STATE AGENCY ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW SUMMARY

School Food Authority Name: St. Rita Church

Date of Administrative Review (Entrance Conference Date): May 14, 2019

Date review results were provided to the School Food Authority: May 14, 2019

SFA/Sponsor CNIPS Number: 12335

Review Month: April

Onsite Review Date: May 14, 2019

Schools Reviewed: St Rita School

Reviewers: Kim Wise

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
- ☒ N/A

3. Were any findings identified during the review of this School Food Authority?

- [ ] Program Access and Reimbursement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
  | ☐   | ☐  | Certification and Benefit Issuance
Finding(s) and Commendation(s)

The SFA did not process household applications in compliance with 7 CFR 245.6(a). The SFA gave a $100 variance above and below the USDA income eligibility guidelines. The SFA converted income to weekly when different income frequencies were reported. The SFA gave DC benefits to children not on the Statewide DC List.

The SFA did not implement the verification process in accordance with 7 CFR 245.6(a). The SFA chose two applications with incorrect determinations for verification. The original determination should have been paid. The SFA collected income that was not representative of the application income. The SFA did not give a toll free or collect call option. The SFA used the wrong Discrimination Statement. No confirming or verifying signature on the applications.

B. Meal Pattern and Nutritional Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ○   | ○  | Meal Components and Quantities
| ○   | ○  | Offer versus Serve
| ○   | ○  | Dietary Specification and Nutrient Analysis

Finding(s) and Commendation(s)

Commendations:
The FSD and manager are very passionate about feeding the students and are open to new ideas to improve the program.

The kitchen staff are very knowledgeable about the meal pattern. Excellent meal service!

C. School Nutrition Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ○   | ○  | Food Safety
| ○   | ○  | Local School Wellness Policy
| ○   | ○  | Competitive Foods
| ○   | ○  | Other
Finding(s) and Commendation(s)

D. Civil Rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SFA did not comply with civil rights requirements as applicable to the Child Nutrition Programs, i.e., NSLP (including the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program, Seamless Summer Option, and afterschool snacks), SBP, and SMP, in accordance with FNS 113-1. The SFA did not have the correct nondiscrimination statement on all documents that reference FNS programs. The breakfast information flyer does not include the nondiscrimination statement and the request for verification letter has an incorrect nondiscrimination statement.