

APPENDIX B

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 (SA) 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: Choctaw County Board of Education

Date of Administrative Review (Entrance Conference Date): November 27, 2017

Date review results were provided to the School Food Authority: November 30, 2017

Date review summary was publicly posted: July 29, 2019

The review summary must cover access and reimbursement (including eligibility and certification review results), the School Food Authority's (SFA) 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 SFA's 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)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| X | School Breakfast Program |
| X | National School Lunch Program |
| | Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program |
| X | Afterschool Snack |
| | Special Milk Program |
| | Seamless Summer Option |

2. Does the School Food Authority operate under any Special Provisions? (Select all that apply)

| | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| X | 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 | | |
|--|----|---|----|--|
| X | | A. Program Access and Reimbursement | | |
| | | YES | NO | |
| | | | X | Certification and Benefit Issuance |
| | | | X | Verification |
| | | X | | Meal Counting and Claiming |
| | | Finding(s) Details: | | |
| | | 1) The meal counts for the Afterschool Snack Program were not correctly consolidated prior to submitting the monthly claim. | | |
| 2) Meal counts were not taken at the point of service during Afterschool Snack Program meal service. | | | | |
| 3) The STI roster and cafeteria roster were not the same. | | | | |
| X | | B. Meal Patterns and Nutritional Quality | | |
| | | YES | NO | |
| | | X | | Meal Components and Quantities |
| | | | X | Offer versus Serve |
| | | | X | Dietary Specifications and Nutrient Analysis |
| | | Finding(s) Details: | | |
| 1) Production records were not completed accurately and did not identify the components for the Afterschool Snack Program. | | | | |
| 2) | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|-----------|------------------------------|--|
| X | | C. School Nutrition Environment | | | |
| | | YES | NO | | |
| | | X | | Food Safety | |
| | | X | | Local School Wellness Policy | |
| | | X | | Competitive Foods | |
| | | | X | Other | |
| | | Finding(s) Details: | | | |
| | | 1) The Hazard Analysis of Critical Control Points Plan did not reflect the correct Food Code. | | | |
| | | 2) A temperature log was not maintained for food on the serving line. | | | |
| | | 3) The Wellness Policy's required changes, updates, or reviews were not implemented to comply with the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010. | | | |
| | | 4) Vending machines were accessible to students during meal service. | | | |
| | | 5) Vending machines contained items that were not in compliance with Smart Snack guidelines. | | | |
| 6) Milk and bread specifications were included in the same invitation to bid package. | | | | | |
| 7) Procurement documentation revealed that one contract was not bid according to regulations. | | | | | |
| 8) Procurement documentation did not include the required escalation and de-escalation clause for milk. | | | | | |
| 9) Monitoring was not conducted as required by regulations. | | | | | |
| 10) The number of meals per labor hour was below standard of 16-19. | | | | | |
| X | | D. Civil Rights | | | |
| | | Finding(s) Details: | | | |
| | | 1) A written policy was not available for Civil Rights. | | | |