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: Serviam Girls Academy

Date of Administrative Review (Entrance Conference Date): April 9, 2025

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

Date review summary was publicly posted: June 10, 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)

   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?
   x Yes ☐ No

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

<table>
<tr><th>YES</th><th>NO</th><th colspan="3">REVIEW FINDINGS</th></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="6">☐</td><td rowspan="6">x</td><td colspan="3">A. Program Access and Reimbursement</td></tr>
<tr><td>YES</td><td>NO</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>☐</td><td>x</td><td>Certification and Benefit Issuance</td></tr>
<tr><td>☐</td><td>x</td><td>Verification</td></tr>
<tr><td>☐</td><td>x</td><td>Meal Counting and Claiming</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Finding(s) Details: N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="6">x</td><td rowspan="6">☐</td><td colspan="3">B. Meal Patterns and Nutritional Quality</td></tr>
<tr><td>YES</td><td>NO</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>x</td><td>☐</td><td>Meal Components and Quantities</td></tr>
<tr><td>☐</td><td>x</td><td>Offer versus Serve</td></tr>
<tr><td>☐</td><td>x</td><td>Dietary Specifications and Nutrient Analysis</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Finding(s) Details:
The minimum daily grain requirement of 1-ounce equivalent was not met on three days at breakfast during the review week. The insufficient quantities of grains on two days were due to missing product documentation. On one day, only 0.75 oz eq. of grains were served.
The minimum weekly grain requirement was not met at breakfast because of the daily shortages of grains on the three days during the review week.
The minimum daily fruit requirement was not met at breakfast. On five days during the week of review, only ½ cup of fruit was served.
The weekly fruit requirement of five cups for a 5-day week was not met at breakfast because of the daily shortages of fruit on the five days during the review week.
The SFA did not offer students at least two different milk options during breakfast; only fat-free white milk was provided.</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>

During the onsite review of the breakfast meal service, the reviewer observed that only 1/2 cup of fruit was offered to students.
The SA could not determine if the minimum weekly whole grain-rich requirement of 80% was met at breakfast and lunch due to missing product documentation.
The minimum daily grain requirement of 1-ounce equivalents was not met at lunch on one day during the review week. The insufficient quantities of grains were due to missing product documentation.
The minimum weekly grain requirement of 8-ounce equivalents was not met at lunch because of the shortage of grains on the one day during the review week.
The minimum daily vegetable requirement of 3/4 cup was not met at lunch on five days. On one day during the week of review, only 3/8 cup of vegetables were served and on four days, only ½ cup of vegetables were served.
The minimum weekly vegetable requirement of 3 3/4 cups for a 5-day week was not met because of the daily shortages of vegetables on the five days during the review week. A total of 2 3/8 cups of vegetables were served over the course of the week.
The minimum daily vegetable requirement was not met at lunch on 17 days. On March 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 25, 26, 27, and 28, 2025, less than 3/4 cup of vegetables was offered and served.
During the onsite review of the lunch meal service, the reviewer observed that only 1/2 cup of vegetables were offered to students.
During the review week of no dark green or red/orange vegetables were offered.

</td></tr>
<tr><td>x</td><td>☐</td><td>
C. School Nutrition Environment
<table>
<tr><th>YES</th><th>NO</th><th></th></tr>
<tr><td>☐</td><td>x</td><td>Food Safety</td></tr>
<tr><td>☐</td><td>x</td><td>Local School Wellness Policy</td></tr>
<tr><td>x</td><td>☐</td><td>Competitive Foods</td></tr>
<tr><td>x</td><td>☐</td><td>Other: Professional Standards, Buy American, Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) Outreach, Afterschool Snack Program (ASSP)</td></tr>
</table>
Finding(s) Details:

The SFA does not have a complete written food safety plan.
The SFA did not provide the two most recent food safety inspections.

</td></tr>
</table>

		• The Wellness Policy is not posted on the SFA's website and the SFA did not make the Wellness Policy available to the public. • The SFA did not track professional standards hours. • One item was not in compliance with the Buy American Provision (an exception was not on file at the time of the review). • The SFA did not have documentation to support that SFSP Outreach was conducted. • The SFA did not provide production records for 3/17/25, 3/18/25, 3/19/25, and 3/20/25. Per the meal count documents and production records submitted, 573 snacks were served; however, 762 snacks were claimed. This resulted in an over-claim of 190 snacks in March 2025. • The SFA did not provide documentation that the ASSP was monitored. • ASSP production records did not include the correct portion sizes for items. • On seven days during the month of review, insufficient quantities of fruit and vegetables were served during the ASSP. A 1/2-cup portion of fruit or vegetables was served on March 4, 5, 6, 10, 13, 25, and 27, 2025. • The SA could not determine if the minimum daily grains or meat/meat alternates were met during the ASSP due to missing product documentation.
x	☐	**D. Civil Rights**
		Finding(s) Details: • The Serviam Girls Academy's webpage does not have the USDA Nondiscrimination Statement (NDS). • The SFA entered an incorrect version of the USDA NDS in the DENARS compliance module, question #800.