

## 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 Food Authority Name:** LifeScape

**Date of Administrative Review (Entrance Conference Date):** November 20, 2019

**Date review results were provided to the School Food Authority:** December 20, 2019

**Date review summary was publicly posted:** February 12, 2020

---

The review summary must cover access and reimbursement (including eligibility and certification review results), an SFA's compliance with the meal patterns and the nutritional quality of school meals, the results of the review of the school nutrition environment (including food safety, local school wellness policy, and competitive foods), compliance related to civil rights, and general program participation. At a minimum, this would include the written notification of review findings provided 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 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.

This institution is an equal opportunity provider.

YES	NO	REVIEW FINDINGS			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>A. Program Access and Reimbursement</b>			
		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Certification and Benefit Issuance	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Verification	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Meal Counting and Claiming	
Finding(s) Details:					
1) Not all selected applications were approved correctly. The SFA did not calculate the income correctly for one application. This resulted in the student eligibility changing from free to reduced.					
2) The SFA 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, the SFA claimed 9 paid meals as reduced for the month of October.					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>B. Meal Patterns and Nutritional Quality</b>			
		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Meal Components and Quantities	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Offer versus Serve	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Dietary Specifications and Nutrient Analysis	
Finding(s) Details:					
1) Signage is not posted near or at the beginning of the serving line identifying what constitutes a reimbursable meal for breakfast or lunch, and there is no Offer vs. Serve signage.					
2) For the week of menu review, the lunch menu did not meet the minimum daily and weekly requirements for meat/meat alternate. A meat/meat alternate was offered daily; however, the minimum daily and weekly requirements were not met.					
3) For the week of menu review, the breakfast menu did not meet the minimum daily 1-ounce equivalent requirement for grain. A grain was offered daily; however, the minimum required portion size was not met.					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>C. School Nutrition Environment</b>			
		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Food Safety	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local School Wellness Policy	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Competitive Foods	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: Resource Management			
Finding(s) Details:					
1) The SFA charged unallowable costs to the nonprofit school food service account. They used an unallowable method to allocate expenditures across multiple food service programs.					
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>D. Civil Rights</b>			
Finding(s) Details:					