

APPENDIX B

**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 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 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:** Montgomery County Board of Education

**Date of Administrative Review (Entrance Conference Date):** February 11, 2019

**Date review results were provided to the School Food Authority:** February 15, 2019

**Date review summary was publicly posted:** June 20, 2019

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)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	School Breakfast Program
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	National School Lunch Program
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program
<input type="checkbox"/>	Afterschool Snack
<input type="checkbox"/>	Special Milk Program
<input type="checkbox"/>	Seamless Summer Option

2. Does the School Food Authority operate under any Special Provisions? (Select all that apply)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Community Eligibility Provision
<input type="checkbox"/>	Special Provision 1
<input type="checkbox"/>	Special Provision 2
<input type="checkbox"/>	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 below.

YES	NO	REVIEW FINDINGS		
	X	<b>A. Program Access and Reimbursement</b>		
		YES	NO	
			X	Certification and Benefit Issuance
			X	Verification
			X	Meal Counting and Claiming
		Finding(s) Details:		
X		<b>B. Meal Patterns and Nutritional Quality</b>		
		YES	NO	
		X		Meal Components and Quantities
		X		Offer versus Serve
			X	Dietary Specifications and Nutrient Analysis
		Finding(s) Details:		
1.) Catoma Elementary School's breakfast production records indicated inadequate quantities for fruits and fruit juices were served on two days in December 2018.				
2.) Only one variety of milk was offered during breakfast in the classroom at Martin L. King Elementary School.				
3.) Offer versus serve was not implemented properly by several reviewed schools for breakfast in the classroom.				
4.) Preschool students were not comingled and participated in offer versus serve option.				

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
		Finding(s) Details:		
		1.) Several schools did not comply with Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point principles for food storage.		
		2.) Items were sold in the school stores that did not meet the Smart Snack standards.		
		3.) A fundraiser took place on the day of review that was not on the Exempt Fundraiser form.		
		4.) The local education agency did not comply with federal regulations and State agency's financial management accounting requirements.		
		5.) Procurement procedures were not in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations and policies.		
		6.) The Professional Standards Tracking Tool did not contain all required fields.		
		7.) On-site monitoring forms were incomplete.		
		8.) The school food authority did not provide sufficient oversight of the procurement to ensure contractors performed in accordance with the terms, conditions, and specifications of their contracts.		
X		<b>D. Civil Rights</b>		
		Finding(s) Details:		
		1.) Supporting documentation was not available to show all employees had received Civil Rights training.		
		2.) Child Nutrition Programs' website, Local Wellness Policy and menus posted at school sites did not contain the correct nondiscrimination statement.		