

800 Governors Drive Pierre, SD 57501-2235 T 605.773.3413 F 605.773.6846 www.doe.sd.gov

Email: <u>DOE.SchoolLunch@state.sd.us</u>

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 to report the final 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 State agency to post a summary of the most recent final administrative review results for each SFA on the State agency's publicly available website no later than 30 days after the SA provides the final 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 F	ood Authority Name: Wall School District
Date of A	Administrative Review (Entrance Conference Date): April 26, 2019
Date rev	riew results were provided to the School Food Authority: May 23, 2019
Date rev	riew summary was publicly posted: August 30, 2019
compliar nutrition civil right provided	ew summary must cover access and reimbursement (including eligibility and certification review results), an SFA nee with the meal patterns and the nutritional quality of school meals, the results of the review of the school nenvironment (including food safety, local school wellness policy, and competitive foods), compliance related to ts, and general program participation. At a minimum, this would include the written notification of review finding to the SFAs Superintendent or equivalent as required at 7 CFR 210.18(i)(3).
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
2.	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 F	Findings
3.	Were any findings identified during the review of this School Food Authority? ☑ Yes □ No

If yes, please indicate the areas and what issues were identified in the table below.

YES	NO	REVIEW FINDINGS			
\boxtimes		A. Pı	rogram	Access and Reimbursement	
		YES	NO		
		\boxtimes		Certification and Benefit Issuance	
		\boxtimes		Verification	
			\boxtimes	Meal Counting and Claiming	
		Findin	g(s) Det	ails:	
		1)	Not a	Il selected applications were approved correctly. Not all income-	
				d applications included the last four digits of the social security per of an adult household member, or an indication of none.	
		2)		e was one application that was calculated incorrectly but did not tin a change in eligibility status.	
		3)		FA does not have documentation demonstrating that a confirmation w took place prior to the Verification process.	
⊠ □ B. N		B. M	leal Pat	terns and Nutritional Quality	
		YES	NO		
		\boxtimes		Meal Components and Quantities	
		\boxtimes		Offer versus Serve	
			\boxtimes	Dietary Specifications and Nutrient Analysis	
		Findin	g(s) Det	ails:	
		1)		e Group 9-12: For the week of menu review, the lunch menu did not	
				the daily fruit requirement, a fruit was offered but did not meet the	
				num portion size requirement. For the week of menu review and the	
			-	f review the menu did not meet the minimum portion size	
			requi	rements for daily meat/meat alternate.	
		2)	the d	e Group 9-12: For the day of review, the lunch menu did not meet aily grain requirement. A grain was offered but did not meet the num portion size requirement.	
		3)	did n grain not n alteri minir lunch starci menu	e group K-8 and 9-12: For the week of menu review, the lunch menu of meet the minimum daily and weekly requirements for grains. A was offered daily, however the minimum required portion size was net. The menu did not meet the weekly requirements for meat/meat nate. A meat/meat alternate was offered daily, however the weekly num requirement was not met. For the week of menu review, the menu did not meet the minimum weekly requirement for the hy vegetable subgroup. For the week of menu review, the lunch a did not meet the whole grain-rich requirement. Not all grains ded were whole grain-rich.	
		4)	meet	es K-12- For the week of menu review, the breakfast menu did not the minimum daily fruit requirement. Fruit was offered daily, ever the minimum required portion size was not met.	
		5)		versus Serve reimbursable meal signage is not posted, including the rement for students to select at least 1/2 cup fruit or vegetable.	

\boxtimes		C. School Nutrition Environment				
		YES	NO			
		\boxtimes		Food Safety		
		\boxtimes		Local School Wellness Policy		
			\boxtimes	Competitive Foods		
		\boxtimes		Other		
		Finding(s) Details:				
		1)	1) The SFA charged \$1,834.81 in unallowable costs to the food service			
			account.			
		2)	The SFAs Local Wellness Policy does not contain any of the required components.			
		3)	The S	SFA had food that was opened and not dated with date opened.		
	\boxtimes	D. Civil Rights				
		Finding(s) Details:				