

Sunday Morning CFP FPMCC Report Presentation
April 12, 2012 (PowerPoint Slide Number)

(1) Good Morning, I am Joyce Jensen, Chair of the Food Protection Manager Certification Committee, a standing committee of the Conference for Food Protection.

Four years ago when I volunteered to be the Food Protection Manager Certification Committee Chair, I thought this should not be hard, we had worked through the testing versus training issue and the committee should be in a “maintenance mode.” I remember sharing that thought with Jeff Hawley the new Vice Chair.

All that changed in August 2009. **(2)** We were having our committee meeting in Rosemont, Illinois, when news broke that was a slap to the Food Protection Manager Certification Program. 3000 certifications from two certification organizations were revoked due to corruption which compromised the integrity of the certifications.

Having little time to work through the complete security issue, the majority of the committee made the recommendation to separate the trainer and test administrator roles. That Issue was submitted just three months later. The majority of the committee felt that this was a solid answer because it would put our Standards more in alignment with certification industry best practices.

(3) The hours of Council II debate at the Rhode Island Biennial meeting resulted in a committee charge to work through the exam security issues to find a solution that the committee had solid consensus to support. We realized that the Committee had not researched or analyzed the extent of the certification exam security problems and the root causes of these problems at that time we submitted the 2010 Issue.

By June 2010, Jeff Hawley, **(4)** as the ANSI/Certification Providers Workgroup Chair, began the work to examine the security concerns. We knew that we had a huge job ahead of us and less than two years to complete it.

The workgroup unanimously agreed to have John Marcello facilitate this problem solving process. **(5)** As we knew he would, John provided fair and unbiased facilitation that collected information and organized our work in a logical, methodical way to clarify all of the security issues. We thank John and the FDA for allowing him to work with us. It would have been much more difficult to complete this task without his guidance.

We held monthly conference calls, and did “homework” assignments, such as this example **(6)** from June through November of 2010, preparing for a two and a half day meeting in December 2010. The monthly assignments were submitted only to John, who “sanitized” them, and categorized them into matrixes **(7)** that were then shared with the workgroup. **(8)** These are just a sample of the pages **(9)** of matrixes that were created. **(10)** I soon found out, what many people may know, **(11)** that John loves matrixes. **(12)**

Our hope was that at the December 2010 workgroup meeting we would be able to address at least half of the security problems we had identified. **(13)** The outcome was that this workgroup was able to find solutions to all of the security concerns identified, and establish short and long term goals to address them.

The short-term objectives were for the improvement of the entire testing process, to enhance procedures and accountability of test administrators, proctors, and certification organizations. We wanted to find solutions that would work based on logistics, acceptability, cost, technology, and complexity. We also wanted to establish a formalized management system that would create a systematic, continuous improvement process through use of document control, internal audits, and management review.

(14) The long-term objectives were to eliminate the inherent conflict of interest within the testing process, that would include separating trainers from test administrators/proctors, and to meet all applicable nationally accepted personnel certification standards.

The ANSI/Certification Providers workgroup recommendations were presented to the committee in a Webinar on March 22, 2011, just prior to our April 2011 committee meeting here in Indianapolis. This presentation, with some updates, has been included as an attachment to the Final Committee Report, Council II Issue 012 to explain the process that the workgroup went through and the outcome of that work. The Committee voted to support all the workgroup recommendations with just one opposing vote, voicing a concern that the recommendations did not include separating the trainer and test administrator roles at this time.

(15) The recommendations include:

- increasing the exam item bank from 600 to 1000 questions;
 (The large number of questions is needed because trainers can serve as test administrators/proctors.)
- clearly delineating all test administrator/proctor roles and responsibilities;
- requiring a training program for test administrators/proctors based on learning objectives;
- **(16)** requiring notification to ANSI when a test administrator/proctor has been removed by the certification organization;
- requiring a system to track all examination documents;
- adding provisions to ensure appropriate exam shipping and handling procedures;
- **(17)** requiring a private room accessible only to test administrators/proctors and examinees during test administration;
- requiring a system to provide verification of individual certificates;
- preventing test administrators/proctors/organizations from making statements or claims, such as guarantees of passing the exam; and
- **(18)** Adding a new section to the Standards requiring Management Systems.

The committee now had to incorporate the workgroup recommendations into the Standards. This work was completed with the help of the Standards Workgroup and a draft of the Standards revisions was presented to the August 2011 CFP Executive Board in keeping with the timeframe provided in our charge.

(19) At the three day October 2011 Committee meeting in Las Vegas, we worked on finalizing the revisions to the Standards word by word. It was important that the committee ensure that the Standards were clear and consistent.

(20) The revisions being proposed will align our Standards more closely with national and international certification industry best practices, and will address short term security improvements identified by the ANSI/Certification Providers Workgroup. We will then evaluate the effectiveness of these increased security measures to determine if additional precautions/standards are necessary. Our ultimate goal is to continue to maintain a certification process that is legally defensible.

(21) During this process it became clear that our Standards, which have a significant impact on the food safety in our Nation, needed to be improved to ensure the continued integrity and value of the certification process.

Many of the security measures proposed have been already implemented by some of the certification organizations, even though they were not previously required by the Standards. Some recommendations are new and will take some time to implement. The work plan submitted by the committee and included in the charge, is to ensure that the proposed security revisions be implemented and information be gathered and analyzed so that the committee can determine if these improved security provisions have been effective. Dr. Roy Swift with ANSI participated in the ANSI/Certification Providers workgroup and committee meetings. ANSI supports the Committee's recommended actions.

The committee is not recommending the separation of trainers from test administrators/proctors roles at this time. This said, the proposed security revisions, including the new section requiring management systems, represents a significant improvement in exam security requirements, and lessens the conflict of interest, and increases objectivity and impartiality.

I am very proud that our committee has been able to work through this challenge with respectful debate and that the result is a proposal for improved certification exam security. With these revisions, our certification has greater legal defensibility and reliability, and improves food safety in the United States.

(22) On top of the Committee's proposed security revisions to the Standards, we have submitted five other Issues: committee final report, **(23)** a cleanup issue on the Standards to improve consistency and provide a more friendly numbering system, substantive changes to the committee bylaws addressing alternate committee membership and providing for additional certification organization when there are additional ANSI accredited certification providers, clean up revisions to the committee bylaws, the and the continuing committee charges which includes the committee work plan and timetable for evaluating the revised security Standards.

These six Issues represent a massive amount of work completed in the last two years by our committee. I would like to thank the Committee's Workgroup Chairs, Jeff Hawley, Kate Piche, Vicki Everly, George Roughan, and Geoff Leubkemann. They embraced their responsibility to complete this work. In addition, I would like to thank the Committee members and the organization and agencies they represent which allowed them to do this important committee work.

(24) If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to visit with any of the committee members or me so that we can help explain or clarify.

After this Biennial Meeting, I am handing over the committee chair position to Jeff Hawley. Jeff has shown great leadership as workgroup chair and has helped me tremendously these past four years serving as Vice Chair. I am certain that he and the new Committee will continue to serve the CFP well. I am looking forward to taking on a new role as one of the CFP representatives serving on the ANSI CFP Accreditation Committee.

Thank you