

Employee Food Safety Training Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: Wednesday, December 17, 2014

Time: 3:00 p.m. (EST)

Facilitator: Hal King

Introduced himself as Chair and Ben as Vice Chair. . . Ben is not on the call due to illness.

1. Thanked everyone for agreeing to be a participant on the committee and explained that there is a lot of work to do
2. 19 voting members, Linda Catalan will not participate due to change in job duties
3. 18 participants on the call. Hal allowed the pragmatic system to announce callers.
4. Hal read the Antitrust Statement (conference for Food Protection, Inc.). Wants to be clear that everyone has a copy and understands.
5. Read the Committee Charge
 1. Make recommendations to the Conference for Food Protection in regard to:
 - a. What a food employee should know about food safety, prioritized by risk.
 - b. A guidance document to include recommendations for appropriate operator, regulator, and/or third-party food safety training program(s); including the criteria for the program and learning objectives.
 2. Report Committee recommendations to the 2016 Conference for Food Protection Biennial Meeting.
6. Ken Rosenwinkel – thanked Hal for being committee chair. Committee has one year as opposed to two years to complete the charge.
 - Hal stated that he wants to make sure that every voice is heard, and solicits everyone's input

7. The process of gathering information will allow to “close the gaps” in standards of food safety.
 - Christina. . .likes how process is layed out. Question: What can we gain from the training??
 - William. . .not a regulated thing from gov’t perspective. It is a requirement for food safety training.
 - Chirag. . .understands that the focus is retail food protection and not the manufacturing side.
8. We are only talking about “line” employees. Don’t want miss what we can learn from other sectors. The goal is to make sure that the food handler is ready.
9. Alan – Does anyone have a job that is based on Job Task Analysis (JTA)? Wants to prevent any assumptions as to what a food worker should know. The committee should decide what a food handler should really know. He and Hal have been through the JTA process. It would be great to stay as close to the JTA process as possible.
10. Take a look across the board at processes in different states (William). Agreed to be a part of this process and get ASTM standard information. Want to compare the states that are represented, just to see if there is a gap in what states are using.
11. Next call can be based on reports of gaps by members. Will collect info via email prior to call.
12. Steven (FDA) made suggestion to first figure out where programs are. Then look at them as a committee to agree on the actual gaps.
13. Aimee volunteered to get info on the grocery/retail side. Ben will search on the academic side.
14. Janice suggested to start at the state level.
15. Jeff Lang willing to serve with Ben on the academic sector.
16. Regardless of industry, there should not be that big of a difference.

17. A little confusion as to what the motive or goal is. As a baseline, it was suggested to start with the ASTM standard.
18. Hal thanked everyone for the comments and suggestions. The next call should take place at the end of January. Send emails or templates to Hal to assist. The goal is to make more progress.
19. Scheduling of future calls – suggested to preset calls. Select dates that will work for Hal and Ben. Then to send committee to vote on those dates. FDA can't use doodle. Meeting Wizard works best for FDA. Suggested to have calls more frequently.
20. Call ended at 4:25 p.m.

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

Attendance (see below)

1. Introductions

The members introduced themselves and their interest in this committee.

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

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

3. Framing behavior-based training (Ben Chapman)

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

- A good analogy for our work is to consider employees that clean hospital rooms: its known that they care, and understand that their interventions (sanitizing to control infection) matters.

- For our purposes, how do we ensure that food employees care? Teaching and showing them that people get sick when they fail to adhere to standards, and that is largely preventable by food employees. Training must show them how to do this, and getting them talking to each other about this is essential to its successful adoption.
- Methods that matter:
 1. Using stories more than numbers
 2. Putting the info into relatable context for the employee
 3. Generating surprise
 4. Generating ongoing dialog

4. Review of the committee charge, clarification of scope

Charge 1

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

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

Charge 2

Report Committee recommendations to the 2016 CFP Biennial Meeting.

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

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

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

Additional consensus was reached by the Committee that:

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

5. Review cataloged documents/data sources

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

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

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

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

6. Establish subcommittees for each group

Chapman reviewed three proposed subcommittees scopes of work:

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

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

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

7. Milestone setting

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

November, 2015, week 1, details TBD

8. Adjourn

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

Food Handler Training subcommittee: Industry non-regulatory delivery of food handler training

June 15

12pm ET- 1pm ET

Attending: Ben Chapman, Suzanne Fezell, Susan Delauris, Chirag Bhatt, Chuck Catlin, Aimee Lee, Stephen Hughes

- Reviewed the charge and approved the charge subcomponents.
- Quick thoughts on the charge, focused on generating a common outline capturing the elements of current programs.
- Suggestion to create a matrix, using risk factors as a foundation, in order to compare 'apples to apples' of different programs. What elements were similar?
- Discussion on recognizing that specific departments may result in specific requirements: produce department and pizza are different.
- Specific to job tasks should be recognized, not in the generic outline.
- Lets focus on the common knowledge, skills and behaviors.
- We need to try to achieve that the syllabus is universal as the baseline knowledge, skills and understanding
- Suggestion to align the matrix by the suggested inspection code
- Additional resources for this group: Brian Chapman State Food Safety & Kate Piche with NRA

Action 1 : Reach out to William on NRAs members looking like

Action 2: Susan Fezell - create a template to compare apples to apples - Susan to send to Ben

Action 3: Chirag to send to a quick email to restaurants food service to

gather FMI info.

Action 4: Chuck to reach out to additional resources noted above

CFP Employee Training Committee Meeting
IAFP Conference – Portland, OR
July 8, 2015
Conference call

Jordan Mason -FL
Ken Rosenwinkel - IL
Joe Graham - WA
Joyce Jensen

Ben talked about the charge, what we need to do.

Introductions

Expectations were confirmed – review state programs and discuss common elements

Allergens were discussed as a hot topic as they relate to food handlers - need to take into consideration and what's out there and not being used

Joe for context - states that already have it that go into the code interesting conversation, code requirement

Ken Shared: IL - Contentious issues were not really even within scope of content but related to implementation of assessment.

Some very basic criteria food employee training/food handler
Little of basic components - cleaning and sanitizing, temperature controls, personal hygiene
Should it be ANSI approved or not
* IL rule as a compromise - two classifications of training (restaurant vs non-restaurant) no such thing as restaurant vs. non-restaurant component

In IL - Certificates that required after three years

Joe from WA shared:

30 min training requirement as a minimum

Every two years

Food allergy awareness is included

Manual

36 questions are provided in the assessment they are risk based and weighted

Offered in 7 languages - not required in the code

Actions: Joe to send us a food handler info an populate the matrix.
(completed)

Food employees

ANSI landminds

FL experience from Allergens Safe Staff

GA requirements

JTAs

Jordan – shared that there are not JTAs available from Florida

Wrap-up and next meeting confirmed for August 12, 2015.

CFP Employee Training Committee Meeting

July 8, 2015

Conference call

Attendees:

Tom McMahan

Susan Feazell

Ashley Eisenbeiser

Chirag Bhatt

Ben Chapman

Stephen Hughes

Chirag provided details on a few programs:

Cracker Barrel

Waffle House and Starbucks, to be added to matrix

Susan's discussed the matrix including common competencies and unique foci

Pest control - brief of and concise - inform supervisor as - control measures related to pest control

Tom suggested that cleaning and sanitizing - is a core item (specifically the difference between cleaning and sanitizing)

Identifying core items - pest control/cleaning and sanitizing should that maybe be required under.

Some discussion around allergens - potential around adding allergens for food handler core

Focused some discussion of knowledge of a food handler diseases:

Reportable illnesses

- Knowledge know and understand the 6 reportable illnesses
- Shouldn't come to work if they are feeling sick
- Obligation when they have certain symptoms
- Some kind of documentation and a diagnosis is a manager
- If they are throwing up with diarrhea - because of the symptoms
- The problem with the anecdote, is that the indicated pathogens
- Sort of need to know why they are reporting it
- Teach them the symptoms vs. the pathogen
- Need to make sure that the knowledge

Wrap Up

**CFP Employee Training Committee Meeting
IAFP Conference – Portland, OR
Monday, July 27, 2015
Portland Convention Center**

A meeting of the CPF Training Committee was called to order by Chairman Ben Chapman at noon on July 27, 2015. Those in attendance were Ben Chapman, Susan Feazell, Hal King, Geoff Luebke, William Weichelt, Chuck Catlin, Davene Sarrocco-Smith, Bryan Chapman, George Nakamura, Jeff Lang, Joe Graham,

Chairman Chapman explained that the purpose of the meeting was to report on the progress of the work of the three subcommittees and clarify any matters.

Subcommittee 1: Looking at current Industry Practices with regard to food safety employee training.

There was some discussion regarding the different levels of training across the food service industries and the differing categories of food industries – grocery, restaurant, wholesale, etc. It was noted that the subcommittee should not describe in detail what is in the training program but that a subject matter is present.

Subcommittee 2: Looking at State Food Service Employee Training Programs.

It was noted that there appears to be little consistency between State food service training programs and requirements. A request went out for more state program information.

Subcommittee 3: Looking at Risk Factors as they relate to food safety employee training.

In reviewing the literature, it appears that there are five common risk factors being addressed across several training programs. They include Cross Contamination, Personal Hygiene/Hand Washing, Temperature Control, Employee Illness Reporting, and Cleaning/Sanitizing. There was some discussion regarding clarification of terms of employee illness reporting with regard to exclusion/restriction, reportable disease and symptom reporting. It was felt that symptom reporting was key to the discussion.

It was reported that some of the outliers being noted were issues like Pest Control, Allergens, etc.

It was noted that an important factor in evaluating training programs for the food serving employee would be to assess the learning level of the population. It was also noted that when putting in place the California statutes for food training there were political hurdles which needed to be overcome and should be considered when making recommendations to Council. Two new committee members volunteered to work with Subcommittee 2 in looking at state programs.

It was reported that all three subcommittees were collecting data and information and building matrixes for the purpose of comparison and concluding recommendations.

Chairman Chapman advised that what we would be submitting to Council would be “guidelines” for what should be in any food server training program.

The subcommittees will be meeting by conference call monthly to complete their matrixes and will attempt to schedule a call of the full committee around the Thanksgiving time frame. Chairman Chapman thanked everyone in attendance and those on the phone.