

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: Deuel School District						
Date of	Administrative Review (Entrance Conference Date): 12/14/17						
Date rev	Date review results were provided to the School Food Authority: _03/14/17						
Date rev	view summary was publicly posted: 7/19/2017						
complia nutrition civil righ	ew summary must cover access and reimbursement (including eligibility and certification review results), an SFA's nce with the meal patterns and the nutritional quality of school meals, the results of the review of the school n environment (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 findings d 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)						
	XX School Breakfast Program XX National School Lunch Program Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program						
	□ Afterschool Snack XX 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	Findings						
3.	Were any findings identified during the review of this School Food Authority? X Yes No						



Email: DOE.SchoolLunch@state.sd.us

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

YES	NO	REVIEW FINDINGS				
Х		A. Program Access and Reimbursement				
		YES	NO			
		X		Certification and Benefit Issuance		
			Х	Verification		
			Х	Meal Counting and Claiming		
		Findin	g(s) Det	ails:		
		1)		ng PS1 #1: Off Site 304 (I) and On Site 120: SFA indicated that new		
				ents are allowed to eat at full price until a complete application is		
				ved and approved. Once an approved Free or Reduced Price		
				cation is complete, the SFA back dates the free/reduced price meals		
				e start date of the new student. Free or reduced meal price benefits		
			canno	ot be back dated.		
Х		B. M	leal Patt	terns and Nutritional Quality		
,		YES	NO	,		
		Х		Meal Components and Quantities		
			Х	Offer versus Serve		
		Х		Dietary Specifications and Nutrient Analysis		
		Findin	g(s) Det			
		ng PS2, #1: On Site 401 & 500; During breakfast meal service the				
	wer observed sixteen students with incomplete and non-					
				oursable meals. These student meals were entered into the point of		
				ce as a reimbursable meal. POS person did not make any corrections		
				e system to indicate students were not getting the reimbursable		
			meal	and should be charged ala carte.		
				One of three required components: Juice only, muffin only (2),		
				yogurt only		
				, ,		
			_	fruit (3), Toast and juice, Yogurt and Juice		
				Missing ½ c fruit requirement: milk and yogurt, muffin and milk, muffin and yogurt (2), cereal, milk and toast (2)		
			These	e meals do not meet the requirements for reimbursement and will		
				sallowed from claiming.		
		2)		ng PS2, #2: On Site 401; Head Start students were offered juice OR		
		'		at breakfast. Each item is a different component in the menu and		
				ents should be able to choose both juice and milk if they would like.		
				ol allows offer versus serve for this age group.		
		3)	Findi	ng PS2 #3: On Site 404: There was no sign in the meal service area		
			that i	ndicated what a complete lunch and breakfast meal consists of each		
				. The sign must include the components for each meal (breakfast		
				unch); it must also include the minimum selections under offer		
				s serve. The reviewer emailed examples of signs to food service.		
		4)		ng PS2, #4: On Site 603; SFA was using Encore production records		
				were not approved in their SY 16-17 iCAN application. The Encore		
			temp	late was missing some required pieces of production record		



Email: DOE.SchoolLunch@state.sd.us

			Email: <u>DOE.SchoolLunch@s</u>
			mation.
	5)		ng PS2, #5: On Site 603; Production records submitted for the new
			were incomplete. The information left undocumented was "Total
			ned Servings", "Total Units Prepared" and/or "Amount Added of Left
			'. All areas on the production record must be completed with
			ate information for each meal.
	6)		ng PS2, #6: On Site 603; The lunch menu contained noodles made
		from	semolina. Semolina is not a whole grain. Per NSLP and SBP
		regul	ations in 7 CFR 210.10, all grains are required to be whole grain-rich.
			ped margarine and margarine product was submitted with the
			fast menu review and identified during the on-site visit that
			ined 1 gram of trans fat per 1 T serving. Trans fats are not allowed in
			chool Nutrition Program per CFR 210.10(a)(3). "Labels or
			ufacturer specifications for food products and ingredients used to
			are school meals must indicate zero grams of trans fat per serving
		(less	than 0.5 grams)".
Х	C. Sc	hool Nu	strition Environment
	YES	NO	
	Х		Food Safety
	Х		Local School Wellness Policy
		Х	Competitive Foods
	X		Other
		g(s) Det	
	1)		ng GA, #6: On site #1403; SFA is missing HACCP-Based Standard
			ating Procedure #21, "Safe Food transportation, Storage and
		-	ling for all Child Nutrition Programs." This SOP is required for all
			cies per public law 111-296 section 302. This requires the food safety
		_	to include any facility or part of a facility in which food is stored,
		-	ared, or served for the purposes of the school nutrition programs.
	2)		ng GA, #7: Bananas from Honduras and Mandarin Oranges from
			were found in the kitchen. The SFA did not have supporting
			mentation for products which were not grown or manufactured in
			nited States. There is a Buy American requirement in the school
			program (210.21(d)). All food must be domestically grown and
			essed in the United States. If the SFA is unable to purchase
		-	estically grown food, the SFA must obtain documentation to support
			this food is not commercially grown in the U.S. or the cost of
			and read is not commended by the control of the cost of
		dome	estically grown food is significantly higher than a foreign grown and
			estically grown food is significantly higher than a foreign grown and essed food.
	3)	proce	estically grown food is significantly higher than a foreign grown and essed food. ng #3: Off Site 1004; The SFA currently directly solicits member of
	3)	proce Findi	essed food.
	3)	proce Findii their	essed food. ng #3: Off Site 1004; The SFA currently directly solicits member of
	3)	proce Finding their stake	essed food. ng #3: Off Site 1004; The SFA currently directly solicits member of Wellness Committee thus limiting their participation from various
	3)	proce Finding their stake for so	essed food. In #3: Off Site 1004; The SFA currently directly solicits member of Wellness Committee thus limiting their participation from various holders. During On Site interview, various options were discussed
	3)	proce Finding their stake for so in the	essed food. ng #3: Off Site 1004; The SFA currently directly solicits member of Wellness Committee thus limiting their participation from various holders. During On Site interview, various options were discussed oliciting various stakeholders, including a notification being included
	3)	proce Finding their stake for so in the	essed food. Ing #3: Off Site 1004; The SFA currently directly solicits member of Wellness Committee thus limiting their participation from various holders. During On Site interview, various options were discussed pliciting various stakeholders, including a notification being included a Parent Packets that are sent out yearly, information being included



Email: DOE.SchoolLunch@state.sd.us

	released in July of 2016 states that a triennial assessment must be done				
	once every 3 years. This assessment must determine compliance with the				
	Wellness Policy, it compares to model policies, and the progress made by				
	the SFA in attaining the goals set forth in the SFA's Wellness Policy.				
	5) Finding GA, #5: Off Site 1206; Full-time staff must complete 6 hours of				
	education/training for the 2016-17 SY as defined by the Professional				
	Standards rule released in March of 2015.				
	6) Finding #8: Off Site 1601; SFA was unaware that it is required to inform				
	families of the availability of meals offered through the Summer Food				
	Service Program before the end of the school year. During the On-Site				
	technical assistance was given in the form of education to the				
	requirement and ideas on how to inform families. The intent of this rule is				
	to reach needy families with free feeding opportunities throughout the				
	state even if there is no local summer feeding site.				
Х	D. Civil Rights				
	Finding(s) Details:				
	1) Finding GA, #2: Off site 803; Currently the SFA has a general Complaint				
	Policy that references Federal Funds, but does not specifically reference				
	discrimination within the FNS School Meal Program. USDA's memo, Civil				
	Rights in the SNLP and SBP, #108 gives specific guidance for all Federally				
	funded FNS programs.				