

**DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
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 (SA) 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 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:** Providence Creek Academy

**Date of Administrative Review (Entrance Conference Date):** January 4, 2024

**Date review results were provided to the School Food Authority:** May 1, 2024

**Date review summary was publicly posted:** \_\_\_\_\_ May 8, 2024 \_\_\_\_\_

---

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

If yes, please indicate the areas and what issues were identified in the table on the following page.

YES	NO	REVIEW FINDINGS		
x	☐	<b>A. Program Access and Reimbursement</b>		
		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	
		x	☐	Certification and Benefit Issuance
		x	☐	Verification
		☐	x	Meal Counting and Claiming
Finding(s) Details: Four students' meal benefit determinations were incorrectly determined. The LEA did not make a determination and notify two households of their eligibility status within 10 days of receiving the applications. The SFA gave more than 10 days' written notice prior to reducing benefits for two students. The Notice of Adverse Action did not advise the household that an appeal must be filed within the 10 calendar days advance notice period to ensure continued benefits while awaiting a hearing and decision. The SFA could not locate documentation to support that verification follow-up was conducted; therefore, the SA could not determine if the SFA met the follow-up requirements if the household failed to respond to the request for verification. The SFA could not locate the verification notification letters; therefore, the SA could not determine if the letters included all the required information.				
x	☐	<b>B. Meal Patterns and Nutritional Quality</b>		
		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	
		x	☐	Meal Components and Quantities
		☐	x	Offer versus Serve
		☐	x	Dietary Specifications and Nutrient Analysis
Finding(s) Details: During the review period, there were four days when the production records did not support that each student had the required milk component at breakfast. There were insufficient quantities of fruit served at breakfast on two days. In addition, the SFA exceeded the maximum juice limit because on one day, 107 juices were served, and 102 meals were claimed. During the review period, there were five days when the production records did not support that each student had the required milk component at lunch. On one day, the production record did not support that each student had the required fruit component at lunch. Over the course of the review week, 33.12% of grains were whole-grain rich and the weekly requirement is 80%. The week of December 18th, the planned red/orange subgroup was insufficient. ½ cup serving was planned over the week and the requirement is ¾ cup weekly.				
x	☐	<b>C. School Nutrition Environment</b>		
		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	
		x	☐	Food Safety
		☐	x	Local School Wellness Policy
		☐	x	Competitive Foods
x	☐	Other- Buy American Provision, Reporting and Record Keeping, and Professional Standards		
Finding(s) Details: Exceptions for non-domestic products were not on file at the time of review for five products. The SFA did not have the original letters to notify the households of the verification, the original meal benefit forms, and any follow-up documentation regarding verification for two students. The SFA could not locate current training documentation for their employees. Upon review of the SFA's production records and temperature logs, the reviewer noted that the cooking temperature (135 degrees F) of the pizza served on 12/20/23, was out of compliance.				
x	☐	<b>D. Civil Rights</b>		
		Finding(s) Details: A review of documents identified that the Notice to Households for Approval/Denial, Direct Certification Notification Letter, and Adverse Action Letter used the old USDA Nondiscrimination Statement.		

