

**STATE AGENCY ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW SUMMARY**

Section 207 of the HHFKA amended section 22 of the NSLA (42 U.S.C. 1769c) to require State Agencies (SA) to report the results of the administrative review to the public in an accessible, easily understood manner in accordance with guidelines promulgated by the Secretary. Regulations at 7 CFR 210.18(m) requires the SA to post a summary of the most recent final administrative review results for each School Food Authority (SFA) on the SA publicly available website no later than 30 days after the SA provides the results of the administrative review to the SFA. The SA must also make a copy of the final administrative review report available to the public upon request.

**School Food Authority Name: Adelphoi Village**

**School Agreement Number: 300-65-055-0**

**Date of Administrative Review (Entrance Conference Date): June 8, 2021**

**Date review results were provided to the School Food Authority (SFA):**

**General Program Participation**

1. What Child Nutrition Programs does the School Food Authority participate in? (Select all that apply)

School Breakfast Program

National School Lunch Program

Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program

Afterschool Snack

Special Milk Program

Seamless Summer Option

1. Does the School Food Authority operate under any Special Provisions? (Select all that apply)

Community Eligibility Provision

Special Provision 1

Special Provision 2

Special Provision 3

**Review Findings**

1. Were any findings identified during the review of this School Food Authority?

Yes  No

1. Is there fiscal action associated with findings identified during the review of this School Food Authority?

Yes  No

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **REVIEW FINDINGS** | | |
| 1. **Program Access and Reimbursement** | | |
| **YES** | **NO** |  |
|  |  | **Certification and Benefit Issuance** – Validation of the SFA certification of students’ eligibility for free or reduced-price meals |
| Finding Detail: | | |
|  |  | **Verification** – Validation of the process used by the SFA to confirm selected students’ eligibility for free and reduced-price meals |
| Finding Detail: | | |
|  |  | **Meal Counting and Claiming** – Validation of the SFA meal counting and claiming system that accurately counts, records, consolidates, and reports the number of reimbursable meals claimed, by category |
| Finding Detail:  MIddlecreek 1 – The Sponsor has claimed meals in error based on inaccurate counting and/or claiming procedures. The counts by category were not correctly used in the claim for reimbursement. Specifically, the Test Month site claim report for Lunch does not match the sum of the rosters or edit check worksheet.  La Sa Quick Residential Treatment – All components of the reimbursable meal are not offered prior to the point of service count. No meals were observed in error. | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Meal Patterns and Nutritional Quality** | | |
| **YES** | **NO** |  |
|  |  | **Meal Components and Quantities** – Validation that meals claimed for reimbursement contain the required meal components (also referred to as food components) and quantities |
| Finding Detail:  MIddlecreek 1 – The production records for the review period of April 12, 2021 – April 18, 2021, indicated that the required quantities of meal components were not available for those being served.  Middlecreek 1 – On the day of review, the minimum daily requirements for lunch were not met for those being served.  Greystone – Upon review of the Production Records from the Test Week of April 12, 2021 – April 18, 2021, it was found that the milk variety requirement was not met for Breakfast and/or Lunch.  La Sa Quick Residential Treatment – A review of the menus for the test week of April 12, 2021 – April 18, 2021, did not validate compliance with Dietary Specifications and Food Component Requirements.  La Sa Quick Residential Treatment – The production records and other supporting documentation for the review period of April 12, 2021 – April 18, 2021, indicated that the required quantities of meal components were not available for those being served and the lunch meal pattern was not met.  La Sa Quick Residential Treatment – On the day of review, the minimum daily requirements for lunch were not met for those being served. | | |
|  |  | **Offer versus Serve (provision that allows students to decline some of the food components offered)** – Validation of SFA compliance with OVS requirements if applicable |
| Finding Detail: | | |
|  |  | **Dietary Specifications and Nutrient** **Analysis** – Validation that meals offered to children through the school meal programs are consistent with federal standards for calories, saturated fat, sodium, and *trans* fat |
| Finding Detail:  Upon review of the Breakfast and Lunch Food Component Reports compared to the Production Records of Middle Creek I and Greystone, it was found that they were not reflective of one another. | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **School Nutrition Environment** | | |
| **YES** | **NO** |  |
|  |  | **Food Safety** – Validation that all selected schools meet the food safety and storage requirements, and comply with the Buy American provisions specified by regulation |
| Finding Detail:  Upon review, it was found that the SFA does not have a documented request for Food Safety Inspections from the State or local governmental agency responsible for food safety inspections.  Upon review of the Food Safety Plan provided for the Administrative Review, the following was found:   * Food Safety Plan is not site specific. * Some of the Standard Operating Procedures are missing required elements, to include: Monitoring, Verification, Corrective Action, and/or Date Implemented. * Some of the Standard Operating Procedures that apply to the SFA’s food service structure are not included, such as, Transporting Food to Remote Sites (Satellite Kitchen) and Using and Storing Suitable Utensils When Handling Ready-to-Eat Foods. | | |
|  |  | **Local School Wellness Policy** – Review of the SFA’s established Local School Wellness Policy |
| Finding Detail: | | |
|  |  | **Competitive Foods** – Validation of the SFA compliance with regulations for all food and beverages to students outside of the reimbursable meal |
| Finding Detail: | | |
|  |  | **Professional Standards** – Validation of SFA compliance with required hiring standards and annual training requirements |
| Finding Detail: | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **D. Civil Rights** | | |
| **YES** | **NO** |  |
|  |  | **Civil Rights –** Validation of SFA compliance with civil rights requirements as applicable to the Child Nutrition Programs |
| Finding Detail:  Upon review of the Nondiscrimination Statement utilized by the SFA, it was found that the spacing and verbiage had been altered. | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **E. Resource Management** | | |
| **YES** | **NO** |  |
|  |  | **Resource Management –** Validation of SFA compliance with overall financial health of the school food service account |
| Finding Detail: | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Other**  **SFA On Site Monitoring**  **Reporting and Recordkeeping** |
| Finding Detail:  SFA On Site Monitoring – The SFA did not complete on-site reviews of breakfast of a minimum of 50 percent of the sites operating the School Breakfast Program within the SFA.  Recording and Recordkeeping – Upon review of the Test Week Production Records from the three selected sites, they were found to be incomplete as they did not contain Recipe/Item numbers.  Recording and Recordkeeping – Upon review of the Test Month, it was found that operating days were inaccurately reported for multiple sites. | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENDATIONS** |
| **F. Recognition of Accomplishment** |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | Staff was available to answer additional questions if needed. |  | |