

Conference for Food Protection – Committee Periodic Report

Template approved: 04/20/2016

Committee Reports are considered DRAFT until accepted by the Executive Board

The Conference Chair, Executive Director, Council Chair, or Issue Chair may return committee reports, Issues, or attached documents requesting edits to improve clarity or understanding, or to include missing information.

Committee-submitted documents may impact the image, credibility and integrity of the Conference as an organization. With the exception of material that is copyrighted and/or has registration marks, committee generated documents submitted to the Executive Board and via the Issue process (including Issues, reports, and content documents) become the property of the Conference.

COMMITTEE NAME: Strategic Planning Committee

DATE OF REPORT: Initial fall progress report Spring progress report Second fall progress report

Date submitted: 3/24/2017

Date amended (if applicable): 34T

Date accepted by Executive Board: 34T

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENT: Council I Council II Council III Executive Board

REPORT SUBMITTED BY: Tom Ford, Elizabeth Nutt

COMMITTEE CHARGE(S):

Issue # _____

1. To develop 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

2.

Issue # _____

1.

2.

COMMITTEE WORK PLAN AND TIMELINE:

THE COMMITTEE HAS MET MONTHLY (EXCEPTION WAS APRIL FOR EASTER HOLIDAY), 4 MEETINGS IN TOTAL

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES:

1. Dates of committee meetings or conference calls

The committee met monthly on May 12, June 10, July 14 and August 11(scheduled)

2. Overview of committee activities:

The Committee has completed its SWOT assessment using both the board members and SPC members input and by using the conclusion from that exercise and based on the board recommendation at the April meeting, the committee began the process of crafting a SPC mission statement and plan. A draft of the statement was created by Dr. McSwane (attached)

There was significant discussion about the nature and role of the SPC which the committee would like to board to consider and provide direction for the SPC. We concluded that the role of the SPC could be viewed as proceeding in one of two directions:

1) Pursue a leadership role for the CFB board, one that would truly take an active and analytical approach to provide the board with action orientated recommendations that the board should act on to keep the CFP viable and relevant.

2) Continue the current approach as a data gathering and suggestive role for the board, bringing ideas and suggestions that the board should consider to support the short and long term goals of the CFP.

We felt option one, was a path that the committee should take, concluding that Board would not have the resources (time or research) as to conducting research and developing the solutions or options that would be necessary for the CFP to enact.

In order to assist the committee in which option to pursue we requested that Glenda survey the FDA CFP stakeholders as to the short and long term goals the FDA has for the CFP. We felt this analysis was critical to determining the future role of the SPC.

3. Status of charges still PENDING and activities yet to be completed:

a. Starting with the September meeting the committee will begin the process of implement the navigator program including issuing a follow-up survey to the first time attendees of the 2018 Biennial Meeting.

COMMITTEE REQUESTED ACTION FOR EXECUTIVE BOARD: No requested action at this time

1. Review the draft SPC mission statement and provide the SPC with a direction for the committee to proceed

Conference for Food Protection – Committee Periodic Report

ATTACHMENTS:

1. *Content Documents:*

- a. **Committee Member Roster:** *See changes noted above under “requested action”* *No changes to previously approved roster*
“Committee Members Template” (Excel) available at: www.foodprotect.org/work/ Committee roster to be submitted as a PDF attachment to this report.
- b. **Committee Generated Content Documents (OPTIONAL):** *No draft content documents submitted at this time*
Meeting minutes May-July

2. **Supporting Attachments (OPTIONAL):** *Not applicable*

SPC Draft Mission statement

<p>Q1) Describe or list what you feel are the most important and unique strengths associated with the Conference for Food Protection:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Credibility of the Conference and work output. • Consensus building process with all key stakeholders • Long history and continued membership/conference attendance growth confirming key national role of CFP
<p>Q1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The meeting provides an open forum for the input of all stakeholders to food safety as equal players in the discussion. This allows all views to be heard and acted upon. • The meeting and Committees also provide networking opportunities that are invaluable. When you think that it takes regulatory, industry, consumers, and academia to help achieve an integrated food safety system, this can be progressed by having familiarity with the players and knowing each other and having worked together. The CFP provides that opportunity. • Anyone can submit an Issue
<p>Q1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In my opinion the most important strength of CFP is the large group of people from many different backgrounds converging together expressing their respective thoughts on a common goal. Food Protection.
<p>Q1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a process to include all stake holders in the development of new food safety regulations which are science-based and practical to implement. • Good networking opportunities with other food safety professionals.
<p>Q1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ability for anyone to submit issues or concerns to CFP. This gives everyone a chance to make changes to the Model Food Code, create guidance documents, or point out other changes needed.
<p>Q1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having an opportunity to work together (all constituencies) to bring issues to the forefront and create recommendations for improving and maintaining regulations. This is the only forum that I know that exists for this type of interaction.

<p>Q1)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participants from many different constituencies 2. Opportunity to serve on committees to discuss, research, and make recommendations for topics of concern 3. Ability for anyone to submit an issue for consideration 4. Potential direct impact on FDA Food Code 5. Meetings held in different regions, which allows members who cannot travel far to attend at least some of the time 6. Membership fee included in conference registration
<p>Q1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The passion that we all share for the work that we do. But sometime, our passion gets mixed in with our personal feelings/agendas and I fear that there might be some members that are not willing to put aside their own personal agendas and, instead focus on the what is best for the missions that we share as CFP members.
<p>Q1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most importantly, the idea of all parties (industry, regulatory, and academia working together to achieve one goal. This is also a uniqueness with CFP.
<p>Q1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assembling of individuals from multiple areas of expertise to discuss relevant food topics which have a direct impact on food safety and working conditions for food employees. Attendees show a true dedication and passion for their line of work.
<p>Q1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulators at all levels of the profession get the opportunity to participate in the development of the Food Code. • Gives food safety professionals a way to elevate and enrich their professional experience. • Regulators become more informed by hearing and experiencing the views and perspectives of industry, consumers, and the other regions. • Collaboration with professionals in other regions can make and actual impact in moving toward uniformity and consistency.

<p>Q2) Describe or list what weaknesses or deficiencies you see are impacting the CFP:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership expansion with non-tapped groups (industry, retail etc.) • Financial outlook and potential pressures • Low membership/conference registration fees compared to other national level conferences with less national impact work output
<p>Q2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Those newer to the CFP may not understand the CFP process and its enormous impact on national retail food policy development, which in turn is used as a basis for state and local regulations and applied in retail food and food service establishments as a part of food safety plans/food safety management systems and in daily operational practices. The CFP also is an influence in regards to the development, maintenance, and use of the Retail Program Standards. • To “close this circle”, there is a need for the stakeholder segments and the CFP leadership to come together to better explain this link. For example, for the FDA, to explain the Food Code development process leading up to the Conference meeting and the follow up after. For the CFP, to explain the Issue submission process, the make-up of the CFP membership and the process of the Council sessions and the Committees. For the regulatory segment, to explain what happens at the state and local level with the CFP recommendations and the resulting FDA Food Code changes that come out of the CFP meeting; For the Industry segments, address how the recommendations of the CFP are handled at the store or restaurant operational level; For the consumer segment – identify what is on the minds of consumers and keep other stakeholder segments aware of emerging issues specific to consumer needs; For the Academia segment – Were there any Issues that were a No Action due to lack of science? Are these potential areas of academic study? Could they be? How does Academia utilize the CFP recommendations or resulting Food Code changes to view the emerging needs for food safety research bench research or behavioral research?
<p>Q2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From the short time I have been involved with CFP, I believe its biggest weakness is the marketing of its name and purpose to the industry professionals it serves.
<p>Q2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reliance on volunteers for some key committee leadership positions can result in less-than-satisfactory outcomes.

<p>Q2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local health departments make up a majority of food inspections being performed. There is a large number of local health officials working on committees, but when it comes time for final votes, local health departments have no say in the vote of the delegates.
<p>Q2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While CFP seeks to be inclusive of all members at times it appears that the some companies are “selling” their services or products for their benefit not the good of CFP. The Constitution and Bylaws and Executive Board should continue to address these issues as they arise to minimize these situations. There are opportunities to address balance issues within committees and to restrict the amount of members at large. While the C & B indicates that at large members would consist of those that have signed up for committees, I would suggest (and will to the C & B committee) that if a member signs up for any committee and they are a voting member on any committee that there is not a need for them to be included on other committee that as a member at large.
<p>Q2)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Limited members for some constituencies altogether and specific constituents in some regions 2. Roberts Rules of Order – although they are necessary, they create a lot of confusion & consume too much time 3. Extensive documentation to review for some issues 4. While we strive for equal/fair representation on the EB, councils & committees, the regulatory constituency has the majority of the power to make or break issues (with their vote during the Assembly). 5. Many issue submitters do not know that FDA prefers Food Code issues to be submitted as a concept as opposed to specific verbiage for the Food Code. 6. Difficulty getting committee members to complete charges and submit reports
<p>Q2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to what is described above, I think we need to consider a bigger presence with other food safety organizations such as IAFP and the MFRP Alliance. I attended an IAFP meeting once it seemed that very few people had ever heard of (let alone were familiar with) the CFP.

<p>Q2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the weaknesses of CFP is technology. As a regulator that cannot send multiple people to attend, I feel it is impossible to get to see all Councils. And some of the reasoning behind why council voting went the way they did is lost in the translation when relying on other to fill you in. This could be easily accomplished by streaming the council sessions and providing a link/passcode to those only registered to attend the conference, so at the end of the day they can see what really happened with certain issues.
<p>Q2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of ability to get participation from all attendees. Lack of use of technology to keep attendees connected and interacting outside of the biennial meeting.
<p>Q2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local regulatory membership remains low • Consumer representative membership remains low • Lack of defined mission, vision, and values • Limited use of social media and online applications unlike organizations such as NEHA and AFDO
<p>Q2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cost of attending the Biennial Meeting prevents some jurisdictions from participating. • Some of the issues presented are becoming less substantial and more about editing and definitions. Some issues have changed back and forth (non-continuous cooking requirements) from meeting to meeting. • There can be the appearance of strong industry pressure to promote issues, which can make some regulators uncomfortable.

<p>Q3) What do you feel are the biggest or easiest opportunities that are available to the CFP?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State code alignment with conference outcomes in a timely fashion • Increased electronic programs/systems development which are up-to-date for ease of use prior to, during and post Conference. Website difficult to navigate prior to conference to locate supporting Committee and Council documents • Expand awareness and basic education of CFP to various stakeholder by target groups (strategic messaging)
<p>Q3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CFP members participate in many of the same food safety meetings, symposiums, seminars, throughout the year. Can the CFP begin to work with organizations that have mostly local health department membership, e.g., NEHA or NACCHO, to widen the circle and include locals more? Perhaps, at least provide awareness of the CFP and how it impacts the day-to-day inspection work and for industry, how it impacts industry food safety management systems and daily operational practices.
<p>Q3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The biggest and easiest opportunities are one in the same. As is evident from the past few years' revenue, the largest growing source of revenue is sponsorship. Those potential sponsors must be targeted routinely to ensure they understand the purpose of CFP. • Grants. There must be other grants available besides FDA small conference grant.
<p>Q3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moving forward, we need to continually look at how individuals get information – through various forms of social media, Facebook, smart phone apps, etc. CFP should consider, when feasible, the incorporation of social media communication tools to remain relevant.
<p>Q3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having a way to communicate with other food safety groups before assigning or creating committees. Many of the members of CFP are also involved in the Partnership for Food Protection, AFDO, and the Food Safety Summit. Cut down on the duplication of efforts.

<p>Q3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CFP provides a forum for industry and academia to work closely with state, local and federal regulators in a forum that provides for dialogue and discussion. This is advantageous to members as it may be the only time many get the opportunity to engage with regulatory agencies. Over the years I have noticed that it also provides a forum for regulators to get to know other regulators and have engaging discussions as well. I understand that much work gets done at CFP and on the committees and that members are volunteering but members should not “volunteer” to serve on committees unless they are prepared to participate. CFP could do a better job in communicating that message. Oftentimes there are an abundance of members that wish to participate on a committee (voting members) and there is lack of space – only to find that a voting member doesn’t participate and is taking up space and not contributing.
<p>Q3)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See if a short block of time could be allotted at each FDA Regional Seminar for CFP EB constituency representatives, and representatives from other similar food safety organizations, to be introduced. This could bolster membership and participation. 2. Create a partnership with culinary schools/programs, perhaps in the form of mentorships
<p>Q3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Begin to initiate and maintain a presence with other organizations. Let other people in food safety know who we are and what we do.
<p>Q3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NETWORKING!!! The ability to discuss food safety with those who understand the “language”. Also, this leading into when you have an issue with a certain facility, new equipment, etc. You know who to call. The connection with those individuals are made through CFP.
<p>Q3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intergrating technology into the use of committee work, communication with members, etc. Social media would improve communication between members and may help to increase participation and attendance.
<p>Q3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None

<p>Q3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of most current technology for activities during and between biennial meetings • Engaging the “new generation” of members • More transparency in CFP activities that take place between biennial meeting • Benchmark other professional organizations to see what works and doesn’t work • Better marketing efforts
<p>Q3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Find a way to increase the availability of travel grants so that states with budget constraints do not get left out. • Continue to promote the Program Standards. • Find ways to increase CFP visibility; website use. • Reach out to unrepresented groups such as Tribal Nations and Territories.

<p>Q4) What threats do you see are hindering or are potential roadblocks to the CFP?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rising conference operation costs • Balances exceeding conference income
<p>Q4)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding is not always available for members to attend • If there is a perception that any participating segment is pushing its own agenda this can be detrimental to the process. I haven't seen this, but IF it occurred, it could be a threat to the Conference. • I think the Conference has, over the years, maintained its integrity in providing a fair and balanced forum for discussion and for Issue submission and resolution. To prevent this threat, the Conference should continue to encourage the no branding policy and discourage any segment pushing a certain agenda. Rather, the Conference can continue to promote the message that it serves in achieving national food safety through the collaborative work of the Conference membership. It is the unbiased, neutral body that provides a collaborative forum for the single goal of furthering the cause of food safety and doing so together.
<p>Q4)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have not been involved long enough to say what threats there might be other than revenue sources.
<p>Q4)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Escalating costs for putting on the biennial conferences is beginning to exceed CFP's ability to hold conferences in some parts of the country. • Dwindling employer resources (both regulatory and industry) can result in less funding for travel and sponsorships, and less time for food safety professionals to dedicate for CFP committee work and conference meetings.
<p>Q4)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some issues (especially in Council III) are automatically dismissed based upon no science or documentation supporting the issue. Some issues need to be discussed to find out who can provide the science or documentation because states and locals do not always have the capability or scientist to devote to the ideas.
<p>Q4)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seeking locations for CFP biennial meetings that is affordable and easy to get to is important. Hotel rooms at over \$150 per night are unreasonable.

Q4)	<p>1. Currently no limit on the number of issues a council is expected to deliberate on</p> <p>2. Budget issues</p>
Q4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of people willing to volunteer time. But this is not an exclusive problem to CFP.
Q4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The length of the conference is long, knowing there is an abundance of information to get through (I am not sure how to conquer that). Also, the cost of travel to the meetings; while everyone loves to attend different location throughout the country, sometimes it isn't cost effective for attendees. If the conference found locations that were less expensive and easier in/outs, more people may be able to attend (especially regulators). If was a little upsetting that during the last conference, there were several states not represented. This is largely due to the cost it takes for the states to send the individuals.
Q4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of industry and consumer representatives in addition to regulators in the Issue deliberation process. • A rather comprehensive Constitution & Bylaws document • Working relationships within and between federal, state, local, and tribal/territorial regulators and food industry stakeholders • Financial support provided by sponsors • Integrity of the Issue submission, review, and deliberation process • Opportunities for members to contribute to the work of CFP through Board, Council, and Committee membership • Provides a model for similar organizations such as the Conference for the Model Aquatic Health Code (CMAHC) • Educational workshop is provided in addition to the working biennial meeting sessions
Q4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing costs associated with sustaining activities • Lack of a 5-year Strategic Plan with financial outlook
Q4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar to weaknesses listed above.

<p>Q5) Other thoughts, ideas and suggestions not covered in the items above.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since I have been in the business world my whole life, I treat everything as a business. The most important thing about any business is survival. The reason most businesses fail either they didn't have a plan or they veered off course from their plan. It surprises me that CFP has been in existence as long as it has without a Long Range Plan. Maybe government affiliated organizations don't require a plan. Other people would know better than me. What the Strategic Planning Committee is doing is a step in the right direction. The composition of most businesses is Administration, Marketing, Sales and Production. In CFP's case, the production part is the Conference. Administration is the Ex. Director, Ex. Assistant, and the Ex. Treasurer. Any sales or marketing is coming from committees, website, and administration. In my opinion, as you compose your plan, consider marketing and sales as a key element of the plan. Doing that will help ensure long term growth of CFP.
<p>Q5)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has there been any thoughts of going to two councils instead of three. Council II in recent history have had a much smaller workload, and a number of those have little or no discussion before being approved as submitted. Much of the work involving the bylaws and housekeeping items could be done by a conference call or video conference. The items involving the standards could be moved to council I.
<p>Q5)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important to continue to "advertise" CFP in regional FDA and AFDO associate meetings as well as spread the word to those that are regulated by FDA.
<p>Q5)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When new to the conferences, it may be beneficial to have webinar for new members so they know what to expect prior to arriving, sometimes, they are too nervous or shy to ask questions. This way they will have a better idea of what is going on prior.