OSPI Child Nutrition Services Information Sheet

2025–26 Breakfast Meals for Kids Grant Scoring Matrix

The Washington State legislature provides annual funding for the Breakfast Meals for Kids Grant. This is a competitive grant for National School Lunch Program (NSLP) and/or School Breakfast Program (SBP) sponsors. Each grant proposal is scored based on the following information and may receive up to 103 total points.

Local Education Agency (LEA)/Site Information Section

Scored by OSPI Child Nutrition Services

Points Added by OSPI	Child Nutrition Serv	vices		Points
Free and Reduced-Price F (OBD) of sites included in	_	ed on WINS 2024 (October Building Data	
_	Criteria	Point Value		
_	95-100 %	10		
_	90-94.9%	9		
_	85-89.9%	8		0 – 10
_	80-84.9%	7		
_	75-79.9%	6		
_	70-74.9%	5		
	60-64.9%	3		
	55-59.9%	2		
	50-54.9%	1		
_	49.9% or less	0		
Did the LEA receive a Chil	d Nutrition Grant or He	ealthy Kids, Healthy	/ Schools Grant within	
the past 5 years:				
10 points = Never received grant			0 – 10	
5 points = Received grant in 2022-23 or earlier				
0 points = Received grant in 2023-24 or 2024-25				



the funds will in divided by the	ding ratio: Grants are scored base npact. This ratio is calculated by ta estimated number of students imported by grant funds and will s	king the grant amount pacted. A lower ratio m	requested	1 – 5
	Criteria	Point Value		
	\$20 per student or less	5	1	
	\$21-\$50 per student	3		
	Greater than \$50 per student	1		
The average free and reduced-price percentage of sites included in the application will be added to the total grant score.			0 1	
• For example, if a grant application scores 60 points and the average F/R% of sites in the application is 42.91%, the total score for the grant application will be 60.4291.			0 – 1	

Grant Questions Section

Question Number	Question	Points
1.	Please check off which activities you will implement with these grant funds during the 2025-26 school year. Check all that apply:	
	8 points = Improve student access and participation in current alternative breakfast or Breakfast After the Bell (BAB) program.	
	7 points = Improve meal quality (fewer processed foods, scratch cooking).	
	6 points = Purchase or renew software license for menu planning or nutrient analysis software used in the School Breakfast Program (SBP).	0-35
	5 points = This project will support specific Local School Wellness Policy goals related to the SBP (must attach/highlight specifics).	
	4 points = Supports staff level training hours for SBP.	
	3 points = Funding supports limits to added sugars at breakfast according to Final Rule-Child Nutrition Programs: Meal Patterns Consistent with the 2020-2025 DGAs.	
	2 points = Promotion and outreach of SBP.	
2.	What is your plan to improve the school breakfast program and what is the equipment you need? (Narrative Question)	1-10
3.	Do you have the ability to purchase, have all items delivered on site and outreach activities completed by no later than June 30, 2026?	Yes or No

OSPI September 2025

4.	Funding reaches students within a reengagement program. Must identify site name in application.	+10
5.	Funding supports starting a new alternative breakfast/Breakfast After the Bell (BAB) program. Must identify site name in application.	+10
6.	Funding supports starting a new School Breakfast Program (SBP) or reestablishing a SBP. Must identify site name in application.	+12

Quotes Section

Quotes

One or three quotes for each item must be attached with the grant application, as applicable. Each item requested must be prioritized and listed in the grant application.

For items ≥ \$10,000: 3 quotes required

Items under \$10,000: 1 quote required

Narrative Question Scoring

0 10 Points	Rationale
1	Poor – not explained/marginally established, needs more specifics to be fully funded.
6	Average – acceptable response/described approach sufficiently to be considered as meeting minimum requirements.
8	Good – above-average response/described in sufficient detail to be considered as exceeding minimum requirements, has some specifics as to support the grant request, considers the work of stakeholders, somewhat collaborative.
10	Excellent – superior, highlights innovation, detailed, cites specific data, efficient response/described approach in sufficient detail, very collaborative, considers other partners such as parents, students, teachers, local policy makers, or other organizations with an interest in improving children's health and wellness outcomes.

OSPI September 2025