

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 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:

Tuscaloosa City Board of Education

Date of Administrative Review (Entrance Conference Date):

February 20, 2018

Date review results were provided to the School Food Authority:

August 10, 2018

Date review summary was publicly posted:

August 10, 2018

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)

| | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | School Breakfast Program |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | National School Lunch Program |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Afterschool Snack |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Special Milk Program |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Seamless Summer Option |

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

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Community Eligibility Provision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Special Provision 1 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Special Provision 2 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 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) Tuscaloosa City Board of Education staff did not send adverse action letters to any of the households whose benefits decreased. | | | | |
| 2) A teacher violated meal counting and claiming procedures during Breakfast in the classroom. | | | | |
| 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) The school food authority did not offer a variety of milk during Breakfast meal service as required. | | | | |
| 2) Offer versus serve was not properly implemented. | | | | |

| | | | | |
|----------|----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------------------------------|
| 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 school food authority had a Worthless Check Policy; however, the policy did not meet requirements. | | |
| | | 2) The school food authority had a Charge Meal Policy; however, the policy did not meet requirements. | | |
| | | 3) The procurement plan did not meet federal guidelines and requirements. | | |
| | | 4) The milk contract did not contain a Termination for Cause clause. | | |
| | | 5) The uniform contract was accepted and implemented; however, documentation was not available to substantiate the acceptance. | | |
| | | 6) The school food authority did not update the application/agreement as required by program guidelines. | | |
| | | 7) The school food authority did not properly allocate program costs. | | |
| | | 8) The Professional Standards Tracking Tool presented did not include all required elements. | | |
| | | 9) The school food authority had a balance in excess of the net cash limit. | | |
| | | 10) The school food authority was not in compliance with Hazard Analysis of Critical Control Points principles. | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | X | D. Civil Rights | | |
| | | Finding(s) Details: | | |
| | | 1) | | |
| | | 2) | | |