	0.2%
Winchester Board of Education	597	495	109	1,201	49.7%	41.2%	9.1%
Windham School Lunch	847	2,046	239	3,132	27.0%	65.3%	7.6%
Windsor School Lunch	3,262	1,087	434	4,783	68.2%	22.7%	9.1%
Windsor Locks School Lunch	1,172	421	179	1,772	66.1%	23.8%	10.1%
Wolcott School Lunch	2,227	329	189	2,745	81.1%	12.0%	6.9%
Woodbridge School Lunch	693	26	7	726	95.5%	3.6%	1.0%
Woodstock School Lunch	832	71	24	927	89.8%	7.7%	2.6%
Regional District #1	393	72	41	506	77.7%	14.2%	8.1%
Regional District #4 School Lunch	886	65	23	974	91.0%	6.7%	2.4%
Regional District #5 School Lunch	2,341	82	40	2,463	95.0%	3.3%	1.6%
Region District #6 School Lunch	831	92	56	979	84.9%	9.4%	5.7%
Region District #7 School Lunch	1,083	73	17	1,173	92.3%	6.2%	1.4%
Region District #8 School Lunch	1,696	75	33	1,804	94.0%	4.2%	1.8%
Region District #9 School Lunch	3,073	43	16	3,132	98.1%	1.4%	0.5%
Region District #10 School Lunch	2,347	95	31	2,473	94.9%	3.8%	1.3%
Region District #11 School Lunch	202	55	16	273	74.0%	20.1%	5.9%
Region District #12 School Lunch	516	23	12	551	93.6%	4.2%	2.2%
Region District #13 School Lunch	1,925	71	32	2,028	94.9%	3.5%	1.6%
Region District #14 School Lunch	1,961	136	78	2,175	90.2%	6.3%	3.6%
Region District #15 School Lunch	3,920	157	82	4,159	94.3%	3.8%	2.0%
Region District #16 School Lunch	1,932	233	131	2,296	84.1%	10.1%	5.7%
Region District #17 School Lunch	2,255	126	52	2,433	92.7%	5.2%	2.1%
Region District #18 School Lunch	1,370	85	36	1,491	91.9%	5.7%	2.4%
CREC	1,327	1,010	225	2,562	51.8%	39.4%	8.8%
Education Connection	1,156	99	45	1,300	88.9%	7.6%	3.5%
ACES	596	596	91	1,283	46.5%	46.5%	7.1%
Integrated Day Charter School	238	66	27	331	71.9%	19.9%	8.2%

PARTICIPATION IN NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM, OCTOBER 1, 2010*

	#PAID	#FREE	#REDUCED	#TOTAL	%PAID	%FREE	%REDUCED
Common Ground High School	77	79	7	163	47.2%	48.5%	4.3%
The Bridge Academy	54	158	59	271	19.9%	58.3%	21.8%
Trailblazers Academy	12	124	28	164	7.3%	75.6%	17.1%
Amistad Academy	294	415	104	813	36.2%	51.0%	12.8%
New Beginnings Family Academy Inc.	61	252	47	360	16.9%	70.0%	13.1%
Elm City College Preparatory School	215	269	100	584	36.8%	46.1%	17.1%
Stamford Academy	23	71	16	110	20.9%	64.5%	14.5%
Park City Prep Charter School Inc.	84	128	36	248	33.9%	51.6%	14.5%
Achievement First Bridgeport Academy Inc.	103	238	68	409	25.2%	58.2%	16.6%
Highville Charter School Inc.	0	168	50	218	0.0%	77.1%	22.9%
CT Technical High School System	5,913	3,691	989	10,593	55.8%	34.8%	9.3%
TOTAL**	353,874	156,840	31,444	542,158	65.3%	28.9%	5.8%

*All data provided by the State Department of Education Bureau of Health, Nutrition, Family Services and Adult Education. The data is a snapshot of eligibility from October 1, 2010.

**Total includes non-profit private and parochial schools not listed here. This total may differ from the Connecticut Education and Data Research tables. The FRPM data is not yet available on the CEDaRr site for 2010-2011.

APPENDIX B:

FREE AND REDUCED PRICE MEALS IN CHARTER SCHOOLS, OCTOBER 1, 2010*

SCHOOL NAME	# PAID	# FREE	# REDUCED	# TOTAL	% PAID	% FREE	% REDUCED
Charters in Bridgeport:							
Achievement First Bridgeport Academy Elementary	15	57	18	90	16.7%	63.3%	20.0%
Achievement First Bridgeport Academy Inc.	88	181	50	319	27.6%	56.7%	15.7%
Park City Prep Charter School Inc.	84	128	36	248	33.9%	51.6%	14.5%
The Bridge Academy	54	158	59	271	19.9%	58.3%	21.8%
New Beginnings Family Academy	61	252	47	360	16.9%	70.0%	13.1%
Bridgeport Public Schools Total	2,275	17,203	1,603	21,081	10.8%	81.6%	7.6%
CREC Charters:							
Charter School for Young Children on Asylum Hill	153	71	19	243	63.0%	29.2%	7.8%
CREC Total	1,327	1,010	225	2,562	51.8%	39.4%	8.8%
Charters in Hamden:							
Highville Charter School Inc.	0	168	50	300	0.0%	56.0%	16.7%
Hamden Public Schools Total	3,883	1,785	368	6,036	64.3%	29.6%	6.1%
Charters in Hartford:							
Achievement First Hartford	89	472	64	625	14.2%	75.5%	10.2%
Jumoke Academy	239	294	86	619	38.6%	47.5%	13.9%
Hartford Public Schools Total	4,784	17,549	1,673	24,006	19.9%	73.1%	7.0%
Charters in New Haven:							
Amistad Elementary	184	178	46	408	45.1%	43.6%	11.3%
Amistad High School	42	59	13	114	36.8%	51.8%	11.4%
Amistad Middle School	68	178	45	291	23.4%	61.2%	15.5%
Elm City College Prep Elementary	140	116	38	294	47.6%	39.5%	12.9%
Elm City College Prep High School	15	36	24	75	20.0%	48.0%	32.0%
Elm City College Prep Middle	60	117	38	215	27.9%	54.4%	17.7%
Common Ground High School	77	79	7	163	47.2%	48.5%	4.3%
New Haven Public Schools Total	7,400	10,793	1,817	20,010	37.0%	53.9%	9.1%
Charters in New London:							
Interdistrict School For the Arts and Communication (ISAAC)	44	110	27	181	24.3%	60.8%	14.9%
New London Public Schools Total	1,063	2,440	501	4,004	26.5%	60.9%	12.5%
Charters in Norwalk:							
Side by Side Community	119	93	22	234	50.9%	39.7%	9.4%
Norwalk Public Schools Total	6,307	3,994	881	11,182	56.4%	35.7%	7.9%
Charters in Norwich:							
Integrated Day Charter School	238	66	27	331	71.9%	19.9%	8.2%
Norwich Public Schools Total	1,139	2,296	422	3,857	29.5%	59.5%	10.9%
Charters in Stamford:							
Stamford Academy	23	71	16	110	20.9%	64.5%	14.5%
Trailblazers Academy	12	124	28	164	7.3%	75.6%	17.1%
Stamford Public Schools Total	8,692	5,503	1,150	15,345	56.6%	35.9%	7.5%

*Schools are grouped with district totals for the local district of the town in which the school is located.

APPENDIX C:

FREE AND REDUCED PRICE MEALS IN INTER-DISTRICT MAGNET SCHOOLS, OCTOBER 1, 2010*

SCHOOL NAME	# PAID	# FREE	# REDUCED	# TOTAL	% PAID	% FREE	% REDUCED
Magnets in Avon:							
Reggio Emilia Magnet School for the Arts	162	100	10	272	59.6%	36.8%	3.7%
Avon Public Schools Total	3,391	138	57	3,586	94.6%	3.8%	1.6%
Magnets in Bloomfield:							
The Big Picture High School	46	34	11	91	50.5%	37.4%	12.1%
Wintonbury Early Childhood Magnet School	246	49	16	311	79.1%	15.8%	5.1%
Metropolitan Learning Center	406	215	95	716	56.7%	30.0%	13.3%
Bloomfield Public Schools Total	1,159	839	217	2,215	52.3%	37.9%	9.8%
Magnets in Bridgeport:							
Six to Six Magnet	231	166	55	452	51.1%	36.7%	12.2%
Bridgeport Public Schools Total	2,275	17,203	1,603	21,081	10.8%	81.6%	7.6%
Magnets in Danbury:							
Western CT Academy of International Studies Magnet	332	33	22	387	85.8%	8.5%	5.7%
Danbury Public Schools Total	5,814	3,824	1,060	10,698	54.3%	35.7%	9.9%
Magnets in East Hartford:							
Connecticut River Academy/LEARN	64	92	19	175	36.6%	52.6%	10.9%
East Hartford/Glastonbury Elementary Magnet	204	48	10	262	77.9%	18.3%	3.8%
Two Rivers Magnet Middle	370	226	56	652	56.7%	34.7%	8.6%
International Magnet School for Global Citizenship	149	85	20	254	58.7%	33.5%	7.9%
East Hartford Public Schools Total	3,407	4,103	784	8,294	41.1%	49.5%	9.5%
Magnets in Enfield:							
Public Safety Academy Interdistrict Magnet	122	157	35	314	38.9%	50.0%	11.1%
Enfield Public Schools Total	4,115	1,237	381	5,733	71.8%	21.6%	6.6%
Magnets in Fairfield:							
Discovery Magnet School	75	38	17	130	57.7%	29.2%	13.1%
Fairfield Public Schools Total	9,322	698	240	10,260	90.9%	6.8%	2.3%
Magnets in Hamden:							
Hyde Leadership School of Greater New Haven	68	117	32	217	31.3%	53.9%	14.7%
New Haven Academy	95	126	47	268	35.4%	47.0%	17.5%
Wintergreen Magnet School	408	184	52	644	63.4%	28.6%	8.1%
Hamden Public Schools Total	3,883	1,785	368	6,036	64.3%	29.6%	6.1%
Magnets in Hartford:							
Annie Fisher/Hartford Montessori Magnet School	143	55	8	206	69.4%	26.7%	3.9%
Breakthrough Academy	150	163	63	376	39.9%	43.4%	16.8%
Capital Preparatory Magnet School	182	180	45	407	44.7%	44.2%	11.1%
Classical Magnet School	398	295	71	764	52.1%	38.6%	9.3%
Hartford Magnet Middle School (Learning Corridor)	262	303	68	633	41.4%	47.9%	10.7%
Hooker School	66	166	43	275	24.0%	60.4%	15.6%
Kinsella School	141	431	95	667	21.1%	64.6%	14.2%
Montessori Magnet School	202	108	38	348	58.0%	31.0%	10.9%

FREE AND REDUCED PRICE MEALS IN INTER-DISTRICT MAGNET SCHOOLS, OCTOBER 1, 2010*

SCHOOL NAME	# PAID	# FREE	# REDUCED	# TOTAL	% PAID	% FREE	% REDUCED
Sport Sciences Academy	60	560	56	676	8.9%	82.8%	8.3%
STEM Magnet School at Annie Fisher	145	162	32	339	42.8%	47.8%	9.4%
University High School	259	156	34	449	57.7%	34.7%	7.6%
Webster School	257	311	63	631	40.7%	49.3%	10.0%
Academy of Aerospace & Engineering	133	82	26	241	55.2%	34.0%	10.8%
Charter School for Young Children on Asylum Hill Inc.	153	71	19	243	63.0%	29.2%	7.8%
Greater Hartford Academy of the Arts	230	149	29	408	56.4%	36.5%	7.1%
Hartford Public Schools Total	4,784	17,549	1,673	24,006	19.9%	73.1%	7.0%

Magnets in Manchester:							
Great Path Academy at MCC	151	123	25	299	50.5%	41.1%	8.4%
Manchester Public Schools Total	3,694	2,959	592	7,245	51.0%	40.8%	8.2%

Magnets in Meriden:							
Thomas Edison Magnet Middle School	287	375	57	719	39.9%	52.2%	7.9%
Meriden Public Schools Total	3,028	4,420	764	8,212	36.9%	53.8%	9.3%

Magnets in New Haven:							
Barnard Environmental Magnet School	216	300	53	569	38.0%	52.7%	9.3%
Beecher School	209	257	38	504	41.5%	51.0%	7.5%
Benjamin Jepson Magnet School	273	204	64	541	50.5%	37.7%	11.8%
Betsy Ross Arts Magnet School	208	180	58	446	46.6%	40.4%	13.0%
Cooperative Arts and Humanities Magnet High	233	325	76	634	36.8%	51.3%	12.0%
Davis 21st Century Magnet Elementary	230	176	60	466	49.4%	37.8%	12.9%
High School in the Community	85	194	42	321	26.5%	60.4%	13.1%
Hill Regional Career High School	233	350	105	688	33.9%	50.9%	15.3%
John C. Daniels School	116	346	67	529	21.9%	65.4%	12.7%
King/Robinson Magnet School	179	330	52	561	31.9%	58.8%	9.3%
Metropolitan Business Academy	78	178	49	305	25.6%	58.4%	16.1%
MicroSociety Magnet	97	134	18	249	39.0%	53.8%	7.2%
Science & Engineering University Magnet School	112	53	61	226	49.6%	23.5%	27.0%
Vincent E. Mauro Math Science and Tech. Magnet	212	280	78	570	37.2%	49.1%	13.7%
Woodward School	162	324	37	523	31.0%	62.0%	7.1%
New Haven Public Schools Total	7,400	10,793	1,817	20,010	37.0%	53.9%	9.1%

Magnets in New London:							
Dual Language Arts Academy	27	46	8	81	33.3%	56.8%	9.9%
New London Public Schools Total	1,063	2,440	501	4,004	26.5%	60.9%	12.5%

Magnets in Stamford:							
Rogers School	435	262	49	746	58.3%	35.1%	6.6%
The Academy of Information Technology and Engineering	517	114	46	677	76.4%	16.8%	6.8%
Stamford Public Schools Total	8,692	5,503	1,150	15,345	56.6%	35.9%	7.5%

Magnets in Waterbury:							
Maloney Interdistrict Magnet School	339	238	46	623	54.4%	38.2%	7.4%
Mary R. Rotella Interdistrict Magnet School	331	212	76	619	53.5%	34.2%	12.3%
Waterbury Arts Magnet	399	325	82	806	49.5%	40.3%	10.2%
Waterbury Public Schools Total	3,664	13,205	1,503	18,372	19.9%	71.9%	8.2%

FREE AND REDUCED PRICE MEALS IN INTER-DISTRICT MAGNET SCHOOLS, OCTOBER 1, 2010*

SCHOOL NAME	# PAID	# FREE	# REDUCED	# TOTAL	% PAID	% FREE	% REDUCED
Magnets in Waterford:							
Multicultural Magnet School	290	210	46	546	53.1%	38.5%	8.4%
Friendship School	229	238	24	491	46.6%	48.5%	4.9%
Waterford Public Schools Total	2,622	525	135	3,282	79.9%	16.0%	4.1%

Magnets in West Hartford:							
University of Hartford Magnet School	214	181	55	450	47.6%	40.2%	12.2%
West Hartford Public Schools Total	8,161	1,496	446	10,103	80.8%	14.8%	4.4%

Magnets in Windsor:							
Pathways to Technology Magnet School	190	180	36	406	46.8%	44.3%	8.9%
CREC Medical Professions and Teachers Preparation Academy	75	94	14	183	41.0%	51.4%	7.7%
Windsor Public Schools Total	3,262	1,087	434	4,783	68.2%	22.7%	9.1%

*Schools are grouped with district totals for the local district of the town in which the school is located.

Lists of magnets based on SDE guide to Public School Choice 2011:

http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/pdf/equity/choice/public_school_choice_2011.pdf