INSTRUCTIONS AND WORKSHEET
FOR CONDUCTING A SELF-ASSESSMENT

STANDARD 4 – TRAINED REGULATORY STAFF

Using the Standard 4 Self-Assessment Worksheet
Criterion three on the *Standard 4: Self-Assessment and Verification Audit Form* requires a statistical measure of the program's effectiveness. Tables 4-1 and 4-2 on the *Standard 4: Self-Assessment Worksheet*, included at the end of these instructions, are designed to assist the jurisdiction in determining by statistical method the effectiveness of its Uniform Inspection Program and in documenting its findings. The jurisdictions are not obligated to use the worksheet. Equivalent forms or processes are acceptable provided that the statistical process and result is available for review.

Step 1 – Conduct three field reviews for each employee performing food service or retail food inspection work during the five-year self-assessment period.
The jurisdiction must conduct three field reviews with each employee performing food service or retail food inspection work during the five-year self-assessment period. Staff members who are within their initial 18 months of training and have not completed all prerequisite courses, 25 joint inspections and 25 independent inspections as required in Standard 2, are exempt from the field reviews and file reviews used in the performance measurement rating calculation in the Standard 4 Self-Assessment Worksheet.

Field reviews must be conducted by someone who has competed Steps 1-3 in Standard 2, and is recognized by the program manager as having the field experience and communication skills necessary to train new employees.

Some of the performance elements can only be assessed after thorough a review of the establishment file. Therefore, each field review must be accompanied by a review of the establishment file. Information from the file review will help the field assessor determine if the FSIO:

- Obtained corrective action for out-of-compliance risk factors and Food Code interventions in accordance with the jurisdiction's policies;
- Discussed options for the long-term control of risk factors with establishment managers, when the same out-of-control risk factor occurs on consecutive inspections, in accordance with the jurisdiction's policies; and
- Verified correction of out-of-compliance observations identified during the previous inspection. In addition, follows through with compliance and enforcement in accordance with the jurisdiction's administrative procedures.

The field reviews must be conducted at establishment types representative of the employee's case load. The jurisdiction should determine a method for selecting appropriate facilities for the field review process, and use that method consistently for all employees.

The field review process (and the accompanying file review) is intended to evaluate the quality
and consistency of the program for each performance element. The following should be taken
into consideration when implementing the field review process:
- This Standard is intended to ensure that inspections are of a satisfactory quality and
uniformity across the entire program.
- When assessing a staff member's performance during the field review process, perfection
is not required to demonstrate successful achievement of a performance element.
- Table 4-2 is intended to document the results of the field review process for the purpose
of determining if a jurisdiction has achieved conformance with Standard 4. Table 4-2
is not intended as a mechanism for providing feedback to staff on their performance
during the field review process. Therefore, jurisdictions are encouraged to incorporate
the performance elements from Standard 4 into a field review tool so that staff can be
provided with meaningful feedback that improves the quality and uniformity of their
inspections.
- Jurisdictions may assess additional jurisdiction-specific performance elements during the
field review process. However, for the purposes of determining conformance with
Standard 4, additional jurisdiction-specific performance elements may not be included
in the calculation used for Table 4-1 or 4-2.

**Step 12 – Confirm that Two three field reviews have been conducted for each employee
performing foodservice or retail food inspection work during the five-year self-assessment
period.**
Table 4-2 of the *Standard 4: Self-Assessment Worksheet* is used to document the field
inspections and to analyze statistically the program's overall effectiveness. The jurisdiction
conducts at least two three field inspections with each inspector who conducts food service or
retail food inspections during each five-year self-assessment period.

Table 4-2 must be completed with at least eight twelve field inspections. Jurisdictions with less
than four inspectors must complete additional field inspections with each inspector in order to
reach a total of eight twelve inspections. For example, a jurisdiction with three inspectors would
need to:
- Complete three four inspections with two of the each inspectors.; and
- Complete two inspections with one inspector.

**Step 32 – Use Table 4-2 to enter the results from the two field reviews for each Food Safety
Inspection Officer (FSIO)**
- In the first column of Table 4-2, identify each FSIO by name or by a code.
- In the Establishment ID column, identify the two establishments included in the field
reviews for each FSIO.
- In the "DATE" column, record the dates of the field visit and file review.
- Items 1 through 2010, summarized below, list are the Standard 4 criteria related to the
FSIOs competencies.
  1. The jurisdiction's quality assurance program assures that each inspector documents
the compliance status of each foodborne illness risk factor and intervention through
observation and investigation. (i.e. proper and consistent marking of the inspection
form using the IN, OUT, NA, and NO conventions appropriately.)

2. ~~The jurisdiction's quality assurance program assures that each inspector completes an inspection report that is clear, legible, concise, and accurately records findings, observations and discussion with establishment management.~~
3. ~~The jurisdiction's quality assurance program assures that each inspector interprets and applies laws, regulations, policies and procedures correctly.~~
4. ~~The jurisdiction's quality assurance program assures that each inspector cites the proper local code provisions for the CDC-identified risk factors and *Food Code* interventions.~~
5. ~~The jurisdiction's quality assurance program assures that each inspector reviews past inspection findings and acts on repeated or unresolved violations.~~
6. ~~The jurisdiction's quality assurance program assures that each inspector follows through with compliance and enforcement in accordance with the agency's policies and procedures.~~
7. ~~The jurisdiction's quality assurance program assures that each inspector obtains and documents on-site corrective action for out-of-control risk factors at the time of the inspection as appropriate to the violation.~~
8. ~~The jurisdiction's quality assurance program assures that each inspector documents that options for the long-term control of risk factors were discussed with managers when the same out-of-control risk factor occurred on consecutive inspections.~~
9. ~~The jurisdiction's quality assurance program assures that each inspector verifies that the establishment is in the proper risk category and that the required inspection frequency is being met.~~
10. ~~The jurisdiction's quality assurance program assures that each inspector files reports and other documents in a timely manner.~~

NOTE: ~~Some items (such as 5, 6, 8, and 9) cannot be verified without a review of the file for the establishment visited.~~

The self-assessor must place a check mark in the corresponding column of Table 4-2 when the activity or competency is verified.

Step ~~3~~4 – Conduct calculations to Determine Program Effectiveness

JURISDICTIONS WITH TEN OR MORE INSPECTORS
For jurisdictions with ten or more inspectors conducting foodservice or retail food inspections, the self-assessor must:
1. Add the number of check marks in the column titled "Item 1";
2. Divide the total number of checks marks from Step 1 by the total number of field inspections documented in Table 4-2;
3. Multiply the number in Step 2 by 100; and
4. Repeat this process for Item 1 through Item ~~10~~ 20.

This results in a percent achievement for each of the ~~ten~~ twenty quality elements. Each of the twenty ~~ten~~ columns must show at least a 75% achievement rate in order for the program to meet the effectiveness measure. Perform and review the calculations for each of the ~~ten~~ twenty columns.

JURISDICTIONS WITH LESS THAN TEN INSPECTORS

For jurisdictions with less than ten inspectors conducting foodservice or retail food inspections, an adjustment must be made in the statistical method to compensate for the small sample size. The self-assessor must:

1. Add the total number of check marks for Item 1 through Item ~~10~~ 20;
2. Refer to Chart 4-1. Column three of Chart 4-1 shows the minimum number of items that must be marked "IN Compliance" to meet the effectiveness measure for Standard 4.
3. Complete Table 4-1 to determine if the jurisdiction achieves conformance with the effectiveness measure in Standard 4.

Step 5~~4~~ – Document Results of the Uniform Program Assessment

Use the worksheet results to mark "YES" or "NO" for criteria list under "*3 – Demonstration of Program Effectiveness Using the Statistical Method in Standard 4 Self-Assessment Worksheet*" on the *Standard 4: Self-Assessment and Verification Audit Form.*

Standard 4: Uniform Inspection Program
Self-Assessment Worksheet

Chart 4-1
Method of Calculation for Jurisdictions with Less Than Ten Inspectors

# of inspectors	# inspections needed	# of items needed to be marked IN compliance in order to meet Standard 4 criteria
<4	~~8~~ 12 minimum	**~~65~~200** (out of 240~~80~~ possible Items)
4-9	~~2~~ 3 per inspector	4 inspectors = **200~~65~~** (out of 80~~240~~ possible Items) 5 inspectors = **252~~82~~** (out of 300~~100~~ possible Items) 6 inspectors = **303~~99~~** (out of 360~~120~~ possible Items) 7 inspectors = **355~~116~~** (out of 420~~140~~ possible Items) 8 inspectors = **407~~133~~** (out of 480~~160~~ possible Items) 9 inspectors = **459~~150~~** (out of 540~~180~~ possible Items)

NOTE:

1. These minimum inspection program assessment criteria are comparable to the 75% IN Compliance rate for each of the ten inspection program areas for jurisdictions with 10 or more inspectors.

Example: For 6 inspectors, there will be ~~3~~2 field visits per inspector = ~~12~~18 visits
~~12~~18 visits X ~~10~~20 Items per visit = ~~120~~360 Total Possible Items

Table 4-1
Calculation of Uniformity for Jurisdictions with Less Than Ten Inspectors

Period from ___   _____ to _____   _____

1. Number of inspectors in the jurisdiction	
2. Number of inspections used in the calculation (minimum of ~~8~~12)	
3. Total number of items marked as correct during joint field visits and corresponding file reviews and recorded on Table 4-2.	
4. Total number of possible items based on the number of inspections (~~10~~20 items times the # of inspections – see Chart 4-1, column 3)	

| Determine conformance (YES or NO) using Chart 4-1, column 3 | |

Standard 4: Uniform Inspection Program
Self-Assessment Worksheet
Table 4-2: Calculation of Uniformity for Jurisdictions with Ten or More Inspectors

No.	Inspector ID	Establishment ID	Date	Item (1)	Item (2)	Item (3)	Item (4)	Item (5)	Item (6)	Item (7)	Item (8)	Item (9)	Item (10)	Item (11)	Item (12)	Item (13)	Item (14)	Item (15)	Item (16)	Item (17)	Item (18)	Item (19)	Item (20)
1				☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2				☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3				☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4				☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5				☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6				☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7				☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8				☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9				☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10				☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11				☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12				☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13				☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14				☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15				☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16				☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17				☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18				☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19				☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20				☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

NOTE:

1.   A check mark indicates the inspector complies with the item.

Standard 4: Uniform Inspection Program
Self-Assessment Worksheet

Table 4-3: Calculation of Uniformity for Jurisdictions with Ten or More Inspectors

	Item (1)	Item (2)	Item (3)	Item (4)	Item (5)	Item (6)	Item (7)	Item (8)	Item (9)	Item (10)	Item (11)	Item (12)	Item (13)	Item (14)	Item (15)	Item (16)	Item (17)	Item (18)	Item (19)	Item (20)
1. Number of Check Marks From Table 4-2																				
2. Number of Inspections Reviewed in Table 4-2																				
3. % IN Compliance (Row 1 ÷ Row 2)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%