

**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: Early College School at Delaware State University

Date of Administrative Review (Entrance Conference Date): March 6, 2025

Date review results were provided to the School Food Authority: April 30, 2025

Date review summary was publicly posted: May 1, 2025

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	A. Program Access and Reimbursement	
		YES	NO
		x	<input type="checkbox"/> Certification and Benefit Issuance
		x	<input type="checkbox"/> Verification
		x	<input type="checkbox"/> Meal Counting and Claiming
		Finding(s) Details: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One meal benefit form was dated February 19, 2025, but it was not approved until April 2, 2025. Two students were incorrectly denied benefits. The SFA did not follow their backup system to their primary meal counting and claiming system at Conrad on two days, when the primary system did not operate; therefore, the SFA did not have a record of the meal counts on both days. The SFA did not update the benefit issuance list for the three households that did not provide "sources of information" and should have been determined paid. The SFA's verification notification letters did not give three households adequate dates to submit verification documentation. Since the SFA did not provide documentation to support that verification follow-up was conducted for two applications, the SA could not determine if the SFA met the follow-up requirements if the household failed to respond to the request for verification. In addition, one follow-up letter did not have the correct student's names listed. Since the households did not provide "sources of information", the three applications should have been determined paid for verification purposes. The verification report submitted by the SFA showed that two applications (which included a total of three students) were verified; however, based on a 3% sample size, four forms were required to be selected. 	
x	<input type="checkbox"/>	B. Meal Patterns and Nutritional Quality	
		YES	NO
		x	<input type="checkbox"/> Meal Components and Quantities
		<input type="checkbox"/>	x Offer versus Serve
		<input type="checkbox"/>	x Dietary Specifications and Nutrient Analysis
		Finding(s) Details: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On several days during February at Commons and Conrad, the breakfast production totals exceeded the number of meals claimed and entrees sold as a la carte. The SFA over-claimed 27 breakfasts in February 2025. Per the meal count documents and production records, 1189 breakfasts were served; however, 1216 breakfasts were claimed. This resulted in an over-claim of 27 breakfasts. The minimum weekly whole grain-rich requirement was not met. Over the course of the week of review at lunch, 70.09% of grains were whole grain-rich and the weekly requirement is 80%. During the review week of February 3-7, 2025, the production records did not meet the requirements for the red/orange subgroup. Only 1 cup of red/orange vegetables was offered (the requirement over the course of the week is 1 1/4 cups for grades 9-12). On several days during February at Commons and Conrad, the lunch production totals exceeded the number of meals claimed and entrees sold as a la carte. 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On four days, the production record did not support that each student had the required fruit or vegetable component at lunch. In addition, on February 25, 2025, per the meal count documents and production records, 144 lunches were served; however, 145 lunches were claimed. Based on all production records and documentation provided by the SFA, the reviewer determined that a total of 145 lunches could not be counted as reimbursable due to a lack of required fruit and vegetable components, and one meal was overclaimed. A total of 146 lunches will be disallowed. 															
x	<input type="checkbox"/>	C. School Nutrition Environment <table border="1"> <tr> <th>YES</th> <th>NO</th> <th></th> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>x</td> <td>Food Safety</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>x</td> <td>Local School Wellness Policy</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>x</td> <td>Competitive Foods</td> </tr> <tr> <td>x</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Other: Revenue from Nonprogram Foods, Buy American, On-Site Monitoring, Professional Standards, School Breakfast and SFSP Outreach</td> </tr> </table> <p>Finding(s) Details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SFA does not have documentation that revenue from nonprogram foods was assessed during SY 23-24, and it has not yet been completed for SY 24-25. Since the school sells a la carte, the school must assess compliance with nonprogram foods. The SFA did not conduct the required on-site reviews. While onsite, the reviewer identified one product that was not compliant with the Buy American Provision: Green Beans from Belgium. The SFA did not track professional standards hours. A form of tracking must be used to document the training taken. The SFA Director, Robert McPhatter, has not completed the eight hours of food safety training. The SFA did not have documentation to support that SFSP Outreach was conducted. 	YES	NO		<input type="checkbox"/>	x	Food Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	Local School Wellness Policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	Competitive Foods	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: Revenue from Nonprogram Foods, Buy American, On-Site Monitoring, Professional Standards, School Breakfast and SFSP Outreach
YES	NO																
<input type="checkbox"/>	x	Food Safety															
<input type="checkbox"/>	x	Local School Wellness Policy															
<input type="checkbox"/>	x	Competitive Foods															
x	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: Revenue from Nonprogram Foods, Buy American, On-Site Monitoring, Professional Standards, School Breakfast and SFSP Outreach															
x	<input type="checkbox"/>	D. Civil Rights <p>Finding(s) Details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Early College High School at Delaware State University Dining webpage has the incorrect version of the nondiscrimination statement. The SFA entered an incorrect version of the USDA NDS in the DENARS compliance module, question #800. 															