

## 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:** Charter School of New Castle

**Date of Administrative Review (Entrance Conference Date):** January 6, 2026

**Date review results were provided to the School Food Authority:** March 5, 2026

**Date review summary was publicly posted:** March 13, 2026

---

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"/>	<b>A. Program Access and Reimbursement</b>			
		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	x	Certification and Benefit Issuance	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	x	Verification	
		x	<input type="checkbox"/>	Meal Counting and Claiming	
Finding(s) Details:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breakfast meal counts for the review period were not reasonable compared to the meal counts observed on the day of review.</li> <li>• Per the meal count documents and the production records, 8,886 breakfasts were served; however, 8,875 breakfasts were claimed. This resulted in an under-claim of 11 breakfasts in December 2025.</li> <li>• Lunch meal counts for the review period were not reasonable compared to the meal counts observed on the day of review.</li> <li>• Per the meal count documents and the production records, 8,799 lunches were served; however, 8,827 lunches were claimed. This resulted in an over-claim of 28 lunches in December 2025.</li> </ul>					
x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>B. Meal Patterns and Nutritional Quality</b>			
		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>		
		x	<input type="checkbox"/>	Meal Components and Quantities	
		x	<input type="checkbox"/>	Offer versus Serve	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	x	Dietary Specifications and Nutrient Analysis	
Finding(s) Details:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During the breakfast meal service at the elementary school, there was no signage indicating what constitutes the reimbursable meal at the elementary school.</li> <li>• By July 1, 2025, breakfast cereals must contain no more than six grams of added sugars per dry ounce. The Honey Nut Cheerios and Apple Cinnamon Cheerios contained nine grams of added sugar per dry ounce.</li> <li>• The minimum weekly grain requirement was not met at breakfast. A total of 7 oz. eq. of grains were served over the course of the week.</li> <li>• The SFA did not accurately document the number of portions served and leftover for the fruit and milk on the production records for the month of review. Additionally, the production records did not include all the required information.</li> <li>• The SFA did not accurately document the number of portions served and leftover for the fruit, vegetables, and milk on the production records for the month of review. Additionally, the production records did not include all the required information.</li> </ul>					
x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>C. School Nutrition Environment</b>			
		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>		
		x	<input type="checkbox"/>	Food Safety	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	x	Local School Wellness Policy	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	x	Competitive Foods	
		x	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: Resource Management, Offer versus Serve, SFA On-Site Monitoring, Professional Standards, Afterschool Snack Program	
Finding(s) Details:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While on site, the SA reviewer requested to see a copy of the Hazard Analysis Critical Control Points Plan (HACCP) plan available to the nutrition staff and the HACCP plan could not be located.</li> <li>• The SFA did not have a process for recording the number of free non-reimbursable meals served and for calculating revenue from non-program foods.</li> <li>• Foodservice staff were not properly trained on Offer versus Serve.</li> </ul>					

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On both the SBP and NSLP on-site review forms, the SFA answered "no" on two questions under the meal counting and claiming procedure sections. The SFA did not provide documentation to support that a follow-up visit was conducted and that a corrective action plan was implemented.</li> <li>• The reviewer could not assess the training hours taken by Charter School of New Castle staff; training documentation was not provided.</li> <li>• The SFA did not track professional standards hours.</li> <li>• The SFA Director has not completed the eight hours of food safety training.</li> <li>• The SA requested a copy of the ASSP monitoring forms and the SFA did not provide the forms.</li> <li>• Per the meal count documents and production records, 2,089 snacks were served; however, 2,091 snacks were claimed. This resulted in an over-claim of two snacks in December 2025.</li> <li>• During the review month, a one-half-ounce portion of popcorn, which credits as 0.25-ounce equivalents of grains, was served as one of two snack components. The daily requirement for grains at snack is 1-ounce equivalent. Therefore, the snacks on the days on which popcorn was served as one component had insufficient grains.</li> <li>• During the review month, potato chips were served as one of the two snack components. Potato chips are not creditable; therefore, the snacks served with potato chips as a component are disallowed.</li> </ul>
x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>D. Civil Rights</b></p> <p>Finding(s) Details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Per the SFA, the Food Service Management Company (FSMC) staff members did not receive the annual Civil Rights Training. Also, one CSNC staff member did not receive the annual Civil Rights Training.</li> <li>• The SFA entered an incorrect version of the USDA NDS in the DENARS compliance module, question #800.</li> </ul>