

**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: Tri-State Christian Academy**

**School Agreement Number: 201-63-000-1**

**Date of Administrative Review (Entrance Conference Date): November 12, 2020**

**Date review results were provided to the School Food Authority (SFA): November 12, 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:A review of Certification and Benefit Issuance for the test month of September 2020 resulted in errors that met or exceeded the USDA 10% error threshold. Not all applications selected for review were approved correctly. |
| [x]  | [ ]  | **Verification** – Validation of the process used by the SFA to confirm selected students’ eligibility for free and reduced-price meals |
| Finding Detail: The application subject to verification was not properly selected in accordance with the sample size option. The sponsor chose the Standard Sampling Method but did not choose an error prone application, as required. Reviewer validated that an error prone application was available. This is a Repeat Finding from the previous review. It was also found that number of Error Prone applications reported on the SY20-21 Verification Collection Report is inaccurate. |
| [ ]  | [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: Breakfast – The point of service did not provide an accurate meal count by eligibility status. Upon comparison of the manually written names from the Test Month from the point of service, compared to the electronic input into the Excel spreadsheet utilized to total the meal counts for the claim, errors were found. Fiscal Action may occur.Breakfast – A review of the menus for the test week of September 14, 2020 – September 18, 2020, did not validate compliance with Dietary Specifications and Food Component Requirements. The Breakfast analysis submitted for the Administrative Review is not a reflection of the menu offered. Lunch – Planned menu quantities did not meet the meal pattern requirements for the review period of September 14, 2020 – September 18, 2020, for the grade groups being served. Lunch – The school is serving multiple grade groups but has not structured the meal service to meet the specific meal pattern requirements for each grade group being served. All grade groups are offered the same menu in the same portion sizes.Lunch – On the day of review, the minimum daily requirements for lunch were not met for the grade groups being served. This is a Repeat Finding from the previous review.Lunch – A review of the menus for the test week of September 14, 2020 – September 18, 2020, did not validate compliance with Dietary Specifications and Food Component Requirements, to include vegetable subgroups. The Lunch analyses submitted for the Administrative Review are not a reflection of the Production Records provided.   |
| [ ]  | [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:  |
| [ ]  | [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: |
| [ ]  | [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:The School Nutrition Program Director did not complete food safety training within the past 5 years.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **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:The School Food Authority (SFA) is charging indirect costs to the Non-profit School Food Service Account (NSFSA) on an unallowable basis.   |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [x]  | [ ]  | **Other – Reporting and Recordkeeping** |
| Finding Detail:Upon review of the approved paid lunch price on the Site Application compared to the paid lunch price charged on the point of service spreadsheet, it was found that only week 1 charged the approved amount of $2.15 and all other weeks charged $2.00. Breakfast and Lunch production records were found to be incomplete, as they do not contain recipe/item numbers. Reimbursable projected servings are recorded on the Lunch production records as one total number for grades K-12. This review was expanded and found to be systemic. |

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENDATIONS** |
| **F. Recognition of Accomplishment** |
| SFA did a nice job with the virtual Day of Review. |