

## 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:** White River School District 47-1

**Date of Administrative Review (Entrance Conference Date):** January 31, 2023

**Date review results were provided to the School Food Authority:** 10/30/23

**Date review summary was publicly posted:** 11/20/23

---

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			
X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>A. Program Access and Reimbursement</b>			
		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	X	Certification and Benefit Issuance	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	X	Verification	
		X	<input type="checkbox"/>	Meal Counting and Claiming	
Finding(s) Details:					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The SFA is not following their State Agency approved application. White River Elementary School only lists 1 approved point of sale on the site application.</li> <li>2) The SFA is operating alternate points of service without State Agency approval. The SFA must receive approval from the State Agency prior to operating an alternate point of service.</li> <li>3) The School Food Authority (SFA) is not completing edit checks to ensure meal counts do not exceed enrollment or attendance adjusted enrollment.</li> <li>4) Breakfast: The SFA and SA claims do not match. The SFA has a systemic claiming error. The reviewer is unable to determine what an accurate claim for reimbursement should have been. A recalculation of meals is needed. The SFA used a combination of tray counts and attendance to compile the claim for reimbursement. The SFA must ensure that claims are being filed accurately and consolidate the claim based on the edit checks from each site. This finding may result in a fiscal calculation.</li> <li>5) Breakfast: The point of service did not provide an accurate meal count by eligibility status. This is a systemic error. The SFA was using a tray count for their overall meal count and not the Infinite Campus system. The SFA must ensure that meal counts taken daily at the point of service correctly identify the number meals served as they are CEP. This finding may result in a fiscal calculation.</li> <li>6) Lunch: The SFA and SA claims do not match. The SFA has a systemic claiming error. The reviewer is unable to determine what an accurate claim for reimbursement should have been. A recalculation of meals is needed. The SFA used a combination of tray counts and attendance to compile the claim for reimbursement. The SFA must ensure that claims are being filed accurately and consolidate the claim based on the edit checks from each site. This finding may result in a fiscal calculation.</li> <li>7) Lunch: The point of service did not provide an accurate meal count by eligibility status. This is a systemic error. The SFA was using a tray count for their overall meal count and not the Infinite Campus system. The SFA must ensure that meal counts taken daily at the point of service correctly identify the number meals served as they are CEP. This finding may result in a fiscal calculation.</li> </ol>					
X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>B. Meal Patterns and Nutritional Quality</b>			
		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>		
		X	<input type="checkbox"/>	Meal Components and Quantities	
		X	<input type="checkbox"/>	Offer versus Serve	
<input type="checkbox"/>	X	Dietary Specifications and Nutrient Analysis			

		<p>Finding(s) Details:</p> <p>1) Signage is not posted near or at the beginning of the serving line identifying what constitutes a reimbursable meal for breakfast.</p> <p>2) The planned menu was not followed for the week of menu review. The substitutions made were not acceptable to meet program requirements. The substitution of cauliflower for broccoli on Monday caused a dark green vegetable subgroup finding.</p> <p>3) For the week of menu review, the 9-12 lunch menu did not meet the minimum daily requirements for grain. For the week of menu review, the 9-12 lunch menu did not meet the minimum 1/2 cup weekly requirement for the dark green vegetable subgroup. For the week of menu review, the 9-12 lunch menu did not meet the minimum 1/2 cup weekly requirement for the beans/legumes vegetable subgroup.</p> <p>4) Offer versus Serve reimbursable meal signage does not include the requirement for students to select at least 1/2 cup fruit or vegetable.</p>															
X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>C. School Nutrition Environment</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>YES</th> <th>NO</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>X</td> <td>Food Safety</td> </tr> <tr> <td>X</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Local School Wellness Policy</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>X</td> <td>Competitive Foods</td> </tr> <tr> <td>X</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Other: Professional Standards, Buy American, Outreach</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Finding(s) Details:</p> <p>1) It was found that the SFA has not assessed the implementation of the Local School Wellness Policy.</p> <p>2) The SFA did not determine compliance with non-program food revenue requirements. The South Dakota Nonprogram Food Reference Period Tool or USDA Non-Program Food Revenue Tool must be completed annually to determine the need to increase non-program food prices.</p>	YES	NO		<input type="checkbox"/>	X	Food Safety	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local School Wellness Policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	Competitive Foods	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: Professional Standards, Buy American, Outreach
YES	NO																
<input type="checkbox"/>	X	Food Safety															
X	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local School Wellness Policy															
<input type="checkbox"/>	X	Competitive Foods															
X	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: Professional Standards, Buy American, Outreach															
<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<p><b>D. Civil Rights</b></p> <p>Finding(s) Details:</p>															