

# Conference for Food Protection – Committee Periodic Status Report

Template approved by the Executive Board May 2014

Committee Periodic Status Reports are considered **DRAFT** until reviewed and acknowledged by the Executive Board

## COMMITTEE NAME:

Food Service Employee Training Committee

## COUNCIL or EXECUTIVE BOARD ASSIGNMENT:

Council II

## DATE OF REPORT:

July 2, 2015

## SUBMITTED BY:

Co-chairs Chuck Catlin and Ben Chapman

## COMMITTEE MEMBER ROSTER:

Committee membership has not changed; see previously submitted and approved roster.

## COMMITTEE CHARGE(s):

### Charge 1

Make recommendations to the Conference for Food Protection in regard to:

- a. What a food employee should know about food safety, prioritized by risk.
- b. A guidance document to include recommendations for appropriate operator, regulator, and/or third-party food safety training program(s); including the criteria for the program and learning objectives.

### Charge 2

Report Committee recommendations to the 2016 CFP Biennial Meeting.

## COMMITTEE'S REQUESTED ACTION FOR EXECUTIVE BOARD (If Applicable):

N/A

## PROGRESS REPORT / COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES WITH ACTIVITY DATES:

### 1. *Progress on Overall Committee Activities*

Committee Co-Chairs polled Committee members and decided on dates for our Committee meetings moving forward:

March 18, 2015, Face-to-face meeting Chicago

June 7, 2015 Phone meeting discussed our three working groups

July 27, 2015, in Portland concurrent with IAFP

November, 2015, week 1, details TBD

### 2. *Progress Addressing each Assigned Committee Charge*

Our committee continues to make steady progress. We have broken our members into three subcommittees so that each can dig deeply into the subject matter. These subcommittees will create summaries for the entire committee to review. As we review the summaries we will make decisions on how we move forward. Our biggest challenge was resolved during our face-to-face meeting in Chicago. At this meeting we all aligned upon

# Conference for Food Protection – Committee Periodic Status Report

Template approved by the Executive Board May 2014

**Committee Periodic Status Reports are considered DRAFT until reviewed and acknowledged by the Executive Board**

the concept that our recommendations must encompass both a knowledge base and a behavioral component that will motivate food handlers to model specific actions that proactively prevent foodborne illnesses. In essence food handlers need to realize that their job that contains more risks than they had previously imagined.

## **Subcommittee 1 - Industry non-regulatory delivery of food handler training**

Subcommittee 1 will focus on compiling and reviewing sources of information to help us make some decisions on what to include in our full committee report. The main sources of information are from existing programs that the retail and food service industry have implemented. Pertinent questions we will answer:

- What is common between the programs (content, practices, approach)?
- What is unique about any of the programs?
- Are there particular emphases?
- Delivery modes?
- Evaluation?

## **Subcommittee 2 - Review current state requirements (i.e., CA, IL, FL)**

Subcommittee 2 is focusing on compiling and reviewing sources of information to help us make some decisions on what to include in our full committee report. The main sources of information will be gleaned from states that currently require some sort of food handler training. Pertinent questions we'd like you to answer:

- What is common between the programs (content, practices, approach)?
- What is unique about any of the programs?
- Are there particular emphases?
- Lessons learned from the process (where did the programs/requirements start, where did they end up what were the sticky points)?
- Delivery modes?

## **Subcommittee #3 - FDA Risk Factor related employee activities and research**

Subcommittee 3 is focusing on reviewing and analyzing existing sources of data to help us make some decisions on what to include in our full committee report. These include:

- FDA Retail Risk Factor Study results.  
(<http://www.fda.gov/Food/GuidanceRegulation/RetailFoodProtection/FoodborneIllnessRiskFactorReduction/ucm230313.htm>)
- Information gleaned from the 2013 Food Code that relates to food handlers.
- Peer reviewed literature and other pertinent research on food handler practices and behaviors.

**CFP Food Service Employee Training Committee Meeting**  
**Chicago, IL - March 18, 2015**  
**Minutes of the Meeting**

---

**Attendance (see below)**

**1. Introductions**

The members introduced themselves and their interest in this committee.

**2. An industry and regulatory perspective on the process (Chuck Catlin)**

Co-Chair Chuck Catlin presented an overview of perspectives for the Committee to consider as it frames its work. It was noted that the typical food employee sees their activity as “low risk,” a dangerous perspective. Catlin also reminded the members that consensus is important, and asked them to leave personal and business biases aside, and deliberate with open-mindedness.

**3. Framing behavior-based training (Ben Chapman)**

Co-Chair Ben Chapman suggested that the Committee could work on “knowledge based” guidance, but miss the opportunity to focus on changing behavior. Looking at the food safety requirements and risk factors viewed through the “why” of best practices, in a “behavior based” frame might yield greater impact. Identifying desirable behaviors and advancing their adoption and implementation is the opportunity. Chapman went on to present some academic background information for the members’ consideration, including:

- A good analogy for our work is to consider employees that clean hospital rooms: its known that they care, and understand that their interventions (sanitizing to control infection) matters.
- For our purposes, how do we ensure that food employees care? Teaching and showing them that people get sick when they fail to adhere to standards, and that is largely preventable by food employees. Training must show them how to do this, and getting them talking to each other about this is essential to its successful adoption.
- Methods that matter:
  1. Using stories more than numbers
  2. Putting the info into relatable context for the employee
  3. Generating surprise
  4. Generating ongoing dialog

**4. Review of the committee charge, clarification of scope**

Charge 1

Make recommendations to the Conference for Food Protection in regard to:

- a. What a food employee should know about food safety, prioritized by risk.

- b. A guidance document to include recommendations for appropriate operator, regulator, and/or third-party food safety training program(s); including the criteria for the program and learning objectives.

## Charge 2

Report Committee recommendations to the 2016 CFP Biennial Meeting.

Chapman asked Council II member Brian Turner to perspective on this Committee's genesis, and about what audience we should focus on. Turner explained that discussion about forming this Committee centered on the need for consistent criteria for "frontline" training, and how to provide value (impact) to that training.

Discussion ensued regarding the jobs/people this Committee should focus on impacting, and it was suggested that while position-specific information might be useful, starting with the Food Code definition of "food employee" is a better, more general, and broader reaching start. Consensus of the Committee is to use the Food Code definition of "food employee." Discussion ensued regarding the study and creation of JTAs, and consensus reached that this would not be undertaken by the Committee.

Chapman then asked the Committee to consider clarifying its understanding of the term "prioritized" in the charge, and consensus was reached that this means starting with the known risk factors and prioritizing their importance in training content. Chapman will communicate this "reading" of the prioritization charge to the CFP Executive Board.

Additional consensus was reached by the Committee that:

- the Committee's work will apply to employees in any place the Food Code applies to.
- the learning objectives in the Committee charge are from section a) of the charge (with perspective provided from Council II by Brian Turner).

## 5. Review cataloged documents/data sources

- Job Task Analysis (JTA) and the process
- Current industry outlines
- Compliance/behavior change literature related to employee food safety training
- FDA risk factor study insights

Chapman overviewed documents that Committee members were provided, and asked for others to be submitted. Differentiation was established between "certificate" (that uses learning objectives), and "certification" (that uses a JTA) work. Committee consensus is to proceed based on learning objectives, rather than JTAs.

Discussion ensued regarding CA and IL programs, and their basis in ASTM 2659, which does require a JTA, and consensus reached that what the Committee produces must be "measurable and reportable," and provide a template for national consistency.

Opposition was voiced to moving in any way toward ASTM 2659 and/or employee testing. It was pointed out that demonstration of knowledge via employee questions currently exists in the Food Code. Steven Hughes, FDA consultant to the Committee, pointed out that three main areas exist in our review: Content, Mechanics (implementation), and Food Code relativity, and suggested the Committee focus on the Content mission.

## **6. Establish subcommittees for each group**

Chapman reviewed three proposed subcommittees scopes of work:

1. Review current Industry non-regulatory delivery
2. Review current state requirements (i.e., CA, IL, FL)
3. FDA Risk Factor related employee activities (FC sec. 203.11; “must haves” and “nice to haves”).

The Committee Co-Chairs will call for volunteers to subcommittees, then when formed those groups will select their chairs.

Catlin pointed out that the Committee should be creative in its objectives and activity, not simply use existing “check boxes,” and be aware of the opportunity to create work product based in or derived from something that does not yet exist.

## **7. Milestone setting**

- Co-Chairs set March 27 as the deadline for subcommittee sign up.
- Subcommittees will meet at their own direction, and once empanelled the Committee Co-Chairs will establish reporting deadlines for the remainder of the CFP 2014-16 cycle.
- Committee Co-Chairs will poll Committee members for three proposed Committee meetings moving forward, with integration of the subcommittee schedules. Potential dates:
  - May 2015, in Chicago concurrent with the NRA show
  - July 24-27, 2015, in Portland concurrent with IAFP
  - November, 2015, week 1, details TBD

## **8. Adjourn**

With unanimous consent the Committee adjourned at 1:40 PM.