

Conference for Food Protection – Committee FINAL Report

Template approved: 08/14/2013

Committee Final Reports are considered DRAFT until deliberated and acknowledged by the assigned Council at the Biennial Meeting

COMMITTEE NAME: Strategic Planning Committee (SPC)

COUNCIL or EXECUTIVE BOARD ASSIGNMENT: Executive Board

DATE OF REPORT: March 1, 2016

SUBMITTED BY: James Mack Chair & Thomas Ford Co-Chair

COMMITTEE CHARGE(s): Develops a strategic plan which includes better ways to market the Conference as well as short-range and long-range strategic issues using the mission and vision of the Strategic Plan as guidance.

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Progress on Overall Committee Activities:

The committee met eight times during May 2014 – March 2016. During this period, the committee made great strides toward the development of the strategic plan. The committee has completed the Conference for Food Protection Biennial Meeting Study conducted by Dr. Draper and Dr. Neal, University of Houston, Conrad H. Hilton College of Hotel and Restaurant Management. The study report is attached as Appendix I. The committee has improved the navigation program based upon feedback received from the membership. See Appendix II. Major activities toward these objectives are as follows:

June 2014

- a. SPC added two new members to the committee in 2014

New Members Surveys Feedback & Discussion

- b. The group felt the Navigator program was successful. Comments from SPC included up front work needed; navigator mentee improvement; connection throughout the conference with mentor; use of video to assist in orienting new members; Will form an ad hoc group from SPC to develop a process going forward. SPC is looking at the use of video on the website to help with the navigator project. Discussion regarding whether the Navigator Program is a SPC function ensued. Motion to keep the navigator program with SPC made by Jessica seconded by Elizabeth. Motion passed with one vote no and one vote abstaining.

Event Proposal Discussion

- c. Committee reviewed the document and a discussion ensued regarding the relevancy/timing of the project to SPC goal of reviewing/revising the format for the CFP. Despite such trepidation relating to the relevancy/timing of the project, many

Conference for Food Protection – Committee FINAL Report

Template approved: 08/14/2013

Committee Final Reports are considered DRAFT until deliberated and acknowledged by the assigned Council at the Biennial Meeting

members felt the project has merit but not now. Motion to not pursue the project because of time limitation made by Elizabeth Nutt, seconded by Kevin Smith. Motion passed with 3 no vote, 1 abstaining.

August 2014

a. Event Proposal

James summarized the conference call held August 5 with James, Tom and Elizabeth Nut concerning the survey proposal by Dr. Neal. James explained the need to have further discussion around content of the tool but also the need to postpone the proposal due to the long lead time required for such a survey to actually be able to be tied to a particular CFP.

Motion to take approach of discussing further with Drs. Neal and Draper 2016 and implement 2020 was made.

Motion proposed and seconded by Chuck and Tom

b. SWOT Ad Hoc

Discussion began by reviewing the SWOT notes submitted by Becky A discussion evolved about how the SWOT process might proceed:

James proposed creating an ad hoc committee from the SPC to take this analysis to completion. Chuck and Becky volunteered, and James and Tom would fill out the Ad Hoc committee.

James suggested that the SWOT analysis would drive the creation of a Strategic plan that the SPC would submit to the CFP board. Becky asked for clarification about the goal of the analysis, would the goal be to address items such as identify improvements needed, or increase attendance, etc. James explained using tools, such as the survey proposed by Dr. Neal, and additional outreach efforts such as the new attendee program begun at the 2014 CFP were examples of the goal and potential end results.

The group discussion that followed lead to the suggestion of making a time line and milestone approach to the project and have James present to the board for their review and support of the approach.

The time line suggested was to begin the project now with the creation of the ad hoc committee, the committee conducts the SWOT analysis using the SPC survey, but also considering other sources of information such as member and board input and impressions. The Ad hoc committee would present the analysis to the complete SPC for their review and acceptance. The SPC would then begin the task of using the SWOT report to create the strategic plan for the CFP. The goal would be to submit the Strategic Plan to the board by the 2016 conference.

Kevin asked that the Strategic plan component be further clarified as to root causes that may drive what actions the SPC and SP may request.

Conference for Food Protection – Committee FINAL Report

Template approved: 08/14/2013

Committee Final Reports are considered DRAFT until deliberated and acknowledged by the assigned Council at the Biennial Meeting

Becky stressed the need to understand the effort and work that needs to move from the SWOT exercise to a strategic plan and the need to be concerned and understand that. Kevin asked if there should be a focused list of issues to keep the project manageable. Kelly talked about need to address the financial and also attrition of experienced members and ability/desire of gaining new attendees that are willing to fill in.

The formation of the AD Hoc committee, the idea of the timeline/milestone approach for the project and the suggestion that James present this concept to the board and the next meeting was motioned and seconded by Becky and Kevin.

December 2014

a. Navigator

Elizabeth reviewed the previously provided draft CFP Navigator Program.

- We need to define the requirements for navigators.
- Incorporate into the registration process to help define expectations of the navigators and their availability to the new members.
- Define a 15 minute timeframe for the navigators to meet up collectively at the conference.
- Have a navigator at the registration booth to help promote the program and direct interested new members.
- Navigators should meet with their new members before the meeting starts.
- A script would be beneficial to help standardize the expectations and help ensure a consistent approach. This should also include timeframes for advance communications with the new members.

Tom

- Share creative ways to meet your new member(s).
- Provide the navigator some examples of how they can approach their role and engage with the new member.
- Define who (expectations) can participate in the navigator role.
- Have a navigator at the registration booth.
- Define a means to make new members aware of the navigator process during the application submittal/registration process.

David

- We need to successfully work the process into the conference program.
- In the registration process the form asks the applicant to select if they are a first time attendee. Possibly add if they would like to have a navigator assigned to them.
- Define the role of a navigator and qualifications.
- Possibly email a list of selected navigators to new members in advance of the conference for them to choose.
- It would be good to have the navigator and new member meet on Sunday and/or before the first session and after the first session.
- Have a 1 to 1 matchup of navigator to new member.

Conference for Food Protection – Committee FINAL Report

Template approved: 08/14/2013

Committee Final Reports are considered DRAFT until deliberated and acknowledged by the assigned Council at the Biennial Meeting

- Open up this role to current members that would be interested in being a Navigator
- We would need to look into how we would pair people up or make it a random selection.
- Define the navigator role in conference promotional materials or at time of on line registration. Space may be limited if placed in the on-line registration.
- First time attendees have a ribbon that can be attached to their name tag.

Kelli

- Added that the Navigator label could be added to that person's name tag.

Elizabeth

- Email to the current members with the criteria of the navigator for any interest.

David

- Part of the registration could include; a) advance material about the navigator and benefits and b) in the on-line registration form.
- Put this out 3 months prior to the conference.

Kevin

- He agreed with most of what David stated, but felt 3 new members paired with the navigator would help improve networking and be better received.
- He would like to see the Executive Board members well represented as Navigators.

Kelli

- She agreed with multiple people and sees the benefit of networking.

Tom

- What does David need? James will need to provide some specific recommendations for the program and timeline for implantation to the Executive Board during the April 2015 meeting. A small working group could work with Event Brite to incorporate into the registration process. This is part of what Elizabeth and Jessica are currently working on.
- By Oct/Nov 2015 navigator information would need to be shared with the membership previously approved by the Executive Board.

Elizabeth

- She will work with her team to define the criteria for being a navigator based on a model of each having 3 new members.
- Board Members are preferred; Past Board Members second choice; then nominations from Board Members from the membership would be the third choice.

David

- First contact with the new member is critical to get their introductions and planning defined before the conference starts.

Conference for Food Protection – Committee FINAL Report

Template approved: 08/14/2013

Committee Final Reports are considered DRAFT until deliberated and acknowledged by the assigned Council at the Biennial Meeting

Tom

- Suggested that the working group define ideas to best connect with new members
- Two basic expectations that the new members will gain: 1) Learn the CFP process and 2) Network with others. It may be good to plan to connect with other navigators and their groups to expand networking.
- These recommendations for the navigator role and implementation need to be approved by the SPC and provided to James to present at the April Board meeting.
- Elizabeth and Jessica will draft ideas to be shared during the January SPC meeting. We need to have the final plan Board approved and ready by the August Board meeting.

b. Event Proposal

Discussed the provided Dr. Draper 13 question survey and provided comments. Not all SPC members had time to review the attached questions. He asked that we review the comments and questions and send to he and James prior to the next meeting in January or be prepared to discuss at that time.

c. SWOT

They held a call and discussed the components of a SWOT and questions that might be needed to help with this process.

d. American Indian Demographics

Kevin

- He commented that this group may not be represented at CFP and might need additional outreach to this untapped resource.

Jessica

- She commented she and Larry Edwards worked in the past to stimulate their involvement with little success. Possibly add to future SPC meetings to discuss further ways to reach this and other untapped audiences.

e. Comments from the Chair/Vice Chair

Tom

- Tom spoke for he and James that they greatly appreciate the work and dedication of the SPC.
- He will send out a Doodle poll soon to arrange for the meeting in January.

Conference for Food Protection – Committee FINAL Report

Template approved: 08/14/2013

Committee Final Reports are considered DRAFT until deliberated and acknowledged by the assigned Council at the Biennial Meeting

January 2015

a. Navigator Program

- Elizabeth and Jessica - Reviewed the current CFP Biennial Meeting Navigator Program - DRAFT.
- They presented the 7 points with additional discussion from the group.
- Comments included:
 - Get information to the new members earlier in the process so they can be prepared for what to expect at the conference. There are many ways that this may happen.
 - Leverage the information on the CFP website to help with the education of new members.
 - Maybe a checklist “cheat sheet” of items that should be reviewed would be helpful.
 - It may be beneficial to have the navigator (or alternate) sit in with the new member during the New Member Orientation presentation at CFP.
 - Leverage the template letter developed by Chris Gordon. Email to the new member with links to applicable sections of the CFP website.
 - A phone call to the new member from the navigator followed by an email would be helpful.
 - Note - Dave mentioned that when Issues are posted to the website that the members will be notified.
- Elizabeth and Jessica will revisit the most recent draft document and incorporate the elements that were discussed today and present during the next SPC call. Any additional comments from the SPC should be emailed to Elizabeth and Jessica.

b. Event Study

The survey instrument questions were reviewed with the following comments:

- The ratings may not need to provide all 7 choices, maybe just 5.
- There was a lot of discussion about the questions and if they are applicable to CFP or not. The survey was intended to be published and may explain some of the questions that really don't apply to our needs.
- The Event Proposal team will meet with the developers (Dr. Neal and Dr. Draper) to review the questions and intension of the survey.
- Information from the Event Proposal team meeting may be shared in advance of the next SPC call.

March 2015

Conference for Food Protection – Committee FINAL Report

Template approved: 08/14/2013

Committee Final Reports are considered DRAFT until deliberated and acknowledged by the assigned Council at the Biennial Meeting

a. Navigator Program

- Jessica along with Elizabeth reviewed the most recent Navigator Program draft and Sample Letter.
- Navigator Doc – Some of the comments captures were:
 - Remove the first point under item 7
 - Place a version number on the doc
 - Should “Newbie” be used or some other term? Ideas shared were First Time Attendee or Freshman.
 - It would be nice to provide some form of recognition for the Navigators
 - Under line 7 the navigator will either email, call or use the attached letter to communicate with the first time attendee. Line item 4 will be removed.
- There was discussion around the use of the sample letter with the CFP logo. It was the consensus of the group to leave the sample letter as is and not include the CFP logo.
- For the 2016 registration we should be prepared to act on the modified navigator process. James will present at the April EB meeting for review and approval with the changes made by Jessica and Elisabeth. A copy of the changes will be sent to the committee and James concurrently. Any significant concerns should be shared with James as soon as possible.
- The SPC accepted the minor adjustments discussed and a final document will be sent to all members before James presents to the Executive Board. All should share comments quickly with the group once the update has been shared.

b. Event Study

- Dr. Neal and Dr. Draper have been sent the survey tool with feedback from the sub-committee for review and consideration. This includes recent comments from the SWOT sub-team. This needs to be sent to the larger SPC for review after Dr. Neal and Dr. Draper’s review.
- This survey is around the CFP Bi-Annual meeting and conferences in general and will need to be clearly defined in the survey questions. James will provide an update to the Executive Board in April, however, nothing for them to approve at this time.
- Work is done at this point and waiting for feedback from Dr. Neal and Dr. Draper. Once received James will send the survey tool with their comments back to the entire SPC.
- The plan is to implement the Event survey at the 2016 biennial meeting. The SWOT information will be reviewed for insight and shared with the SPC. (There was discussion with how effective this SWOT will be as part of the Event survey).

c. SWOT

- It was discussed to possibly put a separate survey tool out to the CFP leadership, (Board Members, Council and Committee Chairs/Co-Chairs and Vice Chairs) to understand SWOT from their perspectives. The SWOT team will meet before the

Conference for Food Protection – Committee FINAL Report

Template approved: 08/14/2013

Committee Final Reports are considered DRAFT until deliberated and acknowledged by the assigned Council at the Biennial Meeting

next full committee meeting to develop some draft questions to share with the SPC prior to the May meeting.

May 2015

a. Navigator Program

- Jessica reviewed the most recent Navigator Program draft. This is the same document and version reviewed at the Spring Board Meeting. There were no substantial changes.
- There is a need for more information to be shared with the delegates and how the CFP process works. It would be preferred that all understand the CFP- Rules for Engagement. It may be beneficial to add a link to this document on the website along with other relevant materials specifically to aid new members.
- More printed information is needed for new attendees to understand rules of engagement and limits to Issue presenters. Additional information may be needed. Possibly put this information on the CFP website.
- Issue presenter rules might be set by the Council Chair at the beginning of the meeting. This helps all understand the expectations.
- We would like to have a link added to the information for delegates (CFP – Rule of Engagement). This and other relevant information regarding the CFP process is in the New Member Orientation presentation.
- A flow diagram of the Navigator process will be developed by Elisabeth and Jessica. Provide the website and links to specific parts of the website into the flow diagram for the Navigator's use.

b. Event Study

- We discussed the most recent questions and feedback for further discussion with Dr. Neal and Dr. Draper
 - Q2 - #14 Financial Support available from my employer's organization. Is this worded correctly?
 - Q2 - #16 Conflicting schedule of other conferences. Possibly add "Conflicting".
 - Q2 – Consider adding "That it is a requirement of my job".
 - Q2 - Add "Do you prefer the registration fee that includes, breaks, meals, social at a higher rate? Or at a lower registration fee without breaks, meals and social?" Should this be 1 or a 2 part question?
 - Q4 - Suggested that "Other" be added for the person to write in a response
 - Q6 - Somewhat likely and Somewhat unlikely should be removed
 - Q11- Years of work experience in food safety or food protection?
 - Q12 - Why is this question needed?

c. SWOT

Conference for Food Protection – Committee FINAL Report

Template approved: 08/14/2013

Committee Final Reports are considered **DRAFT** until deliberated and acknowledged by the assigned Council at the Biennial Meeting

- Meeting with Dr. Neal and Dr. Draper was held and was discussed that the SWOT questions would not be added to the Event Survey. The SWOT will be conducted in a separate questionnaire. They will help structure a separate survey for the SWOT and use a small controlled group and not 400 plus members. The target audience would be a focus group, TBD.
- d. SPC Break
 - We discussed taking a break until September. The group agreed. In the meantime the Event and SWOT sub teams will continue to meet.
- e. CFP Rules of engagement for a committee
 - James and Dr. McSwane discussed this during the Spring Board meeting. We are not required to use these rules unless needed. The members of this call felt the current process being used was acceptable.

September 2015

a. Navigator Program

- Jessica reviewed the flow chart. Suggested edits offered by Jessica:
 - Under Executive Director to add Experienced CFP Members,
 - Under Navigator Team to add provide to the new attendees the Rules of Engagement and link to Orientation on the CFP website.
 - Under Conference Program add an arrow to go back to the website, Rules of Engagement.
 - Main reasons why these were added – We wanted to make sure we had enough qualified navigators. The Rules for Engagement are to be reviewed by the Constitution and Bylaws Committee with possible minor edits. It was not thought that these changes needed to be presented as an Issue. Vickie is to help and try to keep it to one page (front and back). Two typos – In the narratives CIII was not represented correctly and reference to the Conference vs Biennial meeting needed clarification. These were considered none-substantive changes. A printed copy of the Rules of Engagement will be in the registration packet.
 - David will confirm with Aggie that we add to Event Brite if you are a new time attendee. Who will add the photos and post? TBD
 - ID Ribbons – The navigators and first time attendees will need to have ribbons that Dave is working on.
 - Elizabeth and Jessica are the Navigator Team leads. They will help on site to take care of new members that registration at the Biennium.
 - Last CFP Dave sent a list of new members to the EB to select and respond back to him with their selection. This similar process can be used for 2016.
 - Elisabeth mentioned that during the fall (Aug) Executive Board meeting that Navigators be defined then. She thinks that the Navigator Team makes the assignments from the voting Board

Conference for Food Protection – Committee FINAL Report

Template approved: 08/14/2013

Committee Final Reports are considered DRAFT until deliberated and acknowledged by the assigned Council at the Biennial Meeting

members. The preferred ratio is 2-4 new members per Board member. We need to get the list of new members in April and add as new members register.

- Dave will ask the Executive Board to help commit to be Navigators.
- This new process will be in place before end of January 2016.
- The notice to register for the Biennial meeting will go out after Oct 1. Dave thinks registrations will start coming in by the end of Oct. As new members register Dave will share with Jessica and Elisabeth.
- Other meeting opportunities for the Navigators/New Members. What does this really mean? Possibly identify times and where first time attendees could meet at the beginning of the conference.
- The Key Objectives of the Navigator program: 1. Understand the process and 2. Facilitate networking opportunities.
- There were 20 first time attendees that registered on site during the last meeting.

b. Event Study

- Elisabeth provided positive comments about the survey tool test.
- James and Tom will work with Dr. Neal and Dr. Draper to move forward.

c. SWOT

- More detailed information will be reviewed at the coming SWOT subcommittee meeting held in Sept or Oct.

d. SPC Report delivered at Executive Board Meeting

- Tom shared that the meeting went well and feedback was provided. The presentation went well with positive comments from the Board.

e. FDA Report

- Good report from Kevin. Discussed that he will remain active with CFP and the SPC. Glenda Lewis will be on the Executive Board in his place.

f. Adobe Connect

- Just another option and way for the committee to meet and communicate. Dave will have Aggie send out the link again to the SPC and other committees. There are 3 committees currently using this platform. Tom suggested that we take a look at the tool to see if it applies to our group.

g. Meeting Room(s) in Boise

- An informal meeting in Boise will be taken care of by James and Tom for the SPC. No meeting room will be needed.
- Tom and James commented that a Sunday morning update will be provided to the conference attendees. Dave will accommodate.

h. Program Standards

Conference for Food Protection – Committee FINAL Report

Template approved: 08/14/2013

Committee Final Reports are considered DRAFT until deliberated and acknowledged by the assigned Council at the Biennial Meeting

- Kevin provided a summary to attempt to pursue a session related to the Retail Program Standards. The ability of the conference to improve the content and help state and locals understand and implement these standards. A session will be hosted on Tuesday (10 – noon) in Boise. Glenda will be getting with David Lawrence to coordinate this effort. Dave asked that Kevin work with Glenda and David to draft an outline. This might be a permanent meeting platform to help increase attendance.
-
- i. Questions for further consideration of the EB.
 - Could someone attend this session only? Could there be other unique means to stimulate attendance? Kevin needs information to Dave by mid-September to be placed into the preregistration materials being sent out first of Oct.

December 2015

a. Navigator Program

- Jessica led us through the navigator document and flow chart. It was agreed that ribbons would be used to identify Navigators and that pictures would be displayed at the registration area to identify navigators. Navigators would bring pictures, send Jpegs to David or have a picture taken on site. Becky volunteered to assist and lead the setup of the navigator poster area at the registration desk, so it has a professional look and feel.

b. Event Study

- The preliminary data was shared with the full SPC. The SWOT sub-committee would use the data to assist it in its development of the questions it would use in its survey. The SPC members were asked to review the document and share any comments with the SWOT members. A presentation by Dr. Neal of the completed report would be held during our March SPC meeting. The SPC has asked that either Dr. Neal or Draper be available to present the findings to the board at the Conference and they have tentatively agreed.

c. SWOT

- The sub-committee met on November 30th and shared the Survey preliminary report. It was agreed that we would use the time before the January meeting to review the data and use the results to assist us in developing the SWOT survey.

d. Executive Board Update

- David communicated that the Issues submission window would be open from December 15 until January 15, and standing and subcommittee reports were due December 5th.
- Using the Adobe Connect option was discussed and it was accepted that the SPC would use the program in 2016 and determine if it would be an option long term.

Conference for Food Protection – Committee FINAL Report

Template approved: 08/14/2013

Committee Final Reports are considered **DRAFT** until deliberated and acknowledged by the assigned Council at the Biennial Meeting

e. Open Forum

- An update on the program standards discussion was given by Glenda, and she stated that the work with David Lawrence was ‘on track’.
- It was noted that Bill Marler has been selected as a keynote speaker for the 2016 conference.

f. Additional agenda item request

- Kevin asked for an additional agenda item be brought up for discussion, the use of Social media at the conference. This was discussed as well as the use for the association in general. Concerns of the media being used for lobbying were raised as well as how the board would manage and approve content. Examples from other conferences such as IAFP, AFDO and GFSI were discussed. It was discussed if social media should be a tool to be used by the navigator program. It was felt that the board would be ultimately the group to decide and manage how and whether social media would be used by the conference. James suggested the concept be taken as an action item by the SWOT sub-committee and the item be brought back for discussion at march SPC meeting.

2. Recommendations for consideration by Executive Board:

Approve the Conference for Food Protection Biennial Meeting Study conducted by Dr. Draper and Dr. Neal, University of Houston, Conrad H. Hilton College of Hotel and Restaurant Management.

Approve the continuing development of the Strategic Plan using SWOT as the methodology.

Approve the Navigator Program for inclusion into all future CFP Biennial Meetings/Conferences targeting new members as well as current members.

CFP ISSUES TO BE SUBMITTED BY COMMITTEE: None

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROSTER (attached):

Conference for Food Protection
Biennial Meeting Study

Conducted by:

Jason Draper, Ph.D.

and

Jay Neal, Ph.D.

December 2015

Project sponsored by the Conference for Food Protection Strategic Planning Committee

Acknowledgments

The research team would like to thank the Conference for Food Protection Strategic Planning Committee for sponsoring this project and providing feedback throughout the project. Also, thanks to all of the delegates of the Conference for Food Protection for taking the time to participate in the study and provide valuable feedback.

Executive Summary

The purpose of this study was to assess the preferences of members of the Conference for Food Protection's Biennial Meeting, their motivations for attending, demographics, and other characteristics. A total of 283 surveys were completed and returned by CFP members representing a response rate of 49.8%. The Respondents are fairly evenly split between male and female and the average age is around 50. Respondents are well educated with most having a four-year college degree or higher level of degree and are experienced in the food protection/safety industry with almost 22 years of experience on average. Almost half of the respondents work for a government agency and one-fourth work on the industry side of food protection/safety.

In terms of future biennial meetings, the most preferred day pattern is Monday (workshops) thru Friday (assembly of delegates meeting), followed by Saturday thru Wednesday. When given a choice between the traditional months of April and May to attend the biennial meeting, April is preferred by 61.3%. Other than April or May, the most preferred months include March, October, and February.

The top five reasons (importance) for attending the biennial meeting include the quality of issues and topics addressed, keeping up with changes in one's profession, developing a professional network, fulfilling a desire to learn, and industry involvement. The items that were rated the lowest for importance in attending the biennial meeting include seeking employment opportunity, spending money on other items, chance to visit friends or relatives at the destination, family activities during the meeting, and the spouse and guest program. The results

indicate delegates attend the biennial meeting for the importance of the conference rather than extra-curricular activities.

When the forty motivation items were reduced to underlying components, travelability (e.g., easy access to the destination, flight schedules, time required to travel to the destination) explained the largest proportion of motivation, followed by education (e.g., fulfilling a desire to learn, listening to respected speakers at the workshop, topics of the workshop). The results generally indicate attendees are focused on the purpose of and not the extra-curricular activities outside of the importance of the conference. These results should be taken into consideration for future planning within the organization.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments.....	ii
Executive Summary	iii
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	vi
List of Figures	vii
Introduction.....	1
Methods.....	1
Study Meeting.....	1
Questionnaire Development.....	1
Pre-Test.....	3
Sample and Data Collection.....	3
Data Screening and Preparation.....	4
Results.....	5
Dimensions/Components of Motivation.....	19
Discussion.....	30
References.....	32
Appendices.....	34
Appendix A: Cover Letters.....	35
Appendix B: Questionnaire.....	38
Appendix C: Open Ended Responses to Other Reasons for Attending the Conference for Food Protection Biennial Meeting.....	48
Appendix D: Open Ended Responses to Other Types of Companies or Businesses Respondents Work for.....	51
Appendix E: Open Ended Responses to Anything Else Respondents Would Like to Share About the Conference for Food Protection Biennial Meeting	54

List of Tables

Table 1: Frequency Distribution for Demographic Characteristics	7
Table 2: Frequency Distribution for Employee and Employer Characteristics	9
Table 3: Frequency Distribution for Past and Likelihood of Participation in CFP Biennial Meeting.....	12
Table 4: Frequency Distribution for Future CFP Biennial Meeting Preferences	14
Table 5: Frequency Distribution for Importance of Attributes in Deciding to Attend the CFP Biennial Meeting.....	16
Table 6: Principal Components Analysis of Motivation Items.....	23
Table 7: Comparisons and Relationships with Motivation Components.....	28

List of Figures

Figure 1: Place of Resident of Respondents	6
--	---

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to assess meeting membership preferences for the Conference for Food Protection's (CFP) Biennial Meeting. More specifically, respondents were asked members their preferred day pattern, type of destination for the meeting, cost concerns, identified type of attendee, types of events and sessions preferred, demographics, and other characteristics of the meeting. The study is intended to help the Strategic Planning Committee understand the preferences of members for future meetings to plan accordingly.

Methods

Study Meeting

The Conference for Food Protection (CFP) began in 1971 as a non-profit organization for members to have a platform to provide input regarding food safety standards (Conference for Food Protection, 2015). Member of the CFP include "industry, regulatory, academia, consumer, and professional organizations" (2nd paragraph). The input from attendees of the Biennial Meeting impacts food safety guidelines at all government levels in the United States.

Questionnaire Development

The first step in developing the questionnaire for this study was reviewing and comparing a number of studies related to the decision making process to attend a conference or meeting (Grant & Weaver, 1996; Lee & Back, 2007; Severt, Wang, Chen, & Breiter, 2007; Yoo & Chon, 2008; Yoo & Zhao, 2010), which included fairly similar items and dimensions or factors, but customized for the respective study and meeting, conference, or convention. The comparisons were shared with the Conference for Food Protection's (CFP) Strategic Planning Committee. Eventually, the scale developed by Yoo and Chon (2008) was chosen as the most comprehensive

and items that best represented the goals of this study and the CFP. The original 42 items identified by Yoo and Chon (2008) were reviewed by the research team and CFP's Strategic Planning Committee. This process was chosen to ensure the most comprehensive list of items was reviewed for potential inclusion in the study. The research team and Strategic Planning Committee reviewed and discussed the list of items numerous times to ensure those chosen and modified validly represented the reasons for attending the CFP's biennial meeting. Modifications included changing the word "convention" to "biennial meeting" in a number of items to best reflect the study meeting's title. Another example of a modification was removing the item "Book, media, and educational exhibitions" since there is no such exhibition at the study's biennial meeting. After modifications, including deleting inappropriate items, as mentioned, for the study meeting a total of 40 items were modified and retained.

In addition to the decision making to attend a conference or meeting section, respondents were asked a series of items to help the CFP's Strategic Planning Committee understand their attendee base and preferences for the Biennial Meeting. Examples of preferences for the Biennial Meeting include the pattern of days and month of the year to attend the meeting. Respondents were also asked which type of member (i.e., regulator, industry, academia, consumer) and business (e.g., government, retail industry, manufacturing industry, university/college) in which they are employed. Subcategories for employment categories such as government (i.e., federal, state, local) and university/college (i.e., public, private) were included. Finally, respondents were asked demographic items such as gender, age, and highest level of education completed.

Pre-test

Prior to sending out the online questionnaire it was first tested with the research team and members of the CFP's Strategic Planning Committee. In addition, the questionnaire was pre-tested with faculty and graduate students of a hospitality program to ensure instructions and item wording were clear, as well as test the system used to collect data. Minimal changes, such as re-ordering a few questions resulted from the pre-test.

Sample and Data Collection

The sample for this study included a list of members of the Conference for Food Protection. The list was deemed appropriate for the study because it comprises the food safety professionals targeted to attend the CFP's Biennial Meeting. The list provided by the CFP included 585 members' email addresses. An invitation to participate in the study was sent by email to the list of 585 members. The email included information about the study and a link to the online questionnaire. The first page of the online questionnaire provided detail about the purpose of the study, rights of participants, and contact information should there be questions. Participants selected the next button to continue the items that comprised the online questionnaire. Two reminder emails were sent as frequency of responding declined.

Sixteen of the 585 email addresses provided by the CFP were flagged as undeliverable by the system used to conduct the study and one person opted out after the initial request, resulting in 568 valid email addresses. Once responses/cases with too much missing data were deleted a total of 283 usable cases remained, representing an effective response rate of 49.8%.

Data Screening and Preparation

Data screening procedures were conducted following the recommended guidelines of Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). Descriptive statistics (e.g., frequencies) and visual representations (e.g., histograms) were run accordingly for each variable to assess the accuracy of the data. Coding for all variables was appropriate and descriptive statistics were within a reasonable range of values for each questionnaire item. In addition, for continuous variables descriptive summary statistics (e.g., mean and standard deviation) were plausible.

The motivation scale was examined for missing data using SPSS and EQS. SPSS descriptive statistics revealed no item had more than 4 missing observations. EQS revealed missing data appeared to be at least missing at random (MAR). Kline (2011) reported there is “no single test that provides definitive evidence of either MAR or MCAR” (p. 56). As a result of the data missing randomly, the expectation maximization (EM) method in EQS was used to estimate missing values for the motivation items. According to Kline (2011) the EM method is a two-step approach where the “missing observations are imputed by predicted scores in a series of regressions in which each incomplete variables is regressed on the remaining variables for a particular case. In the M (maximization) step, the whole imputed data set is submitted for ML estimation” (p. 59).

Next, potential univariate outliers were examined. For dichotomous (e.g., gender) variables Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) suggest outliers exist when there is a split between the options that is very uneven (e.g., 90-10). No such splits existed. For categorical variables with more than two options, a similar procedure was used to ensure the split among the options was not very uneven and/or unreasonable depending on the variable. For continuous variables plots (e.g., histograms) and standardized scores (z) that are disconnected from other z -scores and in

excess of ± 3.29 are potential outliers (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The 40 motivation items standardized to examine for univariate outliers. In addition, histograms were examined for visual evidence of univariate outliers. While a few of the items revealed potential outliers, no transformations were not deemed necessary.

Normality of the motivation items was also assessed using graphs. While the distributions for some items were skewed, no transformations were deemed appropriate given practical implications of the study and results. For example, the item “developing a professional network” was negatively skewed. Practically speaking, this should be expected given the CFP’s Biennial Conference includes the opportunity for food safety professional to build professional networks where ideas are shared and recommendations for food safety are made. Another such example is “Fulfilling my desire to learn”. Inherently, it is important for those representing the food safety industry to learn about issues affecting the industry and make recommendations. In addition, when variables such as the motivation items to attend a conference or meeting, such as the CFP’s Biennial Meeting, are going to be subjected to a data reduction technique assumptions of normality are not necessary (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

Results

Figure 1 provides a visual representation of where respondents live throughout the United States based on the zip code they provided in the study. There is a fairly strong concentration along the east coast and in the Midwest.

Figure 1: Place of Residence of Respondents



Table 1 displays the demographic characteristics of the respondents. Respondents were fairly evenly split for gender with just below half female (48.8%) and just over half male (51.2%). The average age was just over 50. Respondents were well educated with 93.6% having at least a four-year college degree.

Table 1: Frequency Distribution for Demographic Characteristics

	Frequency	Percent	Mean (<i>M</i>); Standard Deviation (<i>SD</i>)
Gender			
Female	138	48.8	
Male	<u>145</u>	<u>51.2</u>	
	283	100.0	
Age			
20-29	5	1.9	
30-39	31	12.0	
40-49	77	29.8	
50-59	91	35.3	
60-69	48	18.6	
70 and above	<u>6</u>	<u>2.3</u>	
	258	100.0	<i>M</i> = 50.62; <i>SD</i> = 10.34
Highest Education Level			
High school diploma or GED	1	0.4	
Technical, vocational, or trade school	3	1.1	
Some college (including junior college)	14	5.0	
Four-year college degree (B.A., B.S., B.F.A.)	139	49.3	
Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.F.A., M.B.A.)	94	33.3	
Ph.D./Professional (M.D., J.D., D.V.M., D.D.M.)	<u>31</u>	<u>11.0</u>	
	282	100.0	
Ethnicity			
White	223	81.4	
Hispanic	10	3.6	
African American	23	8.4	
Asian	11	4.0	
Other (please specify)	<u>7</u>	<u>2.6</u>	
	274	100.0	

M = mean; *SD* = standard deviation

Table 2 presents the results of employee and employer related items. On average, respondents worked in the food protection/safety industry for 21.84 years ($SD = 10.27$). For more than half (54.3%) the CFP's Biennial Conference is one of a number respondents choose from to attend. Almost half (48.0%) of respondents indicated they are industry members or attendees, followed by 44.8% regulators. Almost half (44.7%) of respondents work for either the federal (6.5%), state (25.1%), or local (13.1%) government. One fourth (26.2%) work in either the foodservice (13.8%) or other industry (12.4%). More than three-fourths (83.3%) of respondents' employers pay the full amount for them to attend the Biennial Conference and two-thirds (65.2%) would not prefer an a la carte registration option rather than or in addition to the all-inclusive (e.g., breaks, meals, social events, etc.).

Table 2: Frequency Distribution for Employee and Employer Characteristics

	Frequency	Percent	Mean (<i>M</i>); Standard Deviation (<i>SD</i>)
Years of Work Experience in Food Protection/Safety Industry			
0-9	37	13.2	<i>M</i> = 21.84; <i>SD</i> = 10.27
10-19	83	29.6	
20-29	78	27.9	
30-39	66	23.6	
40 or more	<u>16</u>	<u>5.7</u>	
	280	100.0	
Reason for attending			
My employer encourages me to attend	59	21.2	
My employer requires me to attend	22	7.9	
It is one of a number of conferences I choose from to attend	151	54.3	
Other	<u>46</u>	<u>16.5</u>	
	278	100.0	
Type of Member or Attendee			
Regulator	126	44.8	
Industry	135	48.0	
Academia	17	6.0	
Consumer	<u>3</u>	<u>1.1</u>	
	281	100.0	
Type of Company or Business			
Federal government	18	6.5	
State government	71	25.1	
Local government	37	13.1	
Retail industry	24	8.5	
Grocery industry	13	4.6	
Manufacturing industry	15	5.3	
Vending industry	3	1.1	
Foodservice industry	39	13.8	
Other industry (please specify)	35	12.4	

Table 2 (continued)

	Frequency	Percent	Mean (<i>M</i>); Standard Deviation (<i>SD</i>)
Public university/college	11	3.9	
Private university/college	1	0.4	
Consumer (please specify)	3	1.1	
Non-profit (please specify)	<u>13</u>	<u>4.6</u>	
	283	100.0	
Who Pays for Attending CFP Biennial Meeting			
My employer/company pays the full amount	234	83.3	
Partially paid by my employer/company and partially paid by me	27	9.6	
I pay the full amount	<u>20</u>	<u>7.1</u>	
	281	100.0	
Registration to Include A La Carte Options			
Yes	97	34.8	
No	<u>182</u>	<u>65.2</u>	
	279	100.0	

M = mean; *SD* = standard deviation

Table 3 presents the results of past participating in the CFP's Biennial Meeting, as well as likelihood of attending in the future. Over three-fourths (78.8%) of respondents attended the last Biennial Meeting held in 2014. The frequency of respondents attending the Biennial Meeting decreases for years prior to 2014. The average number of CFP Biennial Conferences attended between 2000 and 2014 was 3.36 ($SD = 2.43$). While respondents are Likely to Very Likely to attend the 2016 Biennial Meeting, the likelihood decreases for 2018 and 2020. Or, another way to view it is respondents are more undecided for 2018 and 2020.

Table 3: Frequency Distribution for Past and Likelihood of Participation in CFP Biennial Meeting

	Frequency	Percent	Mean (<i>M</i>); Standard Deviation (<i>SD</i>)
Past Years Attended			
2014	223	78.8	
2012	163	57.6	
2010	123	43.5	
2008	98	34.6	
2006	74	26.1	
2004	61	26.1	
2002	50	17.7	
2000	42	14.8	
			<i>M</i> = 3.36; <i>SD</i> = 2.43
Likelihood of Attending in 2016			
Very Unlikely	14	5.0	
Unlikely	8	2.8	
Undecided	39	13.8	
Likely	51	18.1	
Very Likely	<u>170</u>	<u>60.3</u>	
	282	100.0	
			<i>M</i> = 4.26; <i>SD</i> = 1.11
Likelihood of Attending in 2018			
Very Unlikely	18	6.4	
Unlikely	10	3.6	
Undecided	68	24.3	
Likely	71	25.4	
Very Likely	<u>113</u>	<u>40.4</u>	
	280	100.0	
			<i>M</i> = 3.90; <i>SD</i> = 1.17

Table 3 (continued)

	Frequency	Percent	Mean (<i>M</i>); Standard Deviation (<i>SD</i>)
Likelihood of Attending in 2020			
Very Unlikely	27	9.7	<i>M</i> = 3.60; <i>SD</i> = 1.24
Unlikely	12	4.3	
Undecided	92	33.1	
Likely	60	21.6	
Very Likely	<u>87</u>	<u>31.3</u>	
	278	100.0	
Conferences Attended in Past 12 Months			
0	13	4.7	<i>M</i> = 3.65; <i>SD</i> = 2.87
1-4	195	70.4	
5-9	59	21.3	
10-19	8	2.9	
20 or more	<u>2</u>	<u>0.8</u>	
	277	100.0	

M = mean; *SD* = standard deviation

Respondents were asked a series of questions regarding the days and months of the Biennial Meeting (Table 4). For the day pattern of the Biennial Meeting, respondents were asked to rank their 1st, 2nd, and 3rd choices from three alternatives. According to the means, Monday (workshops) thru Friday (assembly of delegates meeting) (*M* = 1.45) is the most preferred, followed by Saturday (workshops) thru Wednesday (assembly of delegates meeting) (*M* = 2.07). The Monday thru Friday pattern was the number one choice for seven out of 10 (70.8%) of respondents. In terms of determining which of the months (i.e., April or May) in which the Biennial Meeting has been held, April is preferred by almost two-thirds (61.3%). If

the Biennial Meeting were to be held in a month other than April or May, almost half (47.0%) of respondents prefer March, followed by October (41.7%) and February (33.6%).

Table 4: Frequency Distribution for Future CFP Biennial Meeting Preferences

	Frequency	Percent	Mean (<i>M</i>); Standard Deviation (<i>SD</i>)
Day Pattern			
Monday (workshops) thru Friday (assembly of delegates meeting)			<i>M</i> = 1.45; <i>SD</i> = 0.75
1	196	70.8	
2	37	13.4	
3	<u>44</u>	<u>15.9</u>	
	277	100.0	
Wednesday(workshops) thru Sunday (assembly of delegates meeting)			<i>M</i> = 2.46; <i>SD</i> = 0.64
1	22	7.9	
2	106	38.0	
3	<u>151</u>	<u>54.1</u>	
	279	100.0	
Saturday (workshops) thru Wednesday (assembly of delegates meeting)			<i>M</i> = 2.07; <i>SD</i> = 0.72
	61	22.0	
	133	48.0	
	<u>83</u>	<u>30.0</u>	
	277	100.0	
April vs. May			
April	171	61.3	
May	<u>108</u>	<u>38.7</u>	
	279	100.0	

Table 4 (continued)

	Frequency	Percent	Mean (<i>M</i>); Standard Deviation (<i>SD</i>)
Month other than April or May ¹			
January	64	22.6	
February	95	33.6	
March	133	47.0	
June	77	27.2	
July	46	16.3	
August	55	19.4	
September	86	30.4	
October	118	41.7	
November	60	21.2	
December	14	4.9	

M = mean; *SD* = standard deviation

1. Check all that apply item

Table 5 displays the frequencies for the items measuring the importance of attending the Biennial Meeting of the Conference for Food Protection. The items are in descending order according to the means. The top five items are related to topics of the meeting and education (e.g., quality of issues and topics addressed at the meeting, keeping up with changes in one's profession, developing a social network). The three lowest ranked items include the extracurricular activities (i.e., Chance to visit friends or relatives at the meeting destination, opportunities for family activities during the meeting, spouse and guest program).

Table 5: Frequency Distribution for Importance of Attributes in Deciding to Attend the CFP Biennial Meeting

	Not at all Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Neither Important nor Unimportant	Somewhat Important	Extremely Important
	<u>Values given are percentages</u>				
Quality of issues and topics addressed at the meeting ($n = 281$; $M = 4.57$; $SD = 0.59$)	0.4	0.4	1.8	36.7	60.9
Keeping up with changes in my profession ($n = 281$; $M = 4.53$; $SD = 0.65$)	0.4	0.4	5.3	34.2	59.8
Developing a professional network ($n = 283$; $M = 4.44$; $SD = 0.80$)	1.8	1.4	4.6	35.3	56.9
Fulfilling my desire to learn ($n = 282$; $M = 4.28$; $SD = 0.80$)	1.4	1.8	7.8	45.4	43.6
Industry involvement ($n = 282$; $M = 4.24$; $SD = 0.82$)	1.4	1.8	10.3	44.3	42.2
Financial support availability from my employer's organization ($n = 281$; $M = 4.20$; $SD = 1.12$)	5.7	2.5	12.5	24.6	54.8
My involvement with the association ($n = 282$; $M = 4.15$; $SD = 0.80$)	1.1	1.4	14.9	46.5	36.2
Topics of the workshop ($n = 281$; $M = 4.14$; $SD = 0.88$)	1.1	3.9	14.2	41.3	39.5
Seeing people I know in my field ($n = 283$; $M = 4.09$; $SD = 0.83$)	2.8	0.7	11.0	55.5	30.0
Time availability ($n = 281$; $M = 4.07$; $SD = 0.89$)	2.5	2.5	13.5	48.0	33.5
Personal interactions with colleagues and friends ($n = 281$; $M = 4.06$; $SD = 0.83$)	2.8	1.1	11.4	56.2	28.5

Table 5 (continued)

	Not at all Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Neither Important nor Unimportant	Somewhat Important	Extremely Important
	<u>Values given are percentages</u>				
Listening to respected speakers at the workshop ($n = 281$; $M = 4.04$; $SD = 0.85$)	1.8	2.8	14.6	51.2	29.5
Serving on a council or committee involvement ($n = 279$; $M = 4.03$; $SD = 0.94$)	2.2	3.2	20.4	38.4	35.8
Feeling a sense of global food safety community ($n = 283$; $M = 3.87$; $SD = 1.10$)	7.1	4.2	12.7	46.3	29.7
Total cost of attending the meeting ($n = 283$; $M = 3.76$; $SD = 1.09$)	6.0	6.7	17.7	44.5	25.1
Easy access to the meeting destination ($n = 281$; $M = 3.68$; $SD = 0.97$)	5.0	6.4	19.2	54.8	14.6
Reputation of the meeting organizers ($n = 282$; $M = 3.61$; $SD = 1.07$)	6.7	5.0	28.0	40.8	19.5
Schedules of other conventions ($n = 280$; $M = 3.51$; $SD = 1.03$)	5.0	11.1	26.1	43.2	14.6
Length of the meeting ($n = 283$; $M = 3.51$; $SD = 0.95$)	4.6	6.7	33.6	43.1	12.0
Ease of travel within the meeting destination ($n = 281$; $M = 3.51$; $SD = 1.07$)	7.5	7.8	25.6	44.8	14.2
Safety and security situation at the meeting destination ($n = 283$; $M = 3.47$; $SD = 1.21$)	9.9	9.9	24.4	35.3	20.5
Previous positive experience at the meeting destination ($n = 280$; $M = 3.41$; $SD = 1.19$)	11.8	6.8	26.1	39.6	15.7

Table 5 (continued)

	Not at all Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Neither Important nor Unimportant	Somewhat Important	Extremely Important
	<u>Values given are percentages</u>				
Flight schedules ($n = 283$; $M = 3.38$; $SD = 1.13$)	9.5	8.5	30.4	37.5	14.1
Time required to travel to the biennial meeting destination ($n = 281$; $M =$ 3.24 ; $SD = 1.15$)	11.7	11.0	29.2	37.7	10.3
Gaining recognition from peers ($n = 281$; $M = 3.12$; $SD = 1.06$)	11.0	11.4	37.4	34.5	5.7
Participating in the social and recreational activities as part of the meeting ($n =$ 279 ; $M = 2.94$; $SD = 1.16$)	17.9	12.9	30.5	35.1	3.6
Getting away from my routine work and schedule ($n = 280$; $M = 2.93$; $SD =$ 1.11)	16.8	10.7	40.4	27.5	4.6
Attractive image of the meeting destination ($n =$ 283 ; $M = 2.93$; $SD = 1.09$)	14.1	14.8	39.6	26.5	4.9
My health conditions for travel ($n = 281$; $M = 2.86$; $SD = 1.31$)	23.8	10.7	32.7	21.0	11.7
Extra opportunities available at the destination city ($n = 282$; $M = 2.80$; $SD = 1.13$)	18.8	16.3	34.4	27.3	3.2
Other people attending from my organization ($n =$ 282 ; $M = 2.78$; $SD = 1.21$)	22.3	13.8	33.3	24.5	6.0
Opportunity to visit the meeting destination ($n =$ 282 ; $M = 2.74$; $SD = 1.12$)	20.6	13.8	40.1	22.3	3.2
My personal financial situation ($n = 283$; $M =$ 2.63 ; $SD = 1.37$)	33.6	8.5	29.3	18.7	9.9

Table 5 (continued)

	Not at all Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Neither Important nor Unimportant	Somewhat Important	Extremely Important
	<u>Values given are percentages</u>				
Weather at the meeting destination ($n = 279$; $M = 2.62$; $SD = 1.12$)	23.7	15.1	39.1	20.1	2.2
Novelty of the meeting destination ($n = 283$; $M = 2.54$; $SD = 1.10$)	26.1	13.4	43.1	15.2	2.1
Seeking employment opportunity ($n = 283$; $M = 2.36$; $SD = 1.10$)	30.7	18.4	37.8	10.6	2.5
Spending money on other items ($n = 282$; $M = 2.32$; $SD = 1.04$)	31.2	16.0	44.3	6.7	1.8
Chance to visit friends or relatives at the meeting destination ($n = 280$; $M = 2.11$; $SD = 1.05$)	41.1	15.0	36.4	6.8	0.7
Opportunities for family activities during the meeting ($n = 282$; $M = 2.06$; $SD = 1.07$)	44.3	14.5	33.0	7.4	0.7
Spouse and guest program ($n = 283$; $M = 2.06$; $SD = 1.08$)	43.1	18.7	28.3	8.8	1.1

n = sample size; M = mean; SD = standard deviation

Dimensions/Components of Motivation

In order to identify underlying components of motivation from the 40 items, principal components analysis (PCA) was conducted. An initial solution was run to identify of PCA was appropriate with the data and how many components were revealed. Item loadings below .30 were suppressed, rather than the SPSS default of .10. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure (KMO) of Sampling Adequacy of .875 exceeded the recommended .60 and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (χ^2

= 5195.01; $p < .001$) was highly significant, suggesting the data reduction technique was appropriate (Pallant, 2005). Scree plot and parallel analysis were used to determine the number of components in the data. The scree plot revealed at least three components, and possibly up to five. Parallel analysis revealed four components.

Next, PCA solutions using the Direct Oblimin rotation method were run requesting two, three, four, and five components to assess the ease of interpretation of each. This was done because the scree revealed at least three, but potentially five, components and the parallel analysis revealed up to four components. The Direct Oblimin rotation is an oblique rotation method allowing the components to be correlated which according to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) is intended to “Simplify factors by minimizing the cross-products of loadings” (p. 639). The four component solution was the easiest to interpret and presented in Table 6. Of the 40 original items, 37 loaded onto single components and three loaded onto two components each. The components were labelled “Travelability”, “Professional Development”, “Destination/extra-curriculars”, and “Industry/professional Recognition”.

The first component was labelled “Travelability”, similar to that of other studies (Mair, 2010; Yoo & Chon, 2008, 2010; Yoo & Zhao, 2010). In this study, “Travelability” included items related to traveling to the destination (e.g., flight schedules, time to travel to destination), about conditions at the destination (e.g., safety and security, image of the destination, and ease of travel within the destination), financial (e.g., total cost, support from employer) as well as personal items (e.g., cost, time availability, personal health conditions). This reflects the complexity of the travel decision and various things travelers consider when making the decision.

The second component, “Professional development”, included items specific to the quality of the education of the meeting, such as fulfilling a desire to learn, keeping up with changes in one’s profession, and quality of issues and topics at the meeting. This component suggests the importance of attendees seeking and receiving educational experiences and information sessions to stay well aware of issues affecting their profession.

The third component labelled “Destination/extra-curriculars” included items related to activities both during and outside of the meeting context. For example, the spouse and guest program, as well as participating in the social and recreational activities as part of the meeting represent activities as part of the meeting outside of the actual meetings and sessions. Attractive image of the destination and extra opportunities at the destination city could include attendees seeking extra opportunities which might allow them time before or after the meeting schedule to enjoy the destination. These opportunities could include attendees arriving a day(s) before or staying a day(s) after the meeting is scheduled for leisure purposes, potentially also bring family. However, it should be noted that the observed items that loaded on component three all have negative loadings. This implies that the “Destination/extra-curriculars” were not as important as the other components. As observed in Table 5, many of these items appear near the bottom of when ranked in descending order by the mean.

Finally, component four, “Industry/professional recognition”, included items such as serving on a council or committee involvement, gaining recognition from peers, and developing a professional network, which go beyond the education component (second component) of the meeting. The fourth component is beyond just the educational aspect and includes being more heavily involved in the organization.

The first cross-loading, “Attractive image of the meeting destination” loaded on “Travelability” and “Destination/extra-curriculars”. Both loadings exceeded .40, but a negative loading for “Destination/extra-curriculars”. Interpretation of the cross-loading was taken to mean if the destination had a positive image it could be easy to travel to as it likely possesses the infrastructure (e.g., transportation to and within) for “Travelability” and attractions and amenities of a popular destination for a component such as “Destination/extra-curriculars”. A lesser known or more negative image would potentially be viewed as a more inhibitive destination for “Travelability”. The next cross-loading, “Feeling a sense of global food safety” loaded on “Professional Development” and “Industry/professional Recognition”. This item was deemed to warrant both loadings as attendees could feel a sense of both development and recognition in their profession by attending a meeting that represents food safety. The last item that cross-loaded was the “Weather at the meeting destination” on “Travelability” and “Destination/extra-curriculars”. In terms of “Travelability” the weather could be an indicating of how easy or inhibitive it might be to reach and travel back home from the meeting destination. In terms of “Destination/extra-curriculars” the weather inherently could encourage or inhibit additional activities outside of meeting and events specifically planned for the meeting.

Table 6: Principal Components Analysis of Motivation Items

	Travelability	Professional Development	Destination/extra-curriculars	Industry/professional recognition
Easy access to the meeting destination	.78			
Flight schedules	.74			
Time required to travel to the biennial meeting destination	.73			
Ease of travel within the meeting destination	.71			
Total cost of attending the meeting	.70			
Length of the meeting	.68			
Time availability	.61			
Safety and security at the meeting destination	.55			
My personal financial situation	.50			
My health conditions for travel	.45			
Attractive image of the meeting destination	.44			-.43
Schedules of other conventions	.42			
Financial support from my employer's organization	.40			
Fulfilling my desire to learn		.74		
Listening to respected speakers at the workshop		.71		
Keeping up with changes in profession		.63		
Topics of the workshop		.62		

Table 6 (continued)

	Travelability	Professional Development	Destination/extra-curriculars	Industry/professional recognition
Quality of issues and topics being addressed at the meeting		.53		
Feeling a sense of global food safety community		.50		.35
Personal interactions with colleagues and friends		.40		
Reputation of the meeting organizers		.32		
Opportunities for family activities during the meeting			-.82	
Chance to visit friends or relatives at the meeting destination			-.76	
Spouse and guest program			-.75	
Novelty of the meeting destination			-.73	
Getting away from my routine work and schedule			-.72	
Participating in the social and recreational activities as part of the meeting			-.72	
Extra opportunities available at the destination city			-.64	
Opportunity to visit the meeting destination			-.59	
Spending money on other items			-.54	

Table 6 (continued)

	Travelability	Professional Development	Destination/extra-curriculars	Industry/professional recognition
Weather at the meeting destination	.38		-.51	
Other people attending from my organization			-.50	
Seeking employment opportunity			-.46	
Previous positive experience at the meeting destination			-.36	
Serving on a council or committee involvement				.80
My involvement with the association				.72
Gaining recognition from peers				.50
Industry involvement				.46
Seeing people I know in my field				.39
Developing professional network				.34
Mean (Standard Deviation)	3.39 (0.70)	4.14 (0.54)	2.61 (0.75)	3.99 (0.56)
Eigen Value	10.50	3.36	2.79	1.97
Variance Explained	26.24	8.40	6.98	4.25
Cronbach's Reliability	.88	.78	.91	.72

Once the components of motivation were identified, a series of statistical tests were conducted to test for differences between other variables (e.g., demographics and employment characteristics) and relationships between variables such as number of times attending the Biennial Conference and the motivation components (Table 7). For some group comparisons,

some sub-group sample sizes were too small. Therefore, some groups were combined in order to provide statistical comparisons. All tests utilized $\alpha = .05$. For demographic items, a significant relationship was found between age and the “Destination/extra-curriculars” component of motivation. For gender, females ($M = 4.23$; $SD = 0.47$) had a significantly higher level of motivation to attend the Biennial Conference for “Professional Development” ($t = 2.82$; $p = .005$) than did males ($M = 4.05$; $SD = 0.58$). As age increased, the importance of “Destination/extra-curriculars” slightly decreased ($F = 4.49$; $p = .035$; $\beta = -.009$). Compared to caucasians ($M = 3.31$; $SD = 0.70$) the other aggregated other ethnicity ($M = 3.70$; $SD = 0.58$) had a significantly higher level of importance for the “Travelability” component ($t = -3.75$; $p < .001$). The other aggregated ethnicity ($M = 2.88$; $SD = 0.69$) also had a significantly higher level of importance for the “Destination/extra-curriculars” component of motivation ($t = -2.99$; $p = .003$) than did caucasians ($M = 2.54$; $SD = 0.74$). For the “Professional development” component of motivation, there was a significant difference between reasons for attending the Biennial Conference ($F = 5.88$; $p = .001$). The post hoc tests for the ANOVA revealed that those whose employer requires them to attend ($M = 3.72$; $SD = 0.71$) had a significantly lower level of motivation than the other three groups. ANOVA also revealed a significant difference for the “Professional development/recognition” component of motivation for the type of company or business respondents work for ($F = 9.54$; $p < .001$) with government employees ($M = 3.84$; $SD = 0.61$) having significantly lower levels of importance compared to industry ($M = 4.12$; $SD = 0.50$) and university/consumer/non-profit ($M = 4.11$; $SD = 0.43$). Significant relationships were found between the number of Biennial Conferences attended since 2000 and three of the components of motivation. First, as the number of Biennial Conferences attended since 2000 increased the level of importance for “Travelability” slightly decreased ($F = 6.27$; $p = .013$; $\beta =$

.046). Similarly, as the number of Biennial Conferences attended since 2000 increased the level of importance for “Professional development” slightly decreased ($F = 6.36; p = .012; \beta = -.035$). Finally, as the number of Biennial Conferences attended since 2000 increased the level of importance for the “Destination/extra-curriculars” slightly decreased ($F = 4.42; p = .037; \beta = -.040$).

Table 7: Comparisons and Relationships with Motivation Components

	Travelability	Professional Development	Destination/ extra-curriculars	Industry/professional recognition
Gender				
Female	3.44 (0.65)	4.23 (0.47)	2.67 (0.72)	4.05 (0.49)
Male	3.33 (0.74)	4.05 (0.58)	2.56 (0.77)	3.94 (0.62)
	$t = 1.40; p = .16$	$t = 2.82; p = .005$	$t = 1.18; p = .24$	$t = 1.75; p = .08$
Age	$F = 1.10; p = .30$	$F = 0.04; p = .85$	$F = 4.49; p = .035$ $\beta = -.009$	$F = 0.19; p = .66$
Ethnicity				
White/Caucasian	3.31 (0.70)	4.11 (0.54)	2.54 (0.74)	3.99 (0.54)
Other	3.70 (0.58)	4.25 (0.52)	2.88 (0.69)	3.99 (0.64)
	$t = -3.75; p < .001$	$t = -1.60; p = .11$	$t = -2.99; p = .003$	$t = 0.07; p = .95$
Years work experience in food protection/safety industry	$F = 0.00; p = .98$	$F = 0.09; p = .77$	$F = 1.82; p = .18$	$F = 0.44; p = .51$
Reasons to attend the CFP Biennial Meeting				
My employer encourages me to attend	3.44 (0.77)	4.19 (0.52)	2.68 (0.74)	4.00 (0.44)
My employer requires me to attend	3.21 (0.88)	3.72 (0.71) ^A	2.58 (0.77)	3.74 (0.81)
It is one of a number of conferences I choose from to attend	3.41 (0.65)	4.20 (0.47)	2.63 (0.72)	4.06 (0.51)
Other	3.30 (0.69)	4.08 (0.60)	2.47 (0.83)	3.91 (0.68)
	$F = 0.86; p = .46$	$F = 5.88; p = .001$	$F = 0.76; p = .52$	$F = 2.46; p = .06$

Table 7 (Continued)

	Travelability	Professional Development	Destination/ extra-curriculars	Industry/professional recognition
Type of member or attendee				
Regulator	3.43 (0.74)	4.07 (0.58)	2.67 (0.71)	3.84 (0.61)
Industry	3.35 (0.62)	4.20 (0.49)	2.58 (0.77)	4.12 (0.48)
	$t = 0.88; p = .38$	$t = -2.01; p = .045$	$t = 0.99; p = .32$	$t = -4.11; p < .001$
Type of company or business				
Government	3.41 (0.76)	4.06 (0.58)	2.64 (0.71)	3.84 (0.61) ^A
Industry	3.35 (0.64)	4.20 (0.51)	2.56 (0.78)	4.12 (0.50)
University/Consumer/Non-Profit	3.45 (0.67)	4.23 (0.44)	2.71 (0.76)	4.11 (0.43)
	$F = 0.35; p = .71$	$F = 2.35; p = .10$	$F = 0.61; p = .54$	$F = 9.54; p < .001$
Who pays				
My employer pays the full amount	3.35 (0.71)	4.13 (0.55)	2.60 (0.74)	3.99 (0.56)
Partially paid by my employer/company and partially paid by me	3.56 (0.63)	4.20 (0.36)	2.73 (0.59)	4.01 (0.51)
I pay the full amount	3.62 (0.56)	4.13 (0.65)	2.68 (0.90)	4.03 (0.62)
	$F = 2.39; p = .09$	$F = 0.17; p = .85$	$F = 0.46; p = .63$	$F = 0.06; p = .94$
Number of Biennial Conferences attended since 2000	$F = 6.27; p = .013$	$F = 6.36; p = .012$	$F = 4.42; p = .037$	$F = .007; p = .93$
	$\beta = -.046$	$\beta = -.035$	$\beta = -.040$	

Discussion

The overarching purpose of this study was to assess the preferences of members of the Conference for Food Protection's Biennial Meeting, their motivations for attending, and demographics and other characteristics. Respondents are fairly evenly split between male and female and the average age is around 50. Respondents are well educated with most having a four-year college degree or higher level of degree. Respondents are experienced in the food protection/safety industry with almost 22 years of experience on average. Almost half of respondent work for a government agency and one-fourth on the industry side of food protection/safety.

In terms of future biennial meetings, the most preferred day pattern is Monday (workshops) thru Friday (assembly of delegates meeting), followed by Saturday thru Wednesday. When given a choice between the traditional months of April and May to attend the biennial meeting, April is preferred by 61.3%. Other than April or May, the most preferred months include March, October, and February.

The top five reasons (importance) for attending the biennial meeting include the quality of issues and topics addressed, keeping up with changes in one's profession, developing a professional network, fulfilling a desire to learn, and industry involvement. The items that were rated the lowest for importance in attending the biennial meeting include seeking employment opportunity, spending money on other items, chance to visit friends or relatives at the destination, family activities during the meeting, and the spouse and guest program. The results indicate delegates attend the biennial meeting for the importance of the conference rather than extra-curricular activities.

When the forty motivation items were reduced to underlying components, travelability (e.g., easy access to the destination, flight schedules, time required to travel to the destination) explained the largest proportion of motivation, followed by education (e.g., fulfilling a desire to learn, listening to respected speakers at the workshop, topics of the workshop). The results generally indicate attendees are focused on the purpose of and not the extra-curricular activities outside of the importance of the conference.

References

- Conference for Food Protection. (2015). Home. Retrieved November 13, 2015 from <http://www.foodprotect.org/>
- Grant, Y. N. J., & Weaver, P. A. (1996). The meeting selection process: A demographic profile of attendees clustered by criteria utilized in selecting meetings. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 20(1), 57-71.
- Kline, R. B. (2011). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (3rd ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Lee, M. J., & Back, K.-J. (2007). Association members' meeting participation behaviors. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 22(2), 15-33.
- Mair, J. (2010). Profiling conference delegates using attendance motivations. *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, 11, 176-194.
- Pallant, J. (2005). *SPSS survival guide* (2nd ed.). New York: Open University Press.
- Severt, D., Wang, Y., Chen, P.-J., & Breiter, D. (2007). Examining the motivation, perceived performance, and behavioral intentions of convention attendees: Evidence from a regional conference. *Tourism Management*, 28(2), 399-408.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Yoo, J. J.-E., & Chon, K. (2008). Factors affecting convention participation decision-making: Developing a measurement scale. *Journal of Travel Research*, 47(1), 113-122.
- Yoo, J. J.-E., & Chon, K. (2010). Temporal changes in factors affecting convention participation decision. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 22(1), 103-120.

Yoo, J. J.-E., & Zhao, X. (2010). Revisiting determinants of convention participation decision making. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 27(2), 179-192.

Appendices

Appendix A: Cover Letters

Dear \${m://FirstName}

The Conference for Food Protection is interested in understanding your preferences for the biennial conference and has partnered with the Conrad N. Hilton College of Hotel and Restaurant Management at the University of Houston to conduct this study. The amount of time to complete the online questionnaire should take no more than 10-15 minutes. In order to accurately represent Conference for Food Protection attendees like you, we need as many completed questionnaires as possible. We would appreciate your input regarding these topics.

Please click on the link at the bottom of the page and note, your participation in this study is confidential and your responses will remain anonymous. Also, your participation is voluntary and you may refuse to participate or withdraw at any time. You may also refuse to answer any question.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study or if any problems arise, please contact Dr. Jason Draper at the University of Houston at (713) 743-2416 or [jadrapr@uh.edu](mailto:jadraper@uh.edu). This project has been reviewed by the University of Houston Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (713) 7463-9204.

To complete the online questionnaire and provide your feedback to the Conference for Food Protection, please click on the link below.

James C. Mack, REHS, MPA
Chair, CFP Strategic Planning Committee
Email: james.mack@Wisconsin.gov
Phone: 608-266-8351
Cell: 608-206-3505

Follow this link to the Survey:

[\\${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}](#)

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:

[\\${l://SurveyURL}](#)

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:

[\\${l://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}](#)

Dear \${m://FirstName}

Within the past week we sent you an email to participate in the Conference for Food Protection study regarding the biennial conference. As of today our records indicate you have not completed the online questionnaire. In order to accurately represent Conference for Food Protection attendees like you, we need as many completed questionnaires as possible. We would appreciate your input regarding these topics. This is a friendly reminder to request your input regarding the Conference for Food Protection. The amount of time to complete the online questionnaire should take no more than 10-15 minutes.

Please click on the link at the bottom of the page and note, your participation in this study is confidential and your responses will remain anonymous. Also, your participation is voluntary and you may refuse to participate or withdraw at any time. You may also refuse to answer any question.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study or if any problems arise, please contact Dr. Jason Draper at the University of Houston at 713-743-2416 or [jadrapr@uh.edu](mailto:jadraper@uh.edu). This project has been reviewed by the University of Houston Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (713) 7463-9204.

James C. Mack, REHS, MPA
Chair, CFP Strategic Planning Committee
Email: james.mack@Wisconsin.gov
Phone: 608-266-8351
Cell: 608-206-3505

Follow this link to the Survey:

[\\${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}](#)

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:

[\\${l://SurveyURL}](#)

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:

[\\${l://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}](#)

Appendix B: Questionnaire

Conference for Food Protection_2014/2015

Q1 The Conference for Food Protection has partnered with the University of Houston's Conrad N. Hilton College to conduct a study to better understand your motivations for attending the biennial conference. You are one of 400 Conference for Food Protection attendees being sent the request to participate in this important study. The amount of time to complete the online questionnaire should take no more than 10-15 minutes. In order to accurately represent Conference for Food Protection attendees like you, we need as many completed questionnaires as possible. Your input will be helpful to the biennial conference committee to incorporate attendee attributes into the planning of future conferences. Your participation in this project is confidential. Also, your participation is voluntary and you may refuse to participate or withdraw at any time. You may also refuse to answer any question. All results will be reported in aggregate form. The results of this study may be published in professional and/or scientific journals. It may also be used for educational purposes or for professional presentations. However, no individual subject will be identified. If you have any questions or concerns about this study or if any problems arise, please contact Dr. Jason Draper at the University of Houston at 713-743-2416 or jadrap@uh.edu. Any questions regarding your rights as a research subject may be addressed to the University of Houston committee for the protection of human subjects (713-743-9204). To provide your input about the Conference for Food Protection, please click the "NEXT PAGE" button below to agree to participate and continue to the online questionnaire.

Jason Draper, Ph.D.

University of Houston Conrad N. Hilton College

Q2 For each item below please indicate how important it is in deciding to attend a biennial meeting of the Conference for Food Protection

	Not at all Important (1)	Somewhat Unimportant (2)	Neither Important nor Unimportant (3)	Somewhat Important (4)	Extremely Important (5)
Developing professional network (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My personal financial situation (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fulfilling my desire to learn (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Topics of the workshop (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Extra opportunities available at the destination city (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Time required to travel to the biennial meeting destination (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Previous positive experience at the meeting destination (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Total cost of attending the meeting (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Safety and security situation at the meeting destination (9)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Keeping up with changes in my profession (10)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Time availability (11)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Attractive image of the meeting destination (12)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My involvement with the association (13)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Financial support availability from my employer's organization (14)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Easy access to the meeting destination (15)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Schedules of other conventions (16)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Gaining recognition from peers (17)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Serving on a council or committee involvement (18)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My health conditions for travel (19)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Weather at the meeting destination (20)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Chance to visit friends or relatives at the meeting destination (21)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Listening to respected speakers at the workshop (22)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Opportunities for family activities during the meeting (23)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Participating in the social and recreational activities as part of the meeting (24)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Personal interactions with colleagues and friends (25)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Getting away from my routine work and schedule (26)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reputation of the meeting organizers (27)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Opportunity to visit the meeting destination (28)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Seeing people I know in my field (29)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Quality of issues and topics addressed at the meeting (30)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Industry involvement (31)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Seeking employment opportunity (32)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Length of the meeting (33)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ease of travel within the meeting destination (34)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Spouse and guest program (35)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other people attending from my organization (36)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Feeling a sense of a global food safety community (37)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Novelty of the meeting destination (38)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Spending money on other items (39)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Flight schedules (40)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q3 For which of the following reasons do you attend the Conference for Food Protection biennial meeting?

- My employer encourages me to attend (1)
- My employer requires me to attend (2)
- It is one of a number of conferences I choose from to attend (3)
- Other (please specify) (4) _____

Q4 Please rank the following day patterns you most prefer for the Conference for Food Protection biennial meeting by typing a 1 for the most preferred thru 3 for the least preferred in the boxes below.

- _____ Monday (workshops) thru Friday (assembly of delegates meeting) (1)
- _____ Wednesday (workshops) thru Sunday (assembly of delegates meeting) (2)
- _____ Saturday (workshops) thru Wednesday (assembly of delegates meeting) (3)

Q5 Traditionally, the Conference for Food Protection biennial meeting has been held in April or May, which do you prefer?

- April (1)
- May (2)

Q6 If the Conference for Food Protection biennial meeting were to be held in a month other than April or May, which month(s) would be acceptable? (Please check all that apply)

- January (1)
- February (2)
- March (3)
- June (4)
- July (5)
- August (6)
- September (7)
- October (8)
- November (9)
- December (10)

Q7 Please indicate which of the following years you attended the Conference for Food Protection.
(Please check all that apply)

- 2014 (1)
- 2012 (2)
- 2010 (3)
- 2008 (4)
- 2006 (5)
- 2004 (6)
- 2002 (7)
- 2000 (8)

Q8 Please indicate how likely you are to attend the Conference for Food Protection in the following upcoming years.

	Very Unlikely (1)	Unlikely (2)	Undecided (3)	Likely (4)	Very Likely (5)
2016 (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2018 (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2020 (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q9 In the past 12 months, approximately how many conferences have you attended?

Q10 Currently registration for the Conference for Food Protection meeting includes breaks, meals, social events, etc. Would you like a registration option where breaks, meals, social events, etc. were a la carte options?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q11 Which of the following best describes who pays for you to attend the Conference for Food Protection meeting?

- My employer/company pays the full amount (1)
- Partially paid by my employer/company and partially paid by me (2)
- I pay the full amount (3)

Q12 Please indicate the type of member or attendee you are for the Conference for Food Protection.

- Regulator (1)
- Industry (2)
- Academia (3)
- Consumer (4)

Q13 What is your zip code?

Q14 Which of the following types of companies or businesses do you work for?

- Federal government (1)
- State government (2)
- Local government (3)
- Retail industry (4)
- Grocery industry (5)
- Manufacturing industry (6)
- Vending industry (7)
- Foodservice industry (8)
- Other industry (please specify) (9) _____
- Public university/college (10)
- Private university/college (11)
- Consumer (please specify) (12) _____
- Non-profit (please specify) (13) _____

Q15 Please indicate the highest level of education you have completed.

- Grade school or some high school (1)
- High school diploma or GED (2)
- Technical, vocational, or trade school (3)
- Some college (including junior college) (4)
- Four-year college degree (B.A., B.S., B.F.A.) (5)
- Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.F.A., M.B.A.) (6)
- Ph.D./Professional (M.D., J.d., D.V.M., D.D.M.) (7)

Q16 Approximately how many years of work experience do you have in the food protection/safety industry?

Q17 Are you:

- Female (1)
- Male (2)

Q18 What is your age?

Q19 Which of the following best describes your ethnicity?

- White (1)
- Hispanic (2)
- African American (3)
- Asian (4)
- Other (please specify) (5) _____

Q20 Is there anything else you would like to share about the Conference for Food Protection biennial meeting?

Appendix C: Open Ended Responses to Other Reasons for Attending the Conference for Food
Protection Biennial Meeting

I am a delegate, therefore have a voice in the decisions made.

The FDA full supports the CFP and the results from this intense and very valuable meeting where issues can be discussed at length with all perspectives presented.

learn more about food safety issues affecting meat, poultry, and egg products

I probably won't be attending due to lack of resources.

Voting delegate

I serve on one of the councils and learning opportunity

Voting delegate. In light of budget constraints, employer limits attendance of more than one person, making the ability to understand issues difficult.

I have not been able to attend in the past.

This would be my first time.

Self interest

on council and the board

Participation in committees or councils

Funds were available - I requested the opportunity to attend

I believe it is very important to attend so that as a state representative I have input into development and maintenance of the FDA Food Code. Secondly, I'm a member of the CFP executive board.

Worked as volunteer

Participation in the CFP process

I don't attend.

Represent consumer views on issues the Conference considers

Involved in committee work and council for years

Feel it is important to have each state represented and attend as important decisions are discussed and voted on.

I have yet to attend a meeting

voting delegate

It is part of giving back to public health

I work for the organization

This is where a lot of the food code is developed. It's awesome to be a part of that.

my employer does not always encourage attendance

I've never attended one

voice for impacting/shaping future food code

For career development and educational opportunity

as employee of the Food and Drug administration we are required to represent the agency, serve as resources to stakeholders and we participate actively in the conference, thus the logistics of the meeting location and such is, is not particularly important for me since we are there to work.

I want to play an active role in shaping rules and regulations that impact our industry and company.

Council Member requires attendance

Volunteered to attend.

Interested in the science Having my vote heard. Don't like industry running the show.

It is part of my work duties to attend.

I want to attend

On the board so required to attend

Gaining knowledge and experience from others in the field

The issues that are presented

I would like to choose two answers #1 and #3 in the order they are shown.

It is an important way to stay involved in my field as a food safety professional

learn and network

I have served on committees and Council

I did not attend, so I am not sure why I received the survey. But you asked twice for my opinion, so here it is

To be an active and contributing professional in the food safety field.

Insuring Los Angeles has a voice in the national conversation regarding retail food regulation

Appendix D: Open Ended Responses to Other Types of Companies or Businesses Respondents
Work for:

In the first column: 9 = Other industry (please specify); 12 = Consumer (please specify); 13 = Non-profit (please specify)

- 9 3rd party service provider
- 9 Sanitation solution and food packaging supplier
- 9 Food Distribution and processing
- 13 Feeding America (Food Banking)
- 9 Corporate Dining
- 13 Association
- 9 All of the above as a consultant.
- 9 Supplier
- 13 501 C 3
- 9 all of the above
- 9 Consultant to all
- 13 Restaurant Industry Association
- 9 Chemical supplier and auditor
- 13 Food Banking
- 9 Food Safety Training (eLearning)
- 9 Testing company
- 9 Industry Association
- 9 service provider
- 9 Association
- 9 Certification Body
- 9 Brand Protection - Auditing
- 9 Certification Organization
- 9 private consulting: Food and Brand protection
- 13 consumer advocacy organization focusing on food and health issues
- 9 Foodservice consulting and support
- 9 Food Safety Testing Supplier
- 9 Food Distribution & Processing

- 9 Food Safety Training
- 9 I am a consultant to the foodservice/retail grocery and manufacturing industry along with food safety service/product providers
- 13 CFP
- 9 Strategic Planning/Consulting
- 13 NSF
- 9 Training Company
- 9 Online training
- 9 Retired from foodservice, currently some food safety consulting but mostly retired
- 12 Provide contract foodservice for all types of businesses. Education, Healthcare, Sports & Leisure, Corrections
- 13 Incubator Kitchen/Mobile Food Truck Commissary
- 9 Software
- 9 Training
- 9 Solution provider
- 9 Hospitality Industry (WDW)
- 9 Examination Provider
- 9 Food safety services
- 13 Trade Association - International Flight Services Association
- 9 Service provider - Pest Management

Appendix E: Open Ended Responses to Anything Else Respondents Would Like to Share About
the Conference for Food Protection Biennial Meeting

Number before open ended response represents the number of times respondent has attended the biennial meeting since 2000

4.00 It's always a great meeting

7.00 Sorry to say this but I am retiring and unless hired again by a food industry type, I most likely will not be attending another CFP. I have attended them since 1988. It has been a great experience. Regards and good luck...Larry Edwards, FDA

2.00 Short and efficient is good!

2.00 I think the councils should go sequentially so more people can attend. I hate how they are going on at the same time so you can only experience 1/3 of the sessions at any given time. I also hate the conflicting nature of the meeting where all the factions are privately meeting with each other all the time. It is not a very inclusive experience. The industry has too much representation on the councils and there isn't enough actual consumers represented.

1.00 My first attending was 2014. It was a great learning experience

3.00 It would be nice if there was more opportunity for the audience to ask questions or participate in the proceedings by giving presentations.

I am very interested in attending and participating.

8.00 More transparency and collaboration between regulators and industry.

8.00 This is a great conference, it just needs to be shorter some how.

A Monday-Friday conference is most preferable. Please take into account that many have families and weekends are difficult for travel.

2.00 Would appreciate more workshops on important topics and would like to see younger individuals attending (and holding positions on committees and councils).

2.00 Don't worry so much about the miscellaneous activities and other stuff. People attend CFP because they care about food safety and the industry. When time and/or money is tight, focus on the people the Conference is serving and the reason for getting together in the first place.

7.00 It provides an excellent opportunity to meet representatives of all the constituencies involved, develop relationships and a greater understanding of public health and food safety.

8.00 Best Conference Ever!

7.00 It is the best, most rewarding conference that I have attended.

1.00 GREAT learning experience. Ease of travel is KEY, i.e. choose a destination that is easy to get to NOT one that is off the beaten path. Too much time spent in travel detracts from other work and family obligations and lessens the chance that I will attend any conference.

4.00 No comment

2.00 I enjoy the conference and think it is organized very well.

1.00 n/a

7.00 I think it is extremely important that the biennial meetings continue and that the CFP executive board continues to oversee the workings of the conference. At the same time, it is very important to maintain the cost of the conference so that it is available to the most people possible. I believe this is one of the most important conferences I attend.

2.00 Looking forward to the meeting

7.00 This survey is too long!

Very little local (regulatory) involvement.

3.00 If you are considering moving the CFP meeting dates, please review the dates of other conferences as well as Jewish holidays (which move around year to year).

7.00 Hard work prior to meeting, hard work during meeting... pay-off is better product that is developed.

2.00 Industry is heavily represented compared to other groups. This seems to be true not just at the conference but with in committees. Consumer is grossly under represented. On some committees, the consumer positions are filled by industry, which makes the imbalance worse. The ultimate focus should be on food safety and science, but a lot of decisions are made based on the impacts to industry alone. This is a shame.

6.00 Never ask a participants age

2.00 We need a larger youth movement. The same people do the same things every year. Councils have the same people every year. Need to invigorate the body by bringing in fresh ideas.

8.00 I think the CFP affords a really good opportunity for a variety of stakeholder to come together and learn about the each other, which in turn helps the process of providing a safe food supply to consumers

8.00 More collaboration and transparency. More facilitating of innovation. A more risk-based Model Food Code.

2.00 Some of these answers will change in the future, such as I may have to pay in full personally to attend as employer is stopping most support of any of my programs. Also, dates and locations will influence my plans in 2018 and 2020, and I couldn't find these anywhere, so my answer is Undecided on both. The location of Boise makes 2016 very undecided, as does the ultimate program since I cannot stay the 19th and 20th this year.

The pre-conference workshop topic and cost is a big influence for me, also...not just conference deliberations.

1.00 Although have attended only one conference, it was interesting and I hope I get to attend again.

6.00 I look forward to receiving research information via issues and committee reports. I also look forward to deliberating and being informed about changes to Model Food Code, emerging issues in food science and national agencies.

1.00 N/A

2.00 Ideally we would figure out how to better engage all the attendees instead of the attendees just being an audience to the councils and not really being able to participate or provide any input to the panel discussions.

7.00 Lets get back to food safety and not all of the variances that can't and are not being monitored.

8.00 Great organization. It seems to struggle with costs because without Federal support and industry sponsorships the meeting would not be affordable. Salaried staff is very small. very strong reliance on volunteer work this can be very challenging. the leve of professionalism, organization and historical record keeping with the executive staff has made great strides in the past years. I feel that with the continual updates to the FDA Food Code the format of the Conference and Biennial meeting will need to cange as fewer and fewer issues will be submitted. My hope is that the Conference will continue to bring industry and regulatory folks together in collaboration and partnerships.

8.00 The best meeting and bang for your buck!

1.00 First CFP I attended was well organized and a very valuable experience.

7.00 With tightening travel restrictions for all levels of government agencies, ought to look at adding an interactive online attendance option. Good example is Council for the Model Aquatic Health Code: www.cmahc.org. Free live streaming is available for thei meeting in Scottsdale, AZ next week.

8.00 Try to have more new topics and dynamic speakers. Some of the panels are very good. Some of the speakers are great but many are a bit less interesting.

6.00 I always look forward to the debate/discussions in counsel. Lots of current science is discussed.

3.00 Nothing else like it.

2.00 I think the Conference For Food Protection is great and provides the conduit to get important and relevant scientific changes into the regulations. Never let that function get lost in the "background noise" of special interests. It is also important to et great speakers that could provide updates on the food service industry and the new challenges facing us.

2.00 make it relevant - make it fun. Get industry speakers

3.00 Great meeting, learning opportunity, and networking

3.00 Late-April to early-May are the best times of year to attend the meeting (it is not the end of a fiscal/calendar year). It takes a conference to fully appreciate how the CFP is organized and

operated, but it is a good system and I wouldn't mess with it too much. There will always be conflicts with schedules, travel arrangements, etc., but considering how complex the whole process is and the diversity of interest groups that attend, it works very well. Everyone knows what to expect and when - it boils down to making priorities and mine has been to attend and/or participate in the CFP.

2.00 While I cannot speak for everyone, attending the conference provides the unique opportunity to weigh in on recommendations that have potential to impact food safety nationally. Additionally it affords attendees exposure to and dialogue on often vast differences in regulatory perspectives and enforcement practices throughout the country.