

**Conference for Food Protection  
Executive Board Meeting Committee Report**

**COMMITTEE NAME:** Strategic Planning Committee

**COUNCIL (I, II, or III):** Executive Board

**DATE OF REPORT:** December 11, 2009

**SUBMITTED BY:** Roger Hancock, Chair

**COMMITTEE CHARGE(S):** No Current Outstanding Charges

**REQUESTED ACTION BY BOARD (If Applicable):**

**COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

ACTIVITIES

The Strategic Planning Committee met via conference call 5 times since the CFP Biennial meeting in April, 2008. The committee enjoyed participation from all members. The committee had no outstanding issues to address.

Guided by the Mission statement of the Committee, we openly discussed several ideas for both short and long range directions for the Conference.

Mission

The Strategic Planning Committee develops a strategic plan which includes better ways to market the Conference and proposes short-range and long-range strategic direction using the mission and vision of the Strategic Plan.

Two overriding paths emerged as pivotal for determining the direction of the Conference:

*Uniformity:* Driving greater uniformity of Food Code adoption, standardizing of food regulations, and participating more actively in legislative processes with the goal of uniformity. This track was considered short term.

*Expansion:* Expanding the involvement of CFP activity to issues beyond retail food safety programs. The discussion focused on whether the current CFP business model, which focuses primarily on retail food safety and the Food Code, will be successful and sustainable in the future. The CFP format that was created in 1986 has been successful and extremely valuable, especially in deliberating issues relating to the FDA Food Code.

After 17 years of deliberation on the FDA Food Code, some committee members felt most of the contentious issues have been resolved. It has been suggested that once the major issues are resolved then the CFP might not be relevant. For the CFP to remain relevant in the future, it might have to expand beyond retail food safety issues, to include some of the important food safety topics facing us today. These topics include, for example, ; recall effectiveness, traceability, produce food safety from farm to table, global food safety initiative, food defense, new processing technology including interventions. This track was considered long term.

Two work groups were created to discuss the steps needed to develop each of these tracks into meaningful plans for the Conference to consider. Before much work was done by either group, we began thinking about strategies to get broader input from the Conference to help further define the issues. This input would then insure that any plans would represent the Conference thinking as a whole.

Out of this discussion came the idea of conducting a survey of the membership. Time was spent developing the survey questions and format, as well as discussing implementation. With Conference support, the Committee subscribed to Survey Monkey to conduct the survey.

On November 18th, an e-mail was sent to all 504 Conference members with a link to the survey. Over the next 21 days, 162 surveys were completed (32%).

The committee then met to discuss the survey results, and plan next steps. The survey data and question analysis are attached to this report as Appendix 1 and 2.

### **Analysis:**

The committee analyzed the survey data in two ways. First, questions were grouped into high-medium-low support categories based on a simple percentage of responses. Second, to account for the strength of responses, questions were grouped into the same three categories using a weighted value for the responses as follows:

Strongly Agree	+2
Agree	+1
No Opinion	0
Moderately Disagree	-1
Strongly Disagree	-2

Both methods yielded very similar groupings of the questions, with the High Ranking group nearly identical between the methods. The rankings by simple percentage are shown below:

### **High Ranking ( $\geq 70.0\%$ )**

<u>%</u>	<u>Question</u>
86.7	#8 The CFP should focus more on creating uniformity in state food codes, laws, and regulations.
86.6	#4 The CFP should be more involved with issues associated with food protection and defense.
86.2	#26 The CFP will be relevant once major issues in the Food Code are resolved.
84.3	#18 The CFP should develop rules to prevent commercial interests from being promoted through the CFP.
83.5	#27 The FDA Food code still has significant room for improvement and needs more input from CFP.
80.7	#6 The CFP should be more involved with discussion on recalls and traceability.
74.0	#22 The CFP should create a council, or forum, that focuses on discussion of emerging food safety issues.
72.8	#19 The CFP should target growth through increased membership from currently active groups/constituencies.

### **Medium Ranking (50.0 – 69.9%)**

69.7	#14 The CFP mission statement accurately reflects our direction and action.
67.3	#25 The CFP should charge a new or existing Council with deliberation of emerging food safety issues that are not entirely retail focused, such as recalls, traceability, produce safety, and other farm to table topics.
66.0	#2 The CFP should be more involved with discussion of the Global Food Safety Initiative (GFSI).
66.9	#20 The CFP should target growth through membership from new groups/constituencies.
65.0	#5 The CFP should be more involved with food manufacturers and issues that affect them.
64.6	#10 The CFP should be more involved with specific commodity groups where food safety is important (like produce, meat, etc.).
59.1	#15 The CFP should include other segments of the food industry in addition to retail oriented groups.
58.6	#23 The CFP should provide more educational forums.
57.4	#11 The CFP should be more than just a retail-focused food organization, and should expand into other areas that impact food safety.
56.5	#17 The CFP should assist with issues related to locally grown and marketed products.
53.2	#24 The CFP should focus more on helping the food industry and regulatory agencies deal with variances.
53.1	#7 The CFP should be more involved with food production (farming) operations and issues that affect them.

### **Low Ranking (<50.0%)**

46.3	#16 The CFP should focus more on issues related to food allergies.
39.1	#9 The CFP should be a more global organization.
34.8	#13 The CFP should be much broader in scope.
25.7	#12 The CFP should be more connected with the Interstate Milk Shippers group.
17.5	#3 The CFP should be more involved with discussion of nutrition-based issues that affect health like, trans-fats, omega 3 fatty acids.
12.1	#21 The CFP should increase its administrative and management staff.

One modification was made to question 26 so that its evaluation paralleled all other questions. By removing the word "not" from Question 26 it states is question positively like all the rest of the questions. I re-calculated the score for both Cas' and Rich's ranking by reversing the responses, like we talked about, which moved Question 26 from low support to high support. This change produced the re-analysis as follows:

Question 26: "The CFP will not be relevant once major issues in the Food Code are resolved."

Strongly Disagree	54.1%
Moderately Disagree	32.1%
No Opinion	6.3%
Agree	6.3%
Strongly Agree	1.3%

The discussion suggested that if the question had been worded like this: ""The CFP will be relevant once major issues in the Food Code are resolved,"

Then the answers would have looked like this:

Strongly Disagree	1.3%
Moderately Disagree	6.3%
No Opinion	6.3%
Agree	32.1%
Strongly Agree	54.1%

Survey and statistician pros may have reason to object to this manipulation when it comes to survey responses and statistical validity. But in looking for trends and direction, it seems safe to infer that the responders are indicating that they think the CFP will be relevant even after major issues in the Food Code are resolved. In other words, a negative response to a negative question is comparable to a positive response to a positive question.

### RECOMMENDATION

The committee determined that only the High Ranking questions garnered enough support from the conference to provide direction. Of the nine questions in the this group, six of them can be easily developed into Action items, while three do not lend themselves to follow up action.

### Action Item Questions

- #4 The CFP should be more involved with issues associated with food protection and defense.
- #6 The CFP should be more involved with discussion on recalls and traceability.
- #8 The CFP should focus more on creating uniformity in state food codes, laws, and regulations.
- #18 The CFP should develop rules to prevent commercial interests from being promoted through the CFP.
- #19 The CFP should target growth through increased membership from currently active groups/constituencies.
- #22 The CFP should create a council, or forum, that focuses on discussion of emerging food safety issues.

### Non-Follow Up Item Questions

#14 The CFP mission statement accurately reflects our direction and action.

#26 The CFP will not be relevant once major issues in the Food Code are resolved.

#27 The FDA Food code still has significant room for improvement and needs more input from CFP.

The committee concurred that the six action item questions provide good impetus for future plans. The action item questions can be grouped into the short term *Uniformity*, and long term *Expansion* paths described above. With proper planning and follow through on these items, the CFP will continue to provide a meaningful forum for the advancement of food protection and defense. Due to a lack of time between the survey completion and preparation for the next Biennial meeting, the committee agreed to pass the planning and follow through on the Action Item Questions to the next Strategic Planning committee.

### **REQUESTED ACTION**

The committee requests that this report with its recommendations be provided to the next Strategic Planning Committee Chair for follow up planning as indicated, and ensuing actions.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger Hancock, Chair  
Strategic Planning Committee