

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 Food Authority Name: Lyman School District

Date of Administrative Review (Entrance Conference Date): November 21, 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)						
	□ 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.

YES	NO	REVIEW FINDINGS					
\boxtimes		A. Program Access and Reimbursement					
		YES	NO				
			\boxtimes	Certification and Benefit Issuance			
		\boxtimes		Verification			
		\boxtimes		Meal Counting and Claiming			
		Finding(s) Details:					
				did not complete the required confirmation reviews for the			
		applications selected for Verification. Adjust the finding if the confirmation reviews were completed but not documented.					
		'6	VICVS V	vere completed but not documented.			
		ac to se th	ccordan be ver parateo ose app	cations subject to verification were not properly selected in ce with the standard sample used. For the two applications required ified, the SFA did not consider error-prone applications but instead d the applications into two piles - those approved via income and proved via TANF/FDPIR that were not on the Direct Certification List. then chose one application from each pile and verified those two.			
		a : re w pe	systemi mainin here th	and SA claims do not match, resulting in an under claim. The SFA has it claiming error. At the end of meal service, the FSD counts her g trays and compares that to the POS count. There were two days e tray count for lunch was lower than the POS meal count by one o the lower number was recorded rather than using the accurate at.			
		sc cc ch w ch	thool, Kounted the counted the counted to the counter	ere 32 students from Presho elementary who ate lunch at the other ennebec elementary, during a school presentation. The POS correctly these students but the FSD did not record them on her daily edit eet so she did not include them in the claim. The total underclaim 2 lunches. In addition, the SFA was not reviewing the daily edit leets from the POS.			
		5) Th	ie SFA (did not provide the meal charge policy in writing to households.			
\boxtimes		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			
			g(s) Det				
				ay of review, Breakfast meals that were claimed at the point of			
				or reimbursement did not contain a sufficient quantity of fruit. The erve" for the elementary school. Twelve students only took a half cup			
				stead of the required one cup.			
				no meal signage for breakfast in the cafeteria that identifies the ents of a reimbursable meal.			
				reek of menu review, the lunch menu did not meet the minimum equirement for the dark green vegetable subgroup. Dark green			

		vegetables were offered, but not in large enough quantities to meet the weekly requirement.				
\boxtimes		C. School Nutrition Environment				
		YES	NO			
			\boxtimes	Food Safety		
		\boxtimes		Local School Wellness Policy		
		\boxtimes		Competitive Foods		
		\boxtimes		Other: SFSP Outreach		
		Finding(s) Details:				
		2)	and it has not been posted anywhere for the public to review.			
		school students who have access to the machine.				
		3)	The S	SFA has not performed SFSP outreach.		
	\boxtimes	D. Ci	vil Righ	ts		
		Finding(s) Details:				