

Conference for Food Protection 2006-2008  
Executive Board Meeting Committee Update

**Council II – Electronic Data Capture and Reporting Committee Report**

---

Date of Committee Report: 7/31/2007

Submitted By: Beth Cannon, Sandra Lancaster

Committee Charge(s):

The Conference recommends that a new Electronic Data Capture and Reporting System Committee be formed and work with the Inspection Form Committee to identify best practices and lessons learned in the development and sharing of an electronic data capture and reporting system for presentation at the 2008 CFP Biennial Meeting.

Committee Members:

*Please see attached document.*

Progress Report/Committee Activities:

The survey developed by the committee was published on the CDC's EHS-net website. A link to the survey was sent to over 1100 public health officials, based on a list provided by Brad Tufto with FDA. A total of 210 responses have been received. The Survey closed on July 31. Results of the survey are below.

Requested Actions:

A conference call has been scheduled for 8/3 to discuss survey results.

**Survey Results**

**Responses: 210**

**Jurisdiction Information**

1. What is the level of jurisdiction represented in your answers? (select one)

- Local: **167 (79.5%)**
- State: **34 (16.2%)**
- Territorial: **1 (0.5%)**
- Tribal: **2 (1.0%)**
- Federal: **2 (1.0%)**
- Other: **4 (1.9%)**
  - Specify Type: All county

1a. What state does your jurisdiction represent?

Alabama	1	Montana	4
Alaska	1	Nebraska	2
Arizona	7	Nevada	3
Arkansas	1	New Hampshire	2
California	13	New Jersey	1
Colorado	1	New Mexico	2
Connecticut	11	New York	12
Delaware	1	North Carolina	13
Florida	1	North Dakota	
Georgia	13	Ohio	16
Hawaii	3	Oklahoma	1
Idaho	3	Oregon	6
Illinois	1	Pennsylvania	1
Indiana	19	Rhode Island	1
Iowa	1	South Carolina	1
Kansas	2	South Dakota	
Kentucky	6	Tennessee	
Louisiana	2	Texas	10
Maine		Utah	3
Maryland	2	Vermont	1
Massachusetts		Virginia	1
Michigan	1	Washington	8
Minnesota	10	West Virginia	4
Mississippi		Wisconsin	
Missouri	8	Wyoming	3

2. What is the name of your jurisdiction?

Counties, cities, states listed

3. What categories of food establishments is your jurisdiction responsible for inspecting? (Check all that apply)

Food Service (Including Temporary and Mobile): **204 (97.1%)**

Food Store: **153 (72.9%)**

Food Vending: **124 (59.0%)**

Institution: **162 (77.1%)**

Other: Specify **43 (20.5%)**

**Included: B&B, Catering, Day Care, Processing, Hotels, etc.**

4. How many food establishments are included in your total food inspection program?

**Range: 7 to 50,000**

**Mean: 3135**

**Median: 600**

#### **Inspection Report Information**

5. Does your jurisdiction use an electronic method for collecting and/or storing inspection data?

- **Yes: 147 (70%)**
- **No: 63 (30%)**

5a. How is your electronic inspection data collected?

- **By inspector in the field: 71 (48.3%)**
- **Transferred in office from paper inspection report: 71 (48.3%)**
- **Other: 5 (4.8)**

5b. Where is your electronic inspection data stored?

- **Onsite in an agency maintained database: 97 (66.0%)**
- **Transferred to a state agency (or similar entity) maintained database: 27 (18.4%)**
- **Offsite on inspection software vendor's database: 17 (11.6%)**
- **Other: 6 (4.1%)**

Specify: Most indicate a combination

5c. Do you have plans in place to begin such a program in the future?

- **Yes, within 6 months: 7 (11.1%)**
- **Yes, within 1 year: 11 (17.5%)**
- **Yes, but it is more than one year out: 23 (36.5%)**
- **No, we do not currently have any plans: 22 (34.5)**

6. Do you use a Conference for Protection, Food Code based inspection form?

- **Yes: 101 (48.1%)**
- **No: 109 (51.9%)**

7. What version of the Food Code is your form based on?

- **2005: 37**
- **2003: 12**
- **2001: 20**
- **1999: 18**
- **1997: 4**
- **1995: 1**
- **1993: 2**
- **1982 Model Foodservice Code: 2**
- **1976 Model Foodservice Code: 4**
- **Other: 1**

8. Does your inspection form divide items into 'Foodborne Illness Risk Factors and Public Health Interventions' and 'Good Retail Practices'?

- **Yes: 78 (37.1%)**
- **No: 132 (62.9%)**

9. Does your inspection form have the following capabilities (check all that apply)

Items are designated as **Critical / Non-critical: 180 (85.7%)**

Items can be marked **Not Applicable: 96 (45.7%)**

Items can be marked **Not Observed: 90 (42.9%)**

Facilities are assigned a **Risk Category: 133 (63.3%)**

**Reason for inspection** is noted (Routine/Regular, Re-inspection, Complaint): **205 (97.6%)**

**Repeat** issues are tracked: **144(68.6%)**

Issues that are **Corrected** while the inspector was on site are tracked: **153 (72.9%)**

10. What capabilities would your ideal inspection form contain? (check all that apply)

Items are designated as **Critical / Non-critical: 196 (93.3%)**

Items can be marked **Not Applicable: 148 (70.5)**

Items can be marked **Not Observed: 147 (70.0%)**

Facilities are assigned a **Risk Category: 172 (81.9%)**

**Reason for inspection** is noted (Routine/Regular, Re-inspection, Complaint): **192 (91.4%)**

**Repeat** issues are tracked: **198(94.3%)**

Issues that are **Corrected** while the inspector was on site are tracked: **179 (85.2%)**

Other (specify): **36 (17.1%)**

Score, rating, HACCP, Food handler certification, enforcement action, inspection time, positive comments, correct by dates, code citation,

11. Would your jurisdiction be interested in participating in a program, which involves sending your anonymous electronic data to a central database for research purposes such as improving food safety practices and codes?

- Yes, definitely: **32 (15.2%)**
- Only if the time/resource commitment is minimal: **123 (58.6%)**
- No, we would not be interested: **55 (26.2%)**

12. Other Comments on Electronic Food Inspection Reports and Data Sharing: **Variety of answers**