

**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: Gettysburg Montessori Charter School**

**School Agreement Number: 197-01-054-2**

**Date of Administrative Review (Entrance Conference Date): February 10, 2020**

**Date review results were provided to the School Food Authority (SFA): February 11, 2020**

**General Program Participation**

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

[x]  School Breakfast Program

[x]  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?

[x]  Yes [ ]  No

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

[x]  Yes [ ]  No

|  |
| --- |
| **REVIEW FINDINGS** |
| 1. **Program Access and Reimbursement**
 |
| **YES** | **NO** |  |
| [x]  | [ ]  | **Certification and Benefit Issuance** – Validation of the SFA certification of students’ eligibility for free or reduced-price meals |
| Finding Detail:1. After review of the Benefit Issuance List (BIL) for December 2019, the test month, it was determined an error was made while determining eligibility for a student who received free meal benefits; the income was calculated incorrectly. There was also missing applications for some students who received meal benefits during the test month.
2. The SFA received copies of direct certification approval letters from the family and/or school districts which included names of siblings of students who were enrolled at Gettysburg Montessori. The SFA failed to obtain a copy of the actual DC list from the sending School District which would confirm benefits of the sibling.
 |
| [x]  | [ ]  | **Verification** – Validation of the process used by the SFA to confirm selected students’ eligibility for free and reduced-price meals |
| Finding Detail: 1. The SFA selected to implement the standard verification method, however all applications selected to verify were not error prone. In addition, the SFA failed to obtain all proof of income that was listed on the applications which resulted in errors with re-determination.
 |
| [ ]  | [x]  | **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: |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Meal Patterns and Nutritional Quality**
 |
| **YES** | **NO** |  |
| [x]  | [ ]  | **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: 1. During the on-site review the Field Advisor reviewed the production records for December 2019, the test month. On the productions records the SFA only served 1/2 cup fruit to the students during the breakfast meal service. The SFA was required to offer a total of 1cup fruit. The SFA used a vender during the test month who also entered their menus into Primero Edge. The Vendor entered incorrect information in order to bring the menus under compliance. The information entered in Primero Edge was not what was served and documented by the SFA on their production records. The SFA did not serve the additional 1/2 cup fruit; milk and condiments was not listed on the production records.
2. After review of the SFA productions records during the on-site review, it was discovered milk and condiments was not included on the production records. The SFA used a vendor during the test month and the Vendor input menus into Primero Edge. The Menus entered did not reflect the information listed on the production records.
 |
| [x]  | [ ]  | **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: 1. During the breakfast meal observation, the SFA was instructing the students to take a milk in order to complete their meal. Many students already selected the required number of meal items (including the 1/2 cup fruit or vegetable) but was told to go back to their milk.
2. The SFA did not have correct breakfast signage posted regarding offer versus serve explaining to students what constitutes a reimbursable meal.
 |
| [ ]  | [x]  | **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: |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **School Nutrition Environment**
 |
| **YES** | **NO** |  |
| [x]  | [ ]  | **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:1. The SFA was not documenting or maintaining temperature logs on any refrigerator and freezer units. The SFA has on site and utilizes 1 freezer, 1 refrigerator, 1 milk cooler, 1-line refrigerator and 1 small cooler unit.
2. The SFA did not have a written Food Safety Plan available on site.
 |
| [ ]  | [x]  | **Local School Wellness Policy** – Review of the SFA’s established Local School Wellness Policy  |
| Finding Detail: |
| [ ]  | [x]  | **Competitive Foods** – Validation of the SFA compliance with regulations for all food and beverages to students outside of the reimbursable meal |
| Finding Detail: |
| [ ]  | [x]  | **Professional Standards** – Validation of SFA compliance with required hiring standards and annual training requirements  |
| Finding Detail: |

|  |
| --- |
| **D. Civil Rights** |
| **YES** | **NO** |  |
| [ ]  | [x]  | **Civil Rights –** Validation of SFA compliance with civil rights requirements as applicable to the Child Nutrition Programs |
| Finding Detail:  |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [x]  | [ ]  | **Other** |
| Finding Detail:1. The SFA failed to include all require information on their production records. The SFA did not include Milk and condiments on their production records for breakfast and lunch. The SFA is not listing the specific fruit that was served for breakfast and lunch (i.e. only the word fruit is indicated).
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENDATIONS** |
| **F. Recognition of Accomplishment** |
| * The staff was open to recommendations for compliance and asked many questions for clarification throughout the review process.
 |