**Community Eligibility Provision**

The Community Eligibility Provision (CEP) for the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) and School Breakfast Program (SBP) gives eligible local education agencies (LEAs) and schools with high percentages of low-income children the option to offer free school meals to all children in those schools without collecting applications. Under this provision, eligible LEAs and schools elect to provide meals to all students and are reimbursed by the federal government through a formula using the percentage of directly eligible students (students who are already enrolled in other designated assistance programs) multiplied by a factor (currently 1.6). For more information, please [visit the Community Eligibility Provision (CEP) webpage.](https://www.oregon.gov/ode/students-and-family/childnutrition/SNP/Pages/Special-Provisions.aspx).

**Title I-A Budget Narrative Directions**

On the Targeting Page of the Title I-A Budget Narrative, a “# Public School Poverty Student Count” must be entered for each school.

* For districts not participating in the CEP, all schools will use the prior year’s free and reduced lunch student count (or family income survey for schools that do not participate in NSLP) in the same way that has been done in previous years.
* Districts participating in the CEP for the first time have two options (in subsequent years, participating districts will only use Option B below, but for their first year of participation, they may choose Option A or Option B):
  1. They may use the prior year’s free and reduced lunch student count for all schools, OR
  2. They may use one of the following four methods of accounting for changes in the poverty student count as a result of some or all schools participating in the CEP:

| # | **For schools participating in CEP** | **For schools not participating in CEP** | **Possible Considerations** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1.a.** All schools use the sum of the following Identified Students:   * Direct Certification count * Count of students from any or all of the following categories that are not already included in the Direct Certification count   + Foster student count   + Homeless/Runaway count   + Migrant count   Headstart/Even Start count (if eligible)  **1.b.** All schools use the same sum of Identified Students as above, times the CEP multiplier (currently 1.6). | **1.a.** All schools use the sum of the following Identified Students:   * Direct Certification count * Count of students from any or all of the following categories that are not already included in the Direct Certification count   + Foster student count   + Homeless/Runaway count   + Migrant count   Headstart/Even Start count (if eligible)  **1.b.** All schools use the same sum of Identified Students as above, times the CEP multiplier (currently 1.6). | * The same method of determining poverty is used for all schools (most equitable). * 1.a. results in lower poverty for all schools. * 1.b. results in higher poverty for all schools.   Title I rank is the same for both 1.a. and 1.b. |
| 2. | The same sum of Identified Students as in Method 1 above, times the CEP multiplier (currently 1.6). | The prior year’s free and reduced lunch student count (or family income survey for schools not participating in NSLP). | CEP schools may rank higher as compared to non-CEP schools than they would have using Method 1. |
| 3. | The sum of all Identified Students plus count of students as determined by a family income survey. | The prior year’s free and reduced lunch student count (or family income survey for schools not participating in NSLP). | This method is discouraged as it defeats the purpose of the CEP. |