Subject: Fiscal Year 2006 Summer Food Service Program Federal Reviews of Private Non-profit Sponsors/Sites and Management Evaluations

To: STATE AGENCY DIRECTORS (Special Nutrition Programs)

Colorado ED, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri DH, Montana OPI, Nebraska ED, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah and Wyoming

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide guidance that outlines changes in how our Field Offices (FOs) will address Federal Review requirements for the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) for Fiscal Year 2006.

We commend all who have been involved with the SFSP for their efforts in achieving successful outreach goals. While we encourage continued work in this area, we anticipate increased Program integrity activities to be a part of this year’s expectations. Success in both areas will be achieved when Food and Nutrition Service staff and State Agencies (SAs) develop and maintain good working relationships.


With this memorandum, we are:

- Retaining SFSP-400 and SFSP-449, and
- Incorporating relevant portion of SFSP-277 and thus rescinding this memorandum.

GUIDANCE FOR FEDERAL REVIEWS OF PRIVATE NON PROFIT SPONSORS

As you are aware, the Federal Review process for the SFSP has been in place since 1990. 7 CFR 225.8(d)(1) requires that SAs submit a list of potential Private Non Profit (PNP) sponsors to the Regional Office. Submitting this information to the FOs instead (as was outlined in SFSP-277) is to continue. Information should be received in our FOs by close of business May 1 of each year.
Sponsor Reviews

Field Offices who have been conducting reviews of most or all PNPs will now focus on only new or troubled sponsors. This means they will not do all PNP reviews. Because SAs are required to conduct these reviews, they should contact the FO to determine if any reviews conducted can be counted as SA reviews. Attached is the guidance we have given our FOs.

Notification and Documentation of Deficiencies Identified.

State Agencies will continue to be notified when corrective action is required. Any identified corrective action will be relayed in writing either by electronic mail or letter and will:

- List the deficiency,
- Identify how to correct it, and
- Provide a due date for corrective action.

There may be times when the SA will be notified of a sponsor’s deficiencies by phone, such as when the meal does not meet the meal pattern requirements, non-reimbursable meals are being served, or when meal counting and claiming are inaccurate. All phone conversations will be followed-up with written documentation consisting of either electronic mail or letter.

It is important for the SA to follow proper procedures when closing reviews. These procedures are as follows:

- SAs obtain corrective action from the sponsor and forward it to the FOs, and
- SAs close the review once they have been advised that the corrective action response is acceptable.

We appreciate the work your office does to ensure the integrity of the SFSP and look forward to supporting your efforts for the 2006 Program. If you have questions about any of the above, please do not hesitate to contact our SFSP Team at (303) 844-0354.

DARLENE SANCHEZ
Regional Director
Special Nutrition Programs

Attachment
Subject: Fiscal Year 2006 Summer Food Service Program Federal Reviews of Private Non Profit Sponsors/Sites and Management Evaluations

To: Officers-In-Charge
All FNS Field Offices

THRU: Brian Allison
Assistant Regional Administrator

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide guidance for Field Office (FO) staff that outlines and clarifies:

- National Office Federal Review requirements and Regional Office (RO) expectations for the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2006 regarding on-site visits of sponsors and sites, and

- Management Evaluation (ME) report writing.

We commend all who have been involved with the SFSP for their efforts in achieving successful outreach goals. While we encourage continued work in this area, we anticipate increased Program integrity activities to be a part of this year’s expectations.

With this memorandum, we are:

- Retaining SFSP-400 dated April 6, 2000 and SFSP-449 dated March 6, 2002,
- Incorporating relevant portions of SFSP-277 dated October 25, 1995 and thus rescinding this memorandum, and
- Rescinding the FO memo that accompanied SFSP-277 dated October 30, 1995.

GUIDANCE FOR FEDERAL REVIEWS OF PRIVATE NON PROFIT SPONSORS

As you are aware, the Federal review process for the SFSP has been in place since 1990. 7 CFR 225.8(d)(1) requires that SAs submit a list of potential Private Non Profit (PNP) sponsors to the RO. Submitting this information to the FOs instead is to continue and must be received by close of business May 1 of each year.
Sponsor Reviews

We request that you continue the practice of identifying the number of new and/or troubled PNP sponsors that the FOs will be reviewing and notify our office of this number by electronic mail by close of business June 15.

Flexibility in scheduling can be allowed as long as each new sponsor receives a review at least once during the first year of operation and both a sponsor and some site reviews are conducted.

While it is preferable to adjust the review schedule to ensure that the meal consolidation procedures are evaluated after the sponsor has submitted its claim for reimbursement, we recognize this may not always be possible.

For repeat sponsors and sites that had minor, if any deficiencies, FOs should discuss with the SA the need to do reviews and doing the sponsor/site reviews at the same time. However, these reviews, if any, should not take priority over new and/or troubled sponsor/site reviews.

Site Reviews

The standard operating procedure is to have separate reviews within the first two weeks of operation for all new sponsors and sites, problem prior-year sponsors and sites, and those with a break in service, with the sponsor review being conducted after a claim has been submitted. If your office is able to complete reviews within the first two weeks, we encourage this; however, if your state is experiencing significant growth, and adhering to this procedure is particularly challenging, we ask that these reviews be completed within the first four weeks of operation, recognizing that since an overclaim is taken for any meal served in error, later reviews will carry the risk of larger overclaims.

We request that FOs continue to focus on all new and/or troubled sites. We wish to provide the following guidance for these two types of sites:

- There could be instances where there might be a troubled site but not a troubled sponsor, in which case, the FO would only visit the troubled site.

- There could be instances where there might be multiple troubled sites under the same sponsor, in which case, the FO should visit all troubled sites.

- When there are a number of new sites under the same sponsor, FOs should visit 50 percent of these new sites (always round up to the next whole number when calculating how many to visit). If problems are identified, FOs should notify the SA as soon as possible of the concern, and the FO should visit all the new sites.
Notification and Documentation of Deficiencies Identified.

Field Offices are commended for their efforts in notifying SAs when corrective action is required. Any identified corrective action should be relayed to the SA in writing either by electronic mail or letter and should:

- List the deficiency,
- Identify how to correct it, and
- Provide a due date for corrective action.

There may be times when it is necessary to notify the SA of a sponsor’s deficiencies as soon as possible by phone, such as when a large number of meals do not meet the meal pattern requirements, non-reimbursable meals are being served, or when meal counting and claiming is inaccurate. All phone conversations should be followed-up with written documentation consisting of either electronic mail or letter.

It is important to remind the SA of the procedures to be followed for closing reviews. They are as follows:

- SAs obtain corrective action from the sponsor and forward it to the FO, and
- FOs review corrective action responses and advise SAs that the review should be closed.

All documentation for reviews conducted should be transmitted in one batch to our office by December 1. If there is corrective action outstanding, contact the SA to determine a possible completion date. Or, if necessary, contact this office for further assistance.

MANAGEMENT EVALUATION GUIDANCE

For 2006, SFSP MEs will follow a 2-year cycle for SA operations. Information about where MEs will be conducted and regional staff to be involved will be transmitted at a later date. Field office staff may be called upon to lead the ME and function as Review Coordinator in some cases, and may be assisted by RO staff. Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) should be followed to ensure all team members are aware of their responsibilities. Please see the SOPs for pre-review and on-site activities and sample reports. We request that ME final draft reports be sent into the RO within 21 calendar days after the exit conference is conducted. The Review Coordinator should network with other team members to accomplish this final draft during these 21 calendar days and may set shorter deadlines for team members in order to allow for editing the report. Should your office be unable to meet the time frames listed, please notify your Assistant Regional Administrator’s office to request an extension from the SFSP Section Chief.
For those FOs not scheduled to conduct an ME in 2006, it is important that you continue networking with your respective SA. We suggest you discuss with the SA Director if there is any other SFSP involvement that he/she may want you to have, such as identifying troubled sites or sponsors, assisting or accompanying their staff on reviews, and attending or even helping out in their 2006 training, and so forth.

**New Options That May Be Employed**

Advances in technology may allow a FO to review certain items on the SA’s website such as application/agreement information, site/sponsor changes, claims for reimbursement, handbooks, memos and newsletters. While this will not eliminate the need for an on-site visit to the SA’s offices, it may reduce the amount of time spent there. Using such procedures is acceptable as long as the integrity of the evaluation is maintained.

We appreciate the work your office does to ensure the integrity of the SFSP and look forward to supporting your efforts for the 2006 Program. If you have questions about any of the above, please do not hesitate to contact our SFSP Team at (303) 844-0354.

DARLENE SANCHEZ
Regional Director
Special Nutrition Programs