## 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 School Food Authority (SFA) on the state agency's publicly available website no later than 30 days after the state agency provides the final results of the Administrative Review to the SFA. The state agency must also make a copy of the final Administrative Review report available to the public upon request.

School Food Authority Name: St. Francis Xavier School
Date of Administrative Review (Entrance Conference Date): <u>04/10/19</u>
Date review results were provided to the School Food Authority: 05/10/19

The review summary must cover access and reimbursement (including eligibility and certification review results), compliance with the meal patterns and the nutritional quality of school meals, 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 SFA's Superintendent or equivalent as required at 7 CFR 210.18(i)(3).

## **General Program Participation**

1.	Child Nutrition Programs the School Food Authority participates in.
	☐ School Breakfast Program
	■ National School Lunch Program
	☐ Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program
	☐ Afterschool Snack
	☐ Special Milk Program
	☐ Seamless Summer Option

This institution is an equal opportunity provider.

2.	Special Provisions the School Food Authority operates.
	<ul> <li>□ Community Eligibility Provision</li> <li>□ Special Provision 1</li> <li>□ Special Provision 2</li> <li>□ Special Provision 3</li> </ul>
Reviev	v 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 below.
A.	<ul> <li>☑ Program Access and Reimbursement</li> <li>☐ No Findings</li> <li>Key areas:</li> <li>☐ Certification and Benefit Issuance</li> <li>☐ Verification</li> <li>☐ Meal Counting and Claiming</li> </ul>
indin	g details:
Direct Issuar signat not co with th	and reduced applications were not approved within the required time frame. certification notification does not contain all required information. Benefit note System does not identify required information. Application(s) missing ture. Miscategorized application(s). Denial of benefits notification to household ensistent with FNS requirements. SFA did not perform direct certification matches the State agency according to required timeframes. Insufficient information was led to complete verification. Verification not completed by November 15. School's counts by category not used correctly in the SFA's claim for reimbursement.
B.	<ul> <li>■ Meal Patterns and Nutritional Quality</li> <li>□ No Findings</li> <li>Key areas:</li> <li>■ Meal Components</li> <li>□ Offer versus Serve</li> <li>□ Dietary Specifications and Nutrient Analysis</li> </ul>
	g details:
	ed menus served during Review month do not meet portion size/quantity rements.

This institution is an equal opportunity provider.

C. 🗷	School Environment	
	No Findings	
Key	areas:	
	▼ Food Safety	
	■ Local School Wellness Policy	
	☐ Other	
Finding de	tails:	
Local Wellness Policy does not meet minimum requirements. Beverages sold in the school do not meet Smart Snack requirements for the youngest age/grade group enrolled. A copy of the written food safety plan was not available at the reviewed school. Less than two food safety inspections were done in the current school year and no documentation that two inspections have been requested.		
D. <b>ϫ</b>	Civil Rights No Findings	

## Finding details:

Procedures for receiving and processing civil rights discrimination complaints does not meet all requirements. Documentation of civil rights training for staff was not kept on file.

This institution is an equal opportunity provider.