

Conference for Food Protection Executive Board Meeting Committee Report

COMMITTEE NAME: Inspection Form Scoring Committee

COUNCIL (I, II, or III): II

DATE OF REPORT: 3/4/2011

SUBMITTED BY: Margaret Binkley

COMMITTEE'S REQUESTED ACTION FOR BOARD:
N/A

PROGRESS REPORT / COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES WITH ACTIVITY DATES:

October 22, 2010, initial email went to all members of the committee explaining the charge of the committee, and the process that will be followed. Everyone was asked to provide a list of available dates for conference call. A survey was sent with the email to gather information stating, Which of the following assumptions generated by the Inspection Scoring Committee are of greatest interest to address this charge?

Conference call was held December 16th. Introductions were made, objectives were formed for the committee, teams were discussed that will handle the different objectives of the committee. Stakeholders were identified. The results included:

Introductions

Future conferences will be on webinars with toll free number and handle 100 callers at a sitting; Multiple members from one entity will be allowed

Form objective

Is our objective as the Committee to reduce foodborne illness? Increase restaurant compliance? Or getting the word out to the public?

Can the knowledge of scores allow for the public to make better decisions about restaurant selection or reduce food-borne illness? Or both?

Survey results: over-whelming majority agrees that a form that is intuitive to both the public and inspector is the most important charge of the committee.

Teams:

1. Information Gatherers

- Gather form and gather health data from local jurisdictions who are willing to comply
- Freedom of information? Statutory? Track who is inconvenient
- Can we go to counties we know to provide FBI data (large, med, small jurisdictions)? How do we find commonality in jurisdictions? Consider the role of demographics
- FDA seek scoring system used across the country
- How many systems being used? Can we survey to identify commonalities?

2. Practitioner

- Pilot test different findings to determine if it works for inspectors

3. Results Team

- Academia will take information; provide its meaningfulness and conclusions.

4. Stakeholders

- Consumers-journal submittal next week demonstrates that more narrative health reports affect the choices people make on where to eat

5. Health Inspectors

Email was sent with the summary of the conference call and members were asked to choose a team they wanted to be involved with. The current form listed in the food code as well as the form that was developed by the past committee were attached to the email.

Another email was sent 2/1/2011 to members of the committee along with the latest roster of members. The email informed everyone the teams for the committee, the description of the teams; information gatherers, practitioners, results team and informed members. The email asked those members who have not chosen a team as of yet to do this. Also, each team was asked to select a team leader. After teams were confirmed, conference calls for each team will take place. The inspection form developed by the past Inspection Form Committee was again attached to the email.