

## 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:** Mobridge-Pollock School District

**Date of Administrative Review (Entrance Conference Date):** 3/21/2023

**Date review results were provided to the School Food Authority:** 5/5/2023

**Date review summary was publicly posted:** 5/4/23

---

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

This institution is an equal opportunity provider.

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

YES	NO	REVIEW FINDINGS		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>A. Program Access and Reimbursement</b>		
		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Certification and Benefit Issuance
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Verification
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Meal Counting and Claiming
Finding(s) Details: No findings in this area.				
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Offer versus Serve
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Dietary Specifications and Nutrient Analysis
Finding(s) Details: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During the week of menu review, the breakfast menu did not meet the 80% Whole Grain Rich requirement for grains. At least 80% of the grains provided were not Whole Grain Rich for K-5. Berry Colossal Crunch Cereal, Crispy Rice Cereal, Baked buttermilk biscuit, and Pop tart were not whole grain-rich.</li> <li>Although the appropriate meal pattern is being followed, the Production Records display a breakdown by service, rather than meal pattern. The production records must provide consistency with age/grade group meal patterns.</li> <li>During the week of menu review, the lunch menu did not meet the 80% Whole Grain Rich requirement for grains. At least 80% of the grains provided were not Whole Grain Rich. K-5 Lunch. Hamburger bun, garlic bread, and salad wafer crackers are not whole grain-rich.</li> <li>Although the appropriate meal pattern is being followed, the Production Records display a breakdown by service, rather than meal pattern. The production records must provide consistency with age/grade group meal patterns.</li> <li>Offer versus Serve reimbursable meal signage does not include the requirement for students to select at least 1/2 cup fruit or vegetable.</li> </ol>				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>C. School Nutrition Environment</b>		
		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Food Safety
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local School Wellness Policy
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Competitive Foods
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: Professional Standards, Buy American, Outreach		
Finding(s) Details: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SFA is selling items that do not meet the Smart Snacks nutrition standards. A vending machine holding diet</li> </ol>				

		<p>soda pop is available to middle school students. Only plain water, plain low fat milk, plain or flavored non-fat milk or 100% fruit or vegetable juice (may be diluted with water) with no added sweeteners are allowed for Middle School. The SFA must ensure that all food and beverage items meet the Smart Snack requirements, based on the level of the school (elementary, middle, high) where they are sold and nutrition standards.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The Food Safety Checklist in the Food Safety Plan is not completed as described. The checklist must be completed at least monthly, and the SOPs and checklist must identify an accurate reflection of frequency.</li> <li>3. Reviewer observed pineapple from Indonesia, without supporting documentation to justify the purchase/offering. All foods served must be produced in the United States, or have documentation demonstrating that the domestic product is not available, or that there is a substantial cost differential between foreign and domestic product.</li> <li>4. The Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program's cost documentation does not support the school's claim for reimbursement. Per serving cost calculation resulted in the SFA overclaiming by \$0.16. This will result in a fiscal calculation. To be in compliance, the school participating in the FFVP must ensure that it claims reimbursement only for allowable items for which it has maintained the proper documentation.</li> </ol>
□	X	<p><b>D. Civil Rights</b> Finding(s) Details: No findings in this area.</p>