WEDNESDAY 10/15

Voting Members Present (absent)

1. Jeff Hawley, Chair
2. Christine Hollenbeck, VC
3. Cynthia Bagwell (phone)
4. Dana Brainerd
5. Tony Cartenuto (phone)
6. Bryan Chapman
7. Gary Coleman
8. Greg Colichio
9. Craig Douglas
10. Sean Dunleavy
11. Marlene Gaither
12. Patrick Guzzle
13. Courtney Halbrook
14. Geoff Heinicke (phone)
15. Keith Jackson
16. Linda Kender
17. Jeff Lang (phone)
18. Larry Lynch
19. Ryan McMillion
20. Cas Tryba
21. Jay Neal
22. Jay Neal
23. Tara Paster
24. Kate Piche
25. Therese Pilonetti (phone)
26. Susan Quam
27. George Roughan
28. Davene Sarocco-Smith
29. Ken Scott
30. Cas Tryba
31. Sharon Wood

Alternates Present
1. Liz Corchado
2. David Crownover
3. Michelle Rzendzian
4. Tom Trevino

Others Present
1. Vijay Krishna, ANSI
2. Laurie Williams, FDA
3. Sandra Kovach, TAP Series
4. James Kim, Premier Food Safety

Scribe – Geoff Luebkemann

New Member Orientation
Chair Hawley presented FPMCC new member orientation (slides available on CFP/FPMCC webpage).

Welcome & Introduction of Committee Members
Chair Hawley called the meeting to order at 9:10 AM, welcomed the members, and read the CFP anti-trust statement. Roll was called, and a quorum of 21 voting members was established (16 voting members needed of 31; no alternates were activated). The members introduced themselves.

ANSI and Certification 101
Chair Hawley recognized Vijay Krishna for an overview of the ANSI – CFP relationship and processes, and possible future trends impacting accreditation, such as emerging technology. Members had the opportunity to ask questions and clarify their understanding of the process.

ACTION ITEM
Who – Vijay Krishna, Geoff Luebkemann
What – Post ANSI overview slide deck to FPMCC webpage
When – asap
Review of Committee Bylaws
Chair Hawley reviewed FPMCC administrative information, including purpose, constituencies, reporting, CFP Executive Board role, FPMCC workgroups, and FPMCC and CFP bylaws and governance.

Review of Food Protection Manager Certification Standards
Chair Hawley discussed the FPMCC recent history and activity regarding revision of the Standards, the Security Evaluation Workgroup activity, the Dr. Ford evaluation of exam provider security related data, and the objectives of determining if security measures are working and possible process improvement.

ACTION ITEM
Who – Geoff Luebkemann, Jeff Hawley
What – Post 2012-14 FPMCC Workgroup final reports to FPMCC webpage
When – asap

CFP 2014 Biennial Meeting FPMCC Charges
Chair Hawley discussed the 2014-16 charges, and reminded the members that the practical work cycle for action on these is only about a year, considering committee reporting requirements leading into the 2016 Biennial Meeting.

2014 II-012 / Standards charge
Chair Hawley appointed Kate Piche to chair a Standards Workgroup to continue work on this charge. Dr. Ford will present an updated analysis (meeting TBA), then a live presentation at the Spring FPMCC meeting. Discussion ensued regarding benchmarking and quantification of security incidents and risk analysis, identifying normative levels, that no published studies are available to inform judgment of the quantity of security incidents, and that the analytics must be statistically significant and any potential benchmarks be achievable.

[The Committee broke for lunch from 12:00 to 1:30 PM.]

2014 II-015 / ISO Comparison charge
Chair Hawley recognized Jay Neal to present an overview from the FPMCC 2012-14 Comparison Workgroup, which produced a side-by-side comparison of the CFP Standards and ISO 17024. Chair Hawley stated that FPMCC consensus during the 2012-14 cycle was that the Standards and ISO 17024 are not equivalent. Discussion ensued regarding comparison and equivalency of the two, and potential benefits that equivalency of the Standards and ISO 17024 may bring.

MOTION
CHAPMAN moved and LYNCH seconded that:
A comparison workgroup be established to investigate Issue 2014 II-013 and formulate recommendations to address Issue 2014 II-015 charges. Motion passed, 21 yes, 0 no, 0 sideways.

Christine Hollenbeck volunteered to chair the Comparison Workgroup, and Chair Hawley appointed her to do so, with the task of presenting a preliminary report at the FPMCC Spring 2015 meeting, and a final report at the FPMCC Fall 2015 meeting. This workgroup will start discussions using the “Comparison Document” produced during the 2012-14 cycle.

Remote Meeting Technology
Cynthia Bagwell was recognized to present information on remote meeting technology. Discussion ensued regarding various members’ organizational technology restrictions that could present problems using this. Chair Hawley asked Geoff Luebkemann to chair the Logistics Workgroup and formulate recommendations for this opportunity.

Formation of Sub-Committees or Workgroups
Chair Hawley established the following workgroups, and gratefully acknowledged those volunteering to lead and participate in them; see workgroup tasks outlined above.
Standards Comparison Workgroup
Hollenbeck, Chair; Cartenuto, Chapman, Dunleavy, Halbrook, Lynch, McMillion, Neal, Paster, Piche, Quam, Roughan, Sarocco-Smith, Tryba, Williams, Wood.

Standards Workgroup
Piche, Chair; Bagwell, Brainerd, Chapman, Loudon, Pilonetti, Rzendzian, Scott, Torres-Corchado, Williams.

Logistics Workgroup
Luebkemann, Chair; Bagwell, Dunleavy, Lang, Lynch, Neal, Quam.

Bylaws
Wood, Chair; Crownover, Trevino.

Selection of ACAC Representative
Chair Hawley advised that an ACAC vacancy will occur this year at the expiration of Lee Cornman’s term, and asked the FPMCC for recommendations to consider and forward to the CFP Executive Board for final action. Vijay Krishna was recognized to characterize qualifications for this position, and Chair Hawley identified a short list of candidates to vet for interest. He will contact the candidates and report back to the FPMCC for a decision by end of 2014.

Workgroup Time
Without objection, Chair Hawley adjourned the FPMCC meeting at 4:30 PM, and directed the workgroups to use the remainder of the meeting time today and tomorrow to organize and begin their work.

Upcoming Meetings
All FPMCC members are reminded to plan for attendance at these upcoming meetings:
  - Spring 2015 face-face meeting, venue TBD
  - Fall 2015 face-face meeting, venue TBD
  - April 16-20, 2016 – CFP Biennial Meeting, Boise ID
About ANSI

- Founded in 1918 to facilitate the development of voluntary consensus standards and conformity assessment systems in the United States.
- Only accreditore of U.S. Standards Developers
- Only body that approves standards as American National Standards (ANS)
- US member body to ISO (International Organization for Standardization)

ANSI Accreditation Portfolio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Conformity Assessment (ISO/IEC 17011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANSI</td>
<td>ANSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTM</td>
<td>ISO/IEC 17065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO/IEC</td>
<td>ISO/IEC 14065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. TAGs to ISO</td>
<td>ISO/IEC 17024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate Issuers</td>
<td>ISO/IEC 17021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Certifiers</td>
<td>CFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Verifiers</td>
<td>CFP Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Certifiers</td>
<td>Inspection Bodies Laboratories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management System Certifiers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ISO/IEC 17020 17025
Definitions

Credentialing: Umbrella term that includes different markers of competence.

Accreditation: Agency or organization is recognized as meeting a standard.

Licensing: is a requirement to practice issued by a government agency.

Certification: is an independent third party assessment to verify that a person possesses the required competencies to practice.

Certificate: is an educational/training program that is awarded after a course of study has been completed.

Certification vs. Certificate

| Standards set through a defensible, industry wide process (job analysis) that results in an outline of required competencies | Course content set up faculty, committee; |
| Has on-going requirements; holder must demonstrate continued competence. | No ongoing requirements. |
| Certification owned by the certification body- can be taken away | Certificate owned by the certificate holder. |

Critical aspects of certification

- Levels of conformity assessment: First party, second and third
- Independence and impartiality
- Separation of training and testing ((teaching to the test)
- What is a certification scheme?
• ANSI accreditation process: Meets an international standard ISO/IEC 17011.

• Update on revision to ANSI-CFP policy documents
• ANSI position on remote proctoring
• Minimize or eliminate conflict when working on standard
• Cognizant of language of the standard as it relates to implementation
• E.g. 1000 test items (piloted, pre-tested, active, retired, and poorly performing)
WEDNESDAY 04/01

Voting Members Present, Present by Phone (P), or Absent

1. Jeff Hawley, Chair
2. Christine Hollenbeck, Vice Chair P
3. Cynthia Bagwell P
4. Dana Brainerd
5. Tony Cartenuto P
6. Bryan Chapman
7. Gary Coleman P
8. Greg Colichio
9. Craig Douglas
10. Sean Dunleavy
11. Marlene Gaither
12. Patrick Guzzle
13. Courtney Halbrook
14. Keith Jackson
15. Linda Kender
16. Jeff Lang
17. Kathy Louden
18. Geoff Luebkemann
19. Larry Lynch
20. Ryan McMillen
21. Jay Neal
22. Tara Paster
23. Kate Piche
24. Therese Pilonetti
25. Susan Quam
26. George Roughan
27. Davene Sarocco-Smith P
28. Ken Scott
29. Cas Tryba
30. Sharon Wood

Alternates Present
1. Liz Corchado, P
2. David Crowover
3. Tom Trevino, activated for regulatory

Others Present
1. Roger Hancock, ACAC P
2. Joyce Jensen, ACAC
3. Laurie Williams, FDA
4. Vince Radke, CDC
5. Sandra Kovach, TAP Series
6. Tasha Walker, National Restaurant Association

Scribe – Geoff Luebkemann

Welcome & Roll Call
Chair Jeff Hawley welcomed the members and thanked sponsors National Registry of Food Safety Professionals, National Restaurant Association, Florida Restaurant and Lodging Association, and Wisconsin Restaurant Association. Roll was called and a quorum of 24 of 31 voting members established.

CFP Anti-trust Statement
Chair Hawley read and emphasized the importance of adhering to provisions of the Anti-trust Statement.

Review & Approval of Kansas City Meeting Minutes

MOTION
LANG moved, ROUGHAN seconded that:
Minutes of the FPMCC Kansas City meeting, Oct. 15-16, 2014, be approved. Motion passed unanimously.
Committee Administration, CFP Update
Chair Hawley reviewed committee membership constituencies, the role of alternates and committee consultants, the mechanics of voting and consensus building, and that this committee reports to the CFP Executive Board.

Chair Hawley recognized CFP Executive Board member and Council II Chair Susan Quam, who reported that CFP leadership is considering purchasing Adobe Connect to facilitate committee work, and that Council applications are anticipated in May 2015 from CFP Executive Secretary Aggie Hale.

Review of Charges from CFP
Chair Hawley referenced the 2014-16 committee charges and asked for questions. None presented.

Standards Comparison Workgroup – Christina Hollenbeck
Workgroup Chair Hollenbeck reported the workgroup’s activity, including that a line by line comparison of the CFP Standards and ISO 17024 was undertaken. The workgroup formed three subgroups to manage the tasks, and consensus was reached among the workgroup on the products of the subgroups. FPMCC members were provided a 37-page document with a line by line comparison and “equivalencies.” An additional 12 pages of ISO 17024 were identified for assessment to reconcile equivalency of the two standards.

Coleman offered service to the workgroup in reconciling entities that may be accredited under one or the other of the two.

Roughan stated the comparison document is “ready to go,” except item 5.12C which did not have consensus. It was pointed out that discussion of the comparison document could benefit from input by Vijay Krishna, and Chair Hawley recommended tabling the until Krishna is present.

Piche offered that the comparison document focused on editorial content rather than substantive changes. She explained the dissent on item 5.12C: some felt ISO would require more prescription to be equivalent, while others felt ISO was prescriptive enough. Roughan stated item 5.11A covered the concerns that the 5.12C – 5.13E dissenters had.

It was stated that trainer-proctor separation has been discovered to not be as problematic as initially discussed going back to 2008 (Orlando).

Jay Neal: obligation exists to ensure that those not as familiar as this committees members can uphold the CFP standards. Lynch stated that ISO 17024 must be viewed in totality when compared against the CFP Standard, those that are accredited under ISO 17024 are in fact audited against standards as stringent as CFP Standards, and that 5.13E has impact on trainer-proctor separation.

Piche reminded the committee that ANSI can only audit for requirements it is authorized to do.

Hawley reminded the committee that the discussion is not to replace CFP Standard with ISO, but rather conclude if ISO 17024 is “good enough.”

Lynch asked why compliance with existing ISO 17024 isn’t good enough for equivalency with CFP Standard; Piche related discomfort with ISO 17024 item exposure content in 5.13 A, B, C, E.

Threats from “repeated use” was the point of dissent in the committee’s discussion. Roughan stated the CFP standard may be too prescriptive and lack evolution, which ISO 17024 permits.

Chair Hawley stated there may have been overreaction to security concerns from a few years back.

Lang offered it might be more beneficial to compare process to process, rather than standard to standard or requirement to requirement.
Lynch expressed concern that the food-specific standard not preclude the beneficial use of ISO 17024, as a general and non-food specific personnel accreditation standard.

Much discussion ensued regarding CFP standards as over-prescriptive and ISO 17024 as overly general.

Quam pointed out that government agencies and regulators like prescription, loosening standards could hinder adoption of CFP accreditation, and that this discussion should be informed by that context.

Roughan added the world has moved on regarding CFP Standards, i.e., number of examinees per proctor has differing effectiveness in paper exam vs. computer based testing. The example of test booklet seals as a too-prescriptive provision was discussed, and it was pointed out that ANSI actually advocated that level of specificity for their comfort as auditors.

Roughan stated that with ISO 17024, ANSI could determine the effectiveness without need to come to a group like FPMMC to have standards revised for better effectiveness, and that many CFP requirements may be obsolete.

Lang asked for the purpose is of aligning CFP and ISO 17024 standards.

Quam pointed that CFP Executive Board (and ANSI as its agent) would not want a system that allows assessors too much subjective interpretation, which could impact the CFP contract with ANSI.

Lynch stated that perhaps the CFP should stop reactive band-aiding to problems as they emerge (to the CFP Standards), get non-standards experts out of creating such standards, and look at ISO 17024 as an alternative.

Piche stated that prescription supports consistency among individual assessors and provides greater clarity determining if an exam provider meets the standard or not.

Hollenbeck and Lynch spoke to the need for Krishna’s input; Quam stated CFSAN comfort with CFP v. ANSI must be considered; Laurie Williams advised some CFSAN activity is moving in the direction of ISO standards.

BREAK 10:15 – 10:40

Chair Hawley arranged for Krishna to attend by phone today and solicited the Committee for questions. Questions offered:

1. How do other organizations (i.e., crane operators) apply and interface with ANSI in combination using ISO 17024?
2. What level of prescription does ANSI want in the CFPM standard, since much of the existing prescription was developed at their (Roy Swift) urging?
3. How did ANSI arrive at and recommend the 1000 item question bank requirement?
4. Would ANSI accredit an ISO 17024 organization as equivalent to CFP without additional review?
5. Is the US federal government moving to ISO 17024, and if so, why?
6. How many local, state, or federal entities use ISO 17024, and how does this effect local rule / state’s rights issues, and acceptance of those at various levels of government?
7. How is determining KSA competency under CFP different than ISO?

Chair Hawley tabled further discussion of this topic until Krishna is available to address these questions.

**Standards Workgroup – Kate Piche**

Recommended changes to the CFP Standards were editorial and not substantive, per the workgroup’s charge. Piche presented a summary of the workgroup’s recommendations.

**MOTION**
CHAPMAN moved, LYNCH seconded that:
The recommendations of the Standards Workgroup be accepted as presented. Unanimous passage.

Logistics Workgroup - Geoff Luebkemann
- Milwaukee FPMCC meeting planned and executed.
- Remote meeting and document sharing tech is on hold pending CFP action on Adobe Connect software, which is compatible with PC, smartphone, and tablet. Quam explained it, Pilonetti recommended it, and Jensen suggested that if adopted, Adobe Connect training be available during the CFP Boise Biennial meeting.

Committee Bylaws – David Crownover for Sharon Wood
No changes are recommended by the workgroup at this time.

Chair Hawley advised that pursuant to discussions with CFP Executive Director David McSwane, the FPMCC should discuss reconciling its committee bylaws [Article 6, section 3, subsection 6, “consumer/independent representative] with CFP Bylaws [Section 5, subsection 5, “consumer member”].

Discussion ensued regarding consumer members being spread too thin across CFP committees; the need for funding consumer members to participate in CFP committees and the biennial meeting; “industry support” and “independent” categories; and that the National Environmental Health Association is viewed as regulatory agency by CFP Executive Committee.

**ACTION ITEM**
Chair Hawley charged: a) the FPMCC Communications Workgroup with personally contacting and recruiting potential consumer members to gauge interest, obstacles, and prospects for participating in FPMCC, and b) the FPMCC Bylaws Workgroup to recommend reconciliation of the “consumer” terms in the CFP and FPMCC bylaws.

Communication Workgroup: Roughan (Chair), Brainerd, Crownover, Pilonetti, Kovacs.

**2016-18 FPMCC Chair & Vice-Chair - Chair Hawley**
Chair Hawley advised that committee leadership for 2016-18 should identified by the next FPMCC meeting to timely report to the Executive Board. Chair Hawley advised he is ready to roll off, however would be willing to continue serving. Vice Chair Hollenbeck advised she is unable to serve in leadership.

**MOTION**
LUEBKEMANN moved, LANG seconded that:
That FPMCC Chair and Vice Chair nominations be emailed to Chair Hawley by May 1, 2015.
Unanimous passage.

**MOTION**
Lang moved, ROUGHAN seconded that:
That FPMCC Bylaws regarding Chair and Vice Chair be reaffirmed. Unanimous passage.

**CFP Calendar - Chair Hawley**
All 2014-16 committee must be complete by December 4, 2015, so the FPMCC will meet face to face in mid to late October 2015. Potential venues: Denver, Dallas, LA, New Port RI, New Orleans, Atlanta, Savannah, Birmingham.

**Committee Bylaws**
Chair Hawley returned the discussion to revision of the FPMCC Bylaws Workgroup to recommend FPMCC bylaws reconciliation with CFP Bylaws.
MOTION
LANG moved, ROUGHAN seconded that:
FPMCC Bylaws term “consumer/independent representatives/public members,” in Article 6, section 3, subsection 6, be replaced with the CFP Bylaws term “consumer member” defined in Section 5, subsection 5, and also add “or others as recommended by the FPMCC Chair.” Motion passed with one dissent, 3 sideways votes.

The three “sideways” votes explained they were a) not comfortable with the change, b) found it redundant and unneeded, and c) that it was confusing and the problem to solve not understood.

MOTION
GUZZLE moved, QUAM seconded that:
The previous question be reconsidered. Unanimous passage.

With the previous question reconsidered, the FPMCC agreed to not revise the consumer definition, and the Bylaws workgroup was so instructed.

BREAK 3:00-3:30

Chair Hawley brought to the attention of the FPMCC that voting member Colicchio has been unresponsive and not participated, and asked if the FPMCC wanted to exercise its prerogative to remove the member.

MOTION
ROUGHAN moved, LUEBKEMANN seconded that:
FPMCC Member Colicchio be removed for non-attendance. Unanimous passage.

Having completed all agenda items except those requiring attendance by presenters Krishna and Ford, Chair Hawley declared the meeting in recess at 3:50 PM until 8:00 AM, Thursday April 2.

THURSDAY 04/02

Voting Members Present, Present by Phone (P), or Absent

1. Jeff Hawley, Chair
2. Christine Hollenbeck, Vice Chair P
3. Cynthia Bagwell P
4. Dana Brainerd
5. Tony Cartenuto
6. Bryan Chapman
7. Gary Coleman P
8. Greg Colichio
9. Craig Douglas
10. Sean Dunleavy
11. Marlene Gaither
12. Patrick Guzzle
13. Courtney Halbrook
14. Keith Jackson
15. Linda Kender
16. Jeff Lang
17. Kathy Louden
18. Geoff Luebkemann
19. Larry Lynch
20. Ryan McMillion
21. Jay Neal
22. Tara Paster
23. Kate Piche
24. Therese Pilonetti
25. Susan Quam
26. George Roughan
27. Davene Sarocco-Smith P
28. Ken Scott
29. Cas Tryba
30. Sharon Wood

Alternates Present
1. Liz Corchado P
2. David Crownover
3. Tom Trevino
Meeting Reconvened, Roll call
Chair Hawley called the meeting to order at 8:05 a.m. and a quorum was established.

Security Evaluation Report - Don Ford
Don Ford, consultant to the FPMCC, was recognized to present his report “Security Evaluation Work Group, Baseline & Summative Self-Report Findings 2013-14” [attached as an appendix to these minutes].

Summary of Evaluation Findings:
- Small number of test security violations, but once is one too many
- About 4% of proctors/administrators are disciplinary problems, but numbers are declining
  - Better screening, selection, and discipline are working
  - 100% compliance on retraining achieved
- Test administration and shipping irregularities continue to be problematic
  - Better tracking and enforcement of existing rules needed
  - May be reaching theoretical limits of compliance, given current testing methods

Ford’s remarks included:
- Exam security may be reaching theoretical limits of improvement; some organizations are better than others, and recommends packaging “best practices” for the test organizations.
- 2014 test volume was over 700k candidates; managed more tests with about same number of proctors. Volume poses a challenge to policing the system, detection has continued to improve, with disciplinary and revocations increasing.
- Effectively dealing with “professional cheater” proctors, and preventing them from moving from one provider to another should be addressed. NRA ServSafe has addressed this with a “no longer authorized” list of proctors on their website, which is a result of confirmed security violations by the proctor.

Ford Q+A from the Committee:
Q: Can Ford speak to a comparison of CFPM security “tip of the iceberg” with other industries?
A: Other high stakes testers have same challenges, and may have a little better experience. The culture has enabled and normalized cheaters, creating universal testing challenges.

Q: On Slide 24, what is the number of individual certifications related to each event?
A: Not a data point in the study.

Q: What is the quantity of provider internal audits and external onsite inspections?
A: Both data points were not included in the study, and so number of individual cheaters is unknown; this may be a useful future data point to gauge magnitude of cheating rather than number of “events” of cheating.

Q: On Slide 6, the total proctors, administrators, and sites = nearly 1:1 which seems unlikely; is there an explanation?
A: It is theorized these numbers are influenced by administrators that are registered but never act, and administrators with high activity, creating a sort of average.

Q: Have efforts to filter inactive proctors resulted in fewer proctors?
A: The only filtering identified in the study is the requirement that deficient proctors be re-trained. Also, the providers automatically remove inactive proctors that do not complete the mandatory 3 year re-training.

Chair Hawley provided a multi-year overview of security improvement activity for FPMCC members that may not have been involved in the process. Chair Hawley stated the 2010 security measures have been fully implemented, and that the FPMCC confidently reports significant and credible progress in security. It is not perfect, can’t be perfect, and incremental improvement may and should still be sought.

Q: Did the study differentiate online vs. paper examination?
A: No, because the study intentionally avoided comparing the providers to each other; anecdotally, it appears more problems occur in paper, although that must be viewed in context of the much greater volume of candidates using paper. Also, while online alleviates some problems, it fosters others. Data does not exist to conclude that one method is less prone to security problems than the other.

Q: Do we have a sense of what “the iceberg” really is? How do the study findings impact the overall CFP scheme?
A: No, we don’t know the size of the “iceberg,” and that was not part of the study, but other industry comparisons could be useful in the future. It’s impossible to conclude that each irregularity instance is sinister (i.e., lost exam booklets could be nefariously used, or could simply have gone to a landfill). Future study activity could benefit from quantifying number of individuals and number of “incidents” (similar to number of “cases” and number of “outbreaks” in food borne illness trending).

Q: Chair Hawley asked if the providers are seeing online ratio increase vs. paper.
A: The providers reported anecdotally that the mix has not significantly changed.

Chair Hawley re-created the Security Evaluation Workgroup and charged it to review and improve the exam security self-reporting process and report to the FPMCC at the next meeting. The following volunteered: Chapman (Chair), Guzzle, Williams, Kender, Coleman, Corchado, Piche, Douglas, McMillion, and Don Ford as advisor.

**ACTION ITEM**

Security Evaluation Workgroup to review and report on improvement to the exam security self-reporting process at the next FPMCC meeting.

**ANSI Update - Vijay Krishna**

Chair Hawley advised that work of the Standards Comparison Workgroup will carry over to the next meeting. He then recognized Vijay Krishna for an ANSI update.

Krishna began with a report on remote proctoring. It is ANSI’s position that all forms of test administration must meet the security requirements as detailed in the CFP standard, and ANSI will review and approve remote proctoring on a pilot basis. One provider has been approved to conduct a pilot, and another is being reviewed.

Regarding the FPMCC questions from yesterday (previously listed above), Krishna will not address all but will discuss the matter of specific prescriptive standards.

Regarding the number in the item bank, Krishna advised that “more is better,” but that is also impacted by number of administrations, online v. paper, exposure rate, etc. One size does not fit all, and case by case unique factors can and do drive the appropriate level of prescription. The level of prescription is for the FPMCC to determine, but Krishna can assist and react to its development. Other Q+A covered include:

Q: How is assessor consistency in determining “acceptable standards” achieved?
A: The generally accepted standards within an industry are relied upon.

Q: How are different ISO standards-certified disciplines differentiated?
A: Use of normative documents specific to the industry are incorporated to the scheme to augment the ISO standard. ANSI assessors review how the entire scheme (ISO + industry specific documents) was developed.

Q: Would ANSI accredit an ISO 17024 organization as equivalent to CFP without additional review?
A: No.

Q: Is the US federal government moving to ISO 17024, and if so, why?
A: ANSI is seeing more federal agencies working with them due to increased concerns over quality. Example: about 162 financial planner designations exist, not all of which may not be credible or helpful to the stakeholder. About total 4000 certification types exist in the US. OSHA-related, senior citizen providers, cyber security, and others impacting public safety have emerged for ISO applicability.

Q: How many local, state, or federal entities use ISO 17024, and how does this effect local rule / state’s rights issues, and acceptance of those at various levels of government?
A: This is left to the states to decide, via their regulatory activity, i.e., WV has referenced ISO 17024 as pre-requisite for crane operator licensing; NY has done similar in elevator mechanics. Wash DC has done this with fitness trainers.

Q: How is determining KSA competency under CFP different than ISO?
A: At this time, they are not different. ANSI’s process for assessing both is the same, and they use the same lead assessors. The newest version of ISO 17024 is more prescriptive than the previous. Also, KSA study is only part of the process. Other indicators are employed to verify that an individual can demonstrate the required knowledge.

Q: If an organization is ISO accredited and uses a food safety normative document, are they authorized to use the ANSI-CFP logo?
A: Depends on the what the FPMCC decides.

Q: Can Krishna provide examples of normative documents regarding level of detail?
A: In standards terminology, "normative" means "considered to be a prescriptive part of the standard". It characterizes that part of the standard which describes what ought to be done within the application of that standard.

Q: What are the steps / bullets in normative document development?
A: [Steps covered]. Don’t create a document misaligned or in conflict with ISO 17024. Ensure final desired outcome of determining competencies is achieved. Would need to have all the CFP elements to be an “official document.”

Chair Hawley charged the Standards Workgroup to identify items in the CFP Standards that could be made less prescriptive without negative effect on security improvement.

Don Ford stated that of 5 goals, 2 are 100% achieved, significant progress achieved on several others.

Piche asked that in light of the positive Don Ford report, should we consider changing the system that was just reported to have created the desired result of reduced security. Lynch pointed out that changing some prescriptive requirements might not negatively impact security. Much discussion ensued regarding what the right approach is to reducing or even considering prescriptive reduction, and whether effective controlling for item exposure can be accomplished beyond a prescriptive item bank number.

Q: How is assessor subjectivity managed, and is a formula used that contemplates testing volume?
A: No formula is used, however “rules of thumb” and “ball parking” are used.
MOTION

Moved by LYNCH, seconded by LANG that:
The Standards Workgroup review the current CFP Standards to recommend reduction in prescriptive processes with a finding that there is an impact, no impact, or unknown impact to exam security. 16 yes, 1 no, 1 sideways. Motion passes.

During discussion of the motion, the Standards Workgroup asked for guidance on the appropriate methodology to perform its review. Piche pointed out that the overarching principal must be in determining if the prescription helps or harms security. Krishna cautioned that prescription is not all bad.

In the post-vote discussion, the no vote advised more work based on the earlier work of the Standards Comparison Workgroup should be conducted before a prescriptive reduction review can be performed. Sideways vote advised that continued work using the draft of a normative document from the Hollenbeck workgroup might be a better starting place. Chair Hawley asked Piche if she has sufficient guidance for the workgroup to begin work; Piche felt insufficient clarity exists to begin work. Further discussion resulted in consensus that this project could not be completed in time for action at for CFP 2016 Biennial Meeting. Chair Hawley asked that the workgroup get started, ask for help as needed, and produce a document that recommends specific reduction in prescription and the security impact (positive, negative, or unknown) for each recommendation.

Chair Hawley advised the FPMCC members to review the Standards Comparison Workgroup report and be informed and prepared to arrive at a resolution on the committee charges to conclude the 2014-16 work activity.

Chair Hawley thanked the members, meeting sponsors, and consultants for their contribution to a successful meeting.

Without objection, the Chair adjourned the at 1145 AM.

Upcoming Meetings - Chair Hawley
- October 21-22, 2015 Dallas
- April 16-20, 2016: CFP Biennial Meeting Boise, ID
SEWG Background

- Work Group formed to address test security concerns involving the CPFM exam under ANSI CFP certification
- Dr. Ford, ANSI CAP Assessor, designed and conducted a 5 year evaluation study of past, current and future test security breaches and the impact of remedies that CFP implemented starting in 2011.
- Evaluation proceeded in three stages:
  1. Baseline study of the 2009-10 year to pilot test self-report data collection and establish a pre-assessment point from which to measure progress
  2. Interim study of the 2012-13 year to assess progress in addressing test security issues
  3. Post-assessment of the 2013-14 year and future years to measure progress and track trends in CPFM test security
Evaluation Methodology

- Self-reporting via questionnaire
- Data aggregated and reported as single group only (no within-group comparisons)
- Time Periods:
  - Baseline (Pre) – July 2009 – June 2010
  - Pilot (Formative) – July 2012 – June 2013
  - Post (Summative) - July 2013 – June 2014
  - Trending – Annually after 2014 as part of ANSI surveillance

Summary of Evaluation Findings

- Small number of test security violations, but once is one too many
- About 4% of proctors/administrators are disciplinary problems, but numbers are declining
  - Better screening, selection, and discipline are working
  - 100% compliance on retraining achieved
- Test administration and shipping irregularities continue to be problematic
  - Better tracking and enforcement of existing rules needed
  - May be reaching theoretical limits of compliance, given current testing methods
Summary of Evaluation Findings (cont’d)

- Significant efforts being made to prevent test security breaches
  - Best practices should be disseminated to all providers
- Management QA System fully implemented in 2012-13
- Continue to monitor test security as part of ANSI annual surveillance

CPFM is a Big Deal

- Large numbers pose challenges for close policing

- Test Volume and Test Sites show no clear pattern;
- # of Proctors/Administrators shows little change.

Goal One: Provide Regular Training for Proctors/Administrators

- Goal has been achieved with 100% compliance.
Change in Retraining: 2009-2014

- All Retraining completed in 2014.

Goal One: Enforce Proctor/Administrator Disciplinary Actions

- In 2014, violations decreased while revocations increased, indicating greater enforcement.
Changes in Proctor/Administrator Disciplinary Actions: 2009-2014

- Disciplinary issues initially went up, then down, while revocations have steadily increased.

Primary Reasons for Violations - 2014

1. Failure to return exams/answer sheets on time
2. Failure to return all materials, or to sign/seal return envelopes
3. Failure to use a traceable shipping carrier
4. Failure to follow proctor guidelines, including not being present the whole time or allowing test-takers to self-proctor
5. Suspected/confirmed cheating or colluding with test takers
Most Common Disciplinary Actions

1. Warning for 1st offense, probation/suspension/revocation for repeated offenses
2. One year probation/suspension for second offense
3. Revocation of privileges for colluding in cheating; suspected examinees required to re-test

Most Frequent Reasons for Revocation/Suspension of Proctors

1. Resignation from the position (about 100 cases)
2. Confirmed/suspected case of cheating with proctor/administrator collusion, such as providing answers/coaching or allowing examinees to discuss test or use notes during exam (about 30 cases)
Goal Two: Reduce Exam Packaging and Shipping Irregularities

- In 2013-14, 2 out of 10,000 exams lost, the same rate as last year. Lost answer sheets are exceedingly rare.

Most Frequent Reasons for Lost Exams/Answer Sheets: 2013-14

1. Proctors improperly disposed of unused exams – shredding or trashing
2. Carrier lost the package
   - Regular mail is not reliable
   - Even traceable carriers lose packages sometimes (19 answer sheets lost in 2013-14)
3. Proctors lost extra exams/answer sheets; presumed stolen
Changes in Lost Materials: 2009-2014

- Increase in reported lost materials from 2009 to 2013, steady to decreasing in 2013-14.

Goal Three: Reduce Test Site Irregularities

- In 2013-14, Test Administration problems show big increase, while test site problems remain small.
Most Frequent Reasons for Test Administration Irregularities

1. Failure to follow shipping policies for returning materials on time
2. Failure to properly return all materials via traceable carrier
3. Failure to follow policies and procedures for proctoring – partially unproctored or self-proctored exams
4. Cheating or collusion: candidates were allowed to talk in a foreign language during the exam, proctor colluded in cheating, candidates shared notes during exam

Most Frequent Reasons for Test Site Irregularities in 2014

1. Candidate demographic changes (wrong name or other personal information at registration)
2. Exam was given in a restaurant during service or otherwise interrupted by outside noise
3. Examinees were allowed to sit too close together
4. Technical issue with online testing site hardware
Changes in Test Irregularities as Percentage of all Test Locations

- Increase in reported administration irregularities probably due to increased detection; test site problems decreasing.

Where Test Site Irregularities Occurred: 2013-14

- Test site irregularities show decline across all sites.
Reasons for Site Irregularities – 2014

1. Candidate registration information was wrong – name or other personal information incorrect
2. Exam material delivery problem – materials did not arrive on time or items were missing
3. Testing in a public or noisy venue (restaurant during dining service)
4. Technical issue with online testing hardware/network

Goal Four: Reduce Cheating and Test Administration Irregularities

Trend was up initially, but down last year. Better detection and enforcement today.
Data Forensics Employed to Combat Cheating

1. Item Analysis (4)*
2. Pass Rate Analysis – compare by group/proctor (2)*
3. Item Difficulty (p-value) Analysis (1)*
4. Point Biserial Correlation (1)*
5. Online exam time Analysis (1)*
6. Incident Response Investigation (3)*

*Numbers in () indicate how many providers report using this.

Most Frequent Corrective Actions Taken To Combat Cheating

1. Use multiple versions of the exam at each administration (4)*
2. Revoke proctor privileges for collusion (3)*
3. Enforce spacing and other environmental guidelines (2)*
4. Use biometrics to verify examinee identify (1)*
5. Require examinees to retest when cheating is suspected (2)*
6. Adopt better exam forensic analysis methods (1)*
7. Increase exam session audits (1)*

*Numbers in () indicate how many providers report using this.
Test Versions and Revisions

Versions Employed:
- Minimum of 2 versions/administration
- Maximum of 8 versions used
- Avg = 4

Revision Frequency:
- Minimum of yearly
- Maximum of monthly
- Avg = quarterly

Test Administration Violations

One out of 1400 test administrations contains a violation, though most are minor.
Most Frequent Reasons for Test Administration Irregularities

1. Failure to return all test materials on time
2. More exam booklets opened than answer sheets
3. Failure to monitor examinees during entire exam
4. Self-administration of exam
5. Proctor collusion in cheating

Change in Percentage of Administration Violations: 2009-2014

- Decrease in percent of violations over last year shows progress.
**Goal Five: Improve Test Quality Assurance**

- 2009-10: Only 1 of 3 providers had QA system installed and it was incomplete
- 2012-13: All 4 providers had QA system in place, but still implementing some features
- 2013-14: QA system fully functional for all providers

This goal has been achieved by 100% of providers.

---

**QA System Elements in Place -2014**

- Document control (4)*
- Internal audit (3)*
- Management review (4)*
- Exam security plan (1)*
- External audit/certification (1)*

*Numbers in () indicate how many providers report having this in 2013-14.*
Most Frequent Reasons for QA System Breaches

1. Failure to return test materials on time
2. Lost test booklets/completed answer sheets
3. Candidate demographic information missing/incorrect
4. Forensics uncovered possible cheating/collusion

Provider Perceptions of Test Security Breaches

- “After implementing all the changes [over the past 5 years], our quantity of breaches has dramatically decreased.”
- “We are a trusted test development and delivery provider to more than 400 organizations worldwide. On their behalf, we securely deliver an average of 10 million exams per year. We serve as an industry gatekeeper, ensuring that people legitimately earn the credentials they seek to achieve, and thereby guaranteeing a fair testing experience for all who come through our doors.”
Recommendations

- Proctors/Administrators:
  - Increase screening, selection and training standards
  - Continue to vigorously apply disciplinary actions against offenders
    - GGL on from moving to the next provider

- Shipping Irregularities:
  - Use traceable carriers only, especially those with high reputation for security and reliability
  - Continue to enforce rules for shipping

Recommendations (cont’d)

- Test Sites/Administration:
  - Standardize test site requirements across all providers
  - Share best practices for administration

- Test Cheating:
  - Share best practices for data forensics and cheating detection
  - Encourage test-takers to report cheating (whistleblower hotline)

- QA System:
  - Fully implement all features for all providers
  - Use it as preventive mechanism and early warning system
Future Steps

- Present findings to key stakeholders
- Identify areas for further improvement
- Fine tune data collection methods as needed
- Include test security evaluation as part of ANSI annual surveillance and monitor trends

Thank you for the opportunity to work with CFP!
Don Ford
WEDNESDAY 10/21

Voting Members Present, Present by Phone (P), or Absent

1. Jeff Hawley, Chair
2. Christine Hollenbeck, VC
3. Cynthia Bagwell P
4. Dana Brainerd
5. Tony Cartenuto
6. Bryan Chapman
7. Gary Coleman P
8. Craig Douglas
9. Sean Dunleavy
10. Marlene Gaither
11. Patrick Guzzle
12. Courtney Halbrook
13. Keith Jackson
14. Linda Kender
15. Jeff Lang
16. Kathy Louden
17. Geoff Luebkemann
18. Larry Lynch
19. Ryan McMillion
20. Jay Neal
21. Tara Paster
22. Kate Piche
23. Therese Pilonetti
24. Susan Quam
25. George Roughan
26. Davene Sarocco-Smith
27. Ken Scott
28. Tom Trevino
29. Cas Tryba
30. Sharon Wood

Alternates Present
1. Kevin Connell, activated for industry-food retail
2. Liz Corchado

Others Present
1. Roger Hancock, ACAC P
2. Laurie Williams, FDA
3. Vince Radke, CDC P
4. Sandra Kovach, TAP Series

Scribe – Geoff Luebkemann

AGENDA

• Welcome, Roll Call
• CFP Anti-trust Statement
• Review of Charges from CFP
• Review and Approval of Milwaukee Meeting Minutes
• CFP Update – Susan Quam
• ANSI Update – Vijay Krishna
• Standards Comparison Workgroup – Christina Hollenbeck
• Standards Workgroup – Kate Piche
• Security Evaluation Workgroup – Bryan Chapman
• Committee Chair and Vice-Chair for 2016-18
• CFP Calendar & Issues Submission
• Upcoming Meetings:
  o April 16-20, 2016 – CFP Biennial Meeting, Boise, ID
Welcome and Roll Call
Chair Jeff Hawley welcomed the members, thanked the sponsors [add all] National Registry of Food Safety Professionals, National Restaurant Association, Florida Restaurant and Lodging Association, and Wisconsin Restaurant Association, Performance Food Group, Big Y World Class Market, and State Food Safety. Roll was called and a quorum of 20 of 30 voting members established. The 2014-16 committee charges were referenced to keep discussions focused.

CFP Anti-trust Statement
Chair Hawley read and emphasized the importance of adhering to provisions of the Anti-trust Statement.

Review & Approval of Milwaukee April 2015 Meeting Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LYNCH moved, LANG seconded that: Minutes of the FPMCC Milwaukee meeting, April 1-2, 2015, be approved as amended by Vijay Krishna. Motion passed unanimously.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CFP Update – Susan Quam
CFP has a new and renovated website, Boise is ready for the CFP 2016 Biennial Meeting, Council II had great response, and all Council compositions have now been announced. Issue submission - final reports must be submitted to Issues Chairs by December 5; "stand alone" Issue submission opens in December; deadlines and process are available on the CFP website. Chair Hawley reported that this committee was the only one that lacked a position description, which he has developed and submitted for Executive Board review and approval. Guzzle reported that Boise is ready and looks forward to hosting the 2016 Biennial Meeting.

ANSI Update – Vijay Krishna
Krishna reports that ANSI is in its annual surveillance period, including test center audit visits. ACAC meets November 18, 2015 at ANSI headquarters in Washington, D.C. New ACAC members include Roger Hancock, a long serving CFP member, and Dr. Manny Straehle, a psychometrician. Krishna suggested improvement to verifiability and standards writing methodology are an opportunity for the committee. Krishna has a best practices and recommendations document on this and will provide to Chair Hawley for distribution to the FPMCC. It was suggested that an ANSI training workshop(s) be conducted at the first meeting of the FPMCC in the 2016-18 cycle. Discussion ensued and consensus reached that a one-day workshop for the FPMCC regarding standards development and creating a foundation for understanding comparison of the CFP Standards and ISO 17024 would be useful.

Standards Comparison Workgroup Update – Christina Hollenbeck
Workgroup Chair Hollenbeck asked Krishna about ANSI's need or desire for specificity and prescription, and indicated ANSI input would be useful. Krishna offered that prescription is not a negative on its face, but must be evaluated within the context of stated objectives. As an example, the basis for a 1000 test item bank was discussed, which cannot be analyzed in a vacuum, but must be viewed in association with the number of test administrations. Krishna advised that rather than focus on specificity, focus should be on a vision for how the standards be developed and evolved in the future.

Chair Hawley reminded the FPMCC that time is waning and a decision must be made on the 2014-16 committee charge regarding ISO 17124. Discussion ensued regarding the current view of the FPMCC on the equivalency of the CFP Manager Certification Standards and ISO 17024. It was stated that any decision on this must contemplate whether CFP wants to cede control of and/or ownership of the Manager Certification Standards.

Wood asked for ANSI’s view regarding continued use of the CFP Manager Certification Standards; Krishna stated the status quo is fully supported by ANSI, and ANSI commitment remains for the continued implementation of the existing CFP Manager Certification Standards. Discussion ensued including, as comparison of CFP Standards and ISO 17024 continues, operational impacts and costs of implementation must be considered and included in the discussion.
Krishna was asked to address whether ISO 17024 requires training and exam administration separation; he responded that ISO 17024 prohibits trainers from administering exams. Concern was expressed that industry could be compelled by regulatory adoption to implement only 17024, removing choice and increasing cost. Additional discussion ensued over potentially unknown costs and challenges – unintended consequences – precipitated by regulatory adoption or imposition of ISO 17024, and that the FPMCC should attempt to quantify these by survey or other tool.

The FPMCC asked for information on FDA and ANSI positions on use of 17024. Krishna declined to be specific, but indicated ANSI would want consistency, "substantially the same," between the two.

**Break 1030-1045 AM**

Chair Hawley reconvened the meeting and commended the members for their productivity and quality during this biennium in exploring the relationship between CFP Standards and 17024, and asked the FPMCC to move toward a definitive response to the charge:

2014/ II-015   Title: FPMCC 4 - ISO/IEC 17024-2012 as an Option to CFP Standards

The Conference recommends the Food Protection Manager Certification Committee (FPMCC) determine the process and requirements for potential acceptance of the International Organization for Standardization/International Electrotechnical Commission (ISO/IEC) 17024-2012 for food protection manager certification as an additional option to and without impact on the existing CFP Standards for Accreditation of Food Protection Manager Certification Programs and report back its findings at the 2016 Biennial Meeting.

Lynch offered language for consideration as a motion seeking authorization to continue and refine the FPMCC work on this charge during the next biennium. Comments on the offered language from members included ensuring that the committee charge be specifically referenced, and that the FPMCC clearly communicate the parameters for authorizing its continued work without expanding or altering existing charge.

**MOTION**

LYNCH moved, ROUGHAN seconded that:

The FPMCC reports it has conducted an extensive but incomplete study comparing current CFP Manager Certification Standards and ISO 17024, and therefore recommends that Charge 2014/ II-015 be continued for the 2016-18 biennium to permit completion of the comparison with the input of standards development expertise from ANSI, as such expertise will better enable the FPMCC to both resolve the comparison and provide support in ongoing improvement of the CFP Manager Certification Standards while completing work on Charge 2014/ II-015. Vote was 17 affirmative, 1 sideways. Motion passed.

**Consumer Representative Recruiting update – George Roughan**

Roughan contacted five consumer oriented organizations to request their participation in CFP, all five declined. Organizations contacted included Partnership for Food Safety Education, CSPI, Consumer Federation of America, Pew Charitable Trusts, and Consumers Union. STOP’s Darin Detwiler is on Council II for the CFP 2016 Biennial Meeting, and will be contacted for potential future CFP consumer representation. It was noted that CFP Executive Director Dr. David McSwane may have additional ideas for consumer representation, and will be consulted.

**The Specificity / Prescription Workgroup update – Kate Piche**

The workgroup considered a lengthy list of items that could be considered as too specific, prescriptive, or otherwise lacking utility for effectiveness of the CFP Standards. The workgroup has developed a list of items and desires to continue this work and target implementation during the next biennium, concluded its current work with this report, and asked that an issue be submitted to continue the workgroup in the next cycle.
**Lunch break 1200 – 130 PM**

**Security Evaluation Workgroup report and update – Bryan Chapman**
Chair Hawley previously charged this workgroup to review and improve the exam security self-reporting process and report findings at the FPMCC Fall 2015 meeting. Chapman reported the workgroup discussed four alternatives, recommending the FPMCC consider Alternatives #3 and #4 [see attached PowerPoint], which
- combine and streamline two annual ANSI exercises – the “Annual Surveillance” and the “Security Evaluation Worksheets” and
- identify the core metrics that signal the state of security effectiveness.

Discussion ensued by the FPMCC, including:
- Some providers felt more granular detail on security failures is beneficial
- Aggregate data on types and frequency of violations would be useful
- ANSI could use this information to develop a scorecard for FPMCC
- Use The Scorecard, combined with ANSI annual surveillance, to yield actionable improvements

Chair Hawley asked Chapman, provider reps, and Krishna to finalize scorecard content recommendations by 11/20, for timely inclusion in the FPMCC Report to the Executive Board.

**Officer Elections – Chair Hawley**
Chair Hawley reported that one nomination was received for recommended Chair.

**MOTION**
LANG moved, LYNCH seconded that:
Patrick Guzzle, long serving CFP and FPMCC, be recommended to the CFP Executive Board for the position of FPMCC Chair for the 2016-18 biennium. Motion passed unanimously.

Chair Hawley reported that two nominations were received as recommended Vice Chair: Sharon Wood, Bryan Chapman, and called for additional nominations from the floor; none were heard. The candidates each provided a brief introduction, were dismissed, and committee discussion and a vote ensued.

**MOTION**
Chair Hawley called for a vote on recommendation to the CFP Executive Board for the position of FPMCC Vice Chair for the 2016-18 biennium; by majority vote Sharon Wood, long serving CFP and FPMCC member, is recommended.

**Old Business – Chair Hawley**
Chair Hawley called for any additional business for consideration of the FPMCC, or matters that should be considered for issue submission. The FPMCC was directed to consider any Committee bylaw recommendations, and will email a reminder to the members for timely inclusion in the FPMCC Report to the Executive Board.

**Special Thanks To Chair Hawley – Sharon Wood**
Wood expressed, with full FPMCC affirmation, thanks to Chair Hawley for his steadfast leadership, extraordinary commitment, and calm professionalism in leading this Committee in its work during the 2014-16 biennium.

**Adjournment**
Having concluded work on its charges, and having formulated substantive recommendations for a work plan and leadership for the 2016-18 biennium, Chair declared the committee adjourned until the bylaws-required meeting of the committee at the 2016 CFP Biennial Meeting in Boise.
Chair Hawley re-created the Security Evaluation Workgroup and charged it to review and improve the exam security self-reporting process and report to the FPMCC at the next meeting

CHAPMAN, COLEMAN, CORCHADO, DOUGLAS, GUZZLE, KINDER, MCMILLION, PICHÉ, WILLIAMS
FORD

**Audience**

1. Direct
   1. FPMCC
2. Indirect
   1. Certification Bodies
   2. ANSI

**Current Process**

1. Certification Bodies complete two reports:
   1. Annual Surveillance (ANSI)
   2. Security Evaluation (Dr. Ford through ANSI)
      1. Data accumulated and aggregated
2. Security Evaluation Presented to FPMCC
   1. Thorough
   2. So what? Where do we go from here?
      1. Verification? Data to Evaluate and Improve?
Alternatives from the SEW

1. Discontinue any security evaluation by committee and rely on ANSI surveillance
2. Providers discuss security best practice to benefit the whole
3. Integrate security evaluation into annual surveillance
4. Scorecard approach for FPMCC

Chair Hawley re-created the Security Evaluation Workgroup and charged it to review and improved the exam security self-reporting process and report to the FPMCC at the next meeting

Alternative #1- Discontinue evaluation

1. Less administrative burden on Certification Bodies in the short-term
2. FPMCC has responsibility for the standard, standard change recommendations, including security
3. Provides a measurement opportunity that addresses test security at a moment in time

Chair Hawley re-created the Security Evaluation Workgroup and charged it to review and improved the exam security self-reporting process and report to the FPMCC at the next meeting

Alternative #2- Providers discuss and implement best practice

1. Great in a Utopian society
2. Not enforceable by committee
3. Trade secrets/Competitive advantage
4. Anti-trust possibilities

Chair Hawley re-created the Security Evaluation Workgroup and charged it to review and improved the exam security self-reporting process and report to the FPMCC at the next meeting
Alternative #3- Consolidate Reports

2. Has been evaluated by Dr. Ford, Dr. Krishna with recommendations accepted
3. Recommendations by one Certification Body with opportunity for feedback provided to all sub-group

Chair Havley re-created the Security Evaluation Workgroup and charged it to review and improved the exam security self-reporting process and report to the FPMCC at the next meeting.

Alternative #4- Scorecard Approach

1. If you were on a deserted island and had no cell phone or internet, what are the 5-15 numbers that you would need to get a definitive pulse on what’s working and not working?
2. A “pulse” of the certification security
3. Not intended to be all-inclusive
4. Confidential information
   1. ANSI collects information from Annual Surveillance/Security Evaluation
   2. ANSI aggregates
   3. ANSI distributes to FPMCC

Chair Havley re-created the Security Evaluation Workgroup and charged it to review and improved the exam security self-reporting process and report to the FPMCC at the next meeting.

Recommended FPMCC Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of exams delivered total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of test administrators that received initial training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of test administrators receiving retrained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of test administrator caused violations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of violations resulting in disciplinary actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of test administrators/admins audited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of documented cheating cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of documented cheating cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of exam booklets lost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of exam booklets lost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of answer sheets lost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of answer sheets lost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of breaches of QA system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of security issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of exams impacted by security issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee Deliberation

1. Committee deliberation and decisions – Dallas Meeting 10/21
   - Workgroup recommends Alt 3 + 4
   - Some providers felt more granular detail on security failures is beneficial
   - Types and frequency of violations would also be useful
   - The providers already categorize and aggregate violation type and frequency
   - ANSI could take this information and develop a scorecard
   - The scorecard could be combined with ANSI annual surveillance to yield actionable improvements
   - Chair Hawley asked Chapman, provider reps, and Krishna to identify scorecard by 11/20

Chair Hawley re-created the Security Evaluation Workgroup and charged it to review and improve the exam security self-reporting process and report to the FPMCC at the next meeting.
Minutes

1. Chair Jeff Hawley convened the meeting at 1:10 PM.
2. Roll was called (inserted below), a quorum not established, and Chair Hawley conducted and informational meeting.
3. Chair Hawley advised the members present that Patrick Guzzle, nominee to chair the FPMCC in the 2016-18 biennium, would be unable to serve if confirmed by the CFP Executive Board as Chair of the 2018 Conference for Food Protection Biennial Meeting. (Guzzle was subsequently confirmed).
4. Chair Hawley is in discussions with Executive Board on how to proceed. (The Executive Board subsequently requested that Chair Hawley remain in place through the first FPMCC meeting in the new biennium, at which time the committee can recommend a chair to the Executive Board.)
5. Chair Hawley briefly reviewed the two FPMCC-submitted issues, encouraged all to attend the committee formation meeting, and reminded Council members about the mandatory Council orientation session.
6. Logistics Chair Geoff Luebkemann reported arrangements are underway for the first meeting of the 2016-18 FPMCC.
7. The committee presented Chair Hawley a recognition plaque, inscribed:
   “Presented to Jeff Hawley, Chair, Food Protection Manager Certification Committee, Conference for Food Protection, 2012-2016; with deep appreciation for untiring and dedicated service, patient and exemplary leadership.”
8. Chair Hawley announced the 2018 Biennial Meeting location is Richmond, VA, and concluded the meeting at 1:50 PM.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Present?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hawley, Chair</td>
<td>Industry - Food Retail</td>
<td>Harris Teeter, LLC</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hollenbeck, Vice</td>
<td>Regulatory</td>
<td>National Environmental Health Association</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bagwell</td>
<td>Industry - Food Service</td>
<td>Taco Bell Corp/Yum Brands</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Brainerd, Jr</td>
<td>Industry - Food Retail</td>
<td>CVS/Caremark</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Carotenuto</td>
<td>Regulatory - Federal</td>
<td>Navy and Marine Corps Public Health Center</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chapman</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>StateFoodSafety.com</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Coleman</td>
<td>Consumer/ Independent</td>
<td>Consultant (UL-Retired)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Certification Provider</td>
<td>360training.com dba Learn2Serve.com</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dunleavy</td>
<td>Regulatory</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gaither</td>
<td>Regulatory - At-large (Local)</td>
<td>Coconino County (AZ) Health Department</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Guzzle</td>
<td>Regulatory - State</td>
<td>Idaho Department of Health and Welfare</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Halbrook</td>
<td>Industry - Food Service</td>
<td>Brinker International</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Industry - At-large (Vending / Distribution)</td>
<td>Performance Food Group</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kender</td>
<td>Academia</td>
<td>Johnson &amp; Wales University CCA</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lang</td>
<td>Regulatory - Local</td>
<td>Lane County Environmental Health</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Louden</td>
<td>Regulatory - Local</td>
<td>City of Minneapolis Environmental Health</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Luebkemann</td>
<td>Industry - Food Service</td>
<td>Florida Restaurant and Lodging Association</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lynch</td>
<td>Certification Provider</td>
<td>National Registry of Food Safety Professionals</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>McMillion</td>
<td>Certification Provider</td>
<td>Prometric</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Neal</td>
<td>Academia</td>
<td>University of Houston</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Paster</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Paster Training, Inc.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Piche</td>
<td>Certification Provider</td>
<td>National Restaurant Association</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Quam</td>
<td>Industry - At-large (Food Svc)</td>
<td>Wisconsin Restaurant Association</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Roughan</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>TAP Series LLC</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sarrocco-Smith</td>
<td>Regulatory - At-large (Local)</td>
<td>Lake County General Health District</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Industry - At-large (Food Svc)</td>
<td>Bojangles’ Restaurants, Inc.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Tryba</td>
<td>Industry - Food Retail</td>
<td>Big Y Foods, Inc.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Industry - Food Retail</td>
<td>HEB Grocery Company</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>