

## April 2018

No reference to publications found.

## August 2017

Report of ad hoc committee on Standards for Documents Published on CFP Website and Peer Reviewed and Non-Peer Reviewed Publications - Brian Nummer

Dr. Nummer reported on the ad hoc committee progress. He stated the committee was charged with clarifying the non-commercialism policy. He stated a policy/template was needed before initiation of the process. He further stated that perhaps the current ad hoc committee could develop a template that could be followed however he feels that possibly we may need a standing committee to be created to establish a review of publications. Mr. Eils, Ms. Lewis and Ms. Krzyzanowski commented about who will be reviewing documents and what will be reviewed. Dr. Nummer is concerned as to what level the CFP's intent is with peer reviewing a document. Discussion ensued as to whether to review or not review documents. Mr. Horn stated that if CFP does want to publish something, this would then become an important function. He asked if there should be a committee to review documents for accuracy before posting on the website. Ms. Sarrocco-Smith stated this problem (publication) would not be going away and we should address this situation now. There are two concerns, one is the maintenance of documents and the other is they are to be peer reviewed. Dr. McSwane stated there are two very important issues, one is to review the documents on the website now and to update them. This would be done by committee and go through the standard review CFP process and the other is that an individual or group of individuals could take CFP generated materials and publish them under their name. Dr. Schaffner's proposals were not accepted by the CFP therefore, Dr. Nummer was trying to figure out how to proceed. The Board needs to be looking at whether or not documentation reflects what the CFP intended. Ms. Everly stated she was in agreement with the twofold concern stated, and when this arises she suggested the committee put this concern in their Issue. This gives the council an opportunity to debate it and the assembly of delegates an opportunity to decide as to whether the document in question needs peer reviewing and leaving the peer review to whom the committee thinks should do the review. This may relieve the CFP from needing to have a huge internal process. Ms. Bacon believes there was a need for a standing committee to handle these concerns. Ms. Everly clarified that we currently have was a "Commercialism Policy".

ACTION ITEM: Ms. Bacon moved and Ms. Krzyzanowski seconded to create a standing committee with specific charges and specific constituency makeup to review current CFP publications and committee publications. No vote taken.

## April 2017

Publication Committee – Brian Nummer

Dr. Nummer provided an overview of his report via telephone. The question is whether CFP endorses publications. The committee wanted to say that the CFP has had a long-standing policy of non-commercialism; therefore any publication must be scrutinized to assure it meets with the non-commercialism policy. The concern is using volunteers and the possibility of someone wanting to use the document in a commercial sense. Mr. Plunkett stated the question is, are we violating others rights to copyright status? Dr. Nummer said it has not been addressed yet, but needs to be addressed by the committee. Ms. Sarrocco-Smith asked if this applied to all CFP documents including guidance documents and Dr. Nummer stated both. He used the National Advisory Committee on Microbiological Criteria for Food (NACMCF) format as an example. Can CFP follow the format used by (NACMCF)? The CFP would be the author. The CFP document would probably need a peer review. Ms. Lewis asked about authorship and would it include committee member names rather than stating "CFP". It could be either and is under discussion by the committee. There is a question as to whether this ad hoc

committee should be converted to a standing committee. Ms. Everly asked where in the issue process flow would this peer review process occur. It was agreed that publications impacted by this policy would have been previously vetted by Council and approved by the Assembly of State Delegates. She also wanted to clarify that we currently have a “commercialism policy”. Dr. Nummer asked the Board to acknowledge this report with the expectation to provide more clarification by fall Board meeting. Ms. Everly asked about the template committee report document submitted which had the Issue Chair crossed out in the top canned statement. He stated there was a concern about a peer reviewed document and who would also be involved in reviewing the document. He stated that having upper level editors coming into editing the document was a question. He said apologies because he intended to include any other person such as a council chair not just the issue chairs as the concern. Ms. Lewis stated Item 1 bullet point 3 of the report needed clarification.

ACTION ITEM: April 26-27, 2017 Page 4 of 13 Mr. Eils moved and Ms. Krzyzanowski seconded to acknowledge the Publication Committee Report and to come back to the Board meeting in August with further clarification. A vote was taken and the motion carried.

## August 2016

Standards for Documents Published on CFP Website and Peer Reviewed and Non-Peer Reviewed Publications. – Brian Nummer

Dr. Nummer (Chair) of the ad hoc committee is requesting to have the ad hoc committee continued with current membership consisting of Dr. Nummer, Dr. Schnaffer, David Read, and David Crownover. Dr. Nummer asked the Board to approve the committee’s charges as listed in the submitted report [*NOTE: “submitted report” referenced in this statement is not available on the CFP website; see charges below extracted from August 2017 committee report*]. The committee will report back at the spring meeting. Ms. Everly asked how this review falls within the Issue process with respect to when documents are reviewed for determination. Ms. Everly suggested this be placed in a policy. This needs to be included in the charges of the committee. Dr. Nummer responded in the affirmative. Ms. Bacon also asked when this process takes place and Dr. Nummer said it would most likely need to go through the council process. He stated this is still to be determined. The question was asked as to what is CFP’s role as to credit for the work. Ms. Cornman reminded the Board that whatever is created by a committee belongs to the CFP. Ms. Everly brought up ownership of drafts that were not approved through CFP, and to whom the draft belong. Dr. McSwane doesn’t think the CFP can claim ownership to a draft that isn’t submitted as an Issue and doesn’t go through the whole process. Ms. Everly stated clarification is needed to understand the process. Dr. Nummer is open to any and all recommendations from Board Members.

ACTION ITEM: Ms. Bacon moved and Ms. Krzyzanowski seconded, to approve the creation of the Documents Published on CFP Website and Peer Reviewed/Non-Peer Reviewed Publications (ad hoc) Committee as outlined in the report provided by Dr. Nummer and to bring back findings and recommendations at the next spring meeting. A vote was taken and the motion carried.

**NOTE:** The following “charges” are copied from the Publications Adhoc Committee Report submitted in August 2017; unable to verify if these are the charges approved via the above motion in August 2016.

1. *Clarify CFP Non-commercialism policy and CFP “endorsement” (in publications, committee outputs, marketing, etc)*
2. *Determine copyright level of CFP generated documents (public domain or CC-noncommercial use only)*
3. *Determine committee role in creation of a publication (including authorship; e.g. get committee approval early in the process)*

4. *Determine a CFP "peer review" process for documents to be placed on CFP website or bear reference to a CFP committee when submitted to a journal and determine when or if a committee may submit to a journal without CFP review*
5. *Write draft policy and develop draft guidance document for CFP use.*

## **April 2016**

Committee on Standards for Documents Published on CFP Website and Peer Reviewed and Non-Peer Reviewed Publications – Donna Garren

Dr. Garren reported the Committee did not have anything to report at this time. She suggested the committee should continue to work on the issue at hand, however she stated she would not be able to continue as chair. If it were the will of the Board to continue the committee, a new chair would need to be selected.

ACTION ITEM: Ms. Stevens-Grobbelaar moved and Mr. Finkenbinder seconded to acknowledge the Standards for Documents Published on CFP Website and Peer Reviewed and Non-Peer Reviewed Publications Report. A vote was taken and the motion carried.

## **August 2015**

Standards for Documents Published on the CFP Website

Dr. Garren reported on the Ad hoc Committee on Standards for Documents Published on CFP Website and Peer Reviewed and Non-Peer Reviewed Publications. She stated that the work is ongoing and the committee has not done much on this issue to date. She stated that little has changed. Dr. Garren stated that final committee discussions would be sent to Council II as an Issue. She will take the lead in preparing an Issue for the 2016 biennial meeting that addressed the matters that were submitted, but withdrawn, at the 2014 biennial meeting. .

Discussion: Ms. Everly reported that publication of peer-reviewed documents has been discussed and was captured in guidance documents by the Issue Chairs. It was stated that Dr. Garren's committee is supposed to flush out the details. Dr. Garren stated she was tasked to come up with details for the process. Dr. McSwane reiterated that the CFP does not want to be the approvers of peer reviews because this is not the role of the CFP. Mr. Smith stated it is the role of the Ad Hoc committee to submit guidelines to the EB for approval. Ms. Cornman asked if there was ever a straw vote taken by the EB? There was no previously straw vote taken.

## **April 2015**

The report from the ad hoc Committee on Standards for Documents Published on CFP Website and Peer Reviewed and Non-Peer Reviewed Publications chaired by Dr. Garren.

Dr. Garren stated there was no report at this time

## **August 2014**

No reference to publications found.

## May 2014

Executive Board Review of Committee Documents Deemed Worthy of Publication (taken out of order).

Discussion of Issue II-027. Dr. McSwane distributed 3 items and sent out an email message to the Board explaining the a discussion that occurred in Council II. A recommendation was previously submitted by an ad hoc committee Chaired by Dr. Don Schaffner to evaluate requests for publication in peer-reviewed journals. The recommendations of the ad hoc committee were reviewed, however, the EB did not want it as specific as written (See Issue). The Issue language would require the modification of the procedures manual (specific language). Council II thought the recommendation contained in the Issue submitted on behalf of the Board was too vague and wanted process and specific criteria added to the recommended solution. There seemed to be 3 viable options available to the Board:

1. Study the matter more thoroughly and present an issue at the next biennial meeting
2. Create some language for a process and criteria in time to be considered by Council II at the 2014 biennial meeting (this option was not viewed as favorable by the Board).
3. Dr. McSwane provided a copy of the report – basically a disclaimer if good enough for peer reviewer and not necessarily approval by CFP but just to be reviewed to make sure there are no conflicts with CFP role.

The Federal agency representatives mentioned they would want to weigh in on documents that contained information from their respective agencies. Dr. McSwane expressed concern that this review could delay publication of documents to the point they would be no longer timely and relevant. Council II had tabled action on the Issue pending on board direction. Dr. Garren asked what do other similar organizations do? Dr. McSwane indicated that some similar organizations have their own publications and editorial boards that review manuscripts prior to publication, such as the Journal for Food Protection. Dr. McSwane suggested that we could simply check documents proposed for publication for anything (implicitly or explicitly) in conflict with the CFP mission and goals. The federal representatives would need to review before signing off on this process. Mr. Smith suggests a more robust protocol before being put in the procedures manual.

Ms. LeMaster asked what is the will of the board? Ms. Gaither asked how does another similar organization handle this situation and Dr. McSwane stated they have their own peer reviewers.

**ACTION ITEM:** Mr. Roberson moved to create an ad hoc committee to create criteria and a process for assessing the suitability of CFP documents for submission to peer reviewed and non-peer reviewed publications and Mr. Rosenwinkel seconded the motion. Mr. Levee suggested a friendly amendment to include asking the question as to whether or not a procedure is needed. Mr. Roberson wants a time frame for the committee to report back at fall EB meeting and complete the process by spring of 2015. A vote was taken and the motion carried.

## Special Committee Report

Ms. Samarya-Timm was representing the Hand Hygiene Committee on the subject at hand and her concern involving placing the document “Scientific, Regulatory and Behavioral Consideration of Hand Hygiene Regimes” on the CFP website. She stated her point was the timeliness of her request. Dr. Garren stated these concerns couldn’t be resolved here until we have a process and criteria for publication of CFP documents.

**ACTION ITEM:** Michael Roberson moved and Ken Rosenwinkel seconded the motion to create an adhoc board committee comprised of both board and other CFP members to create a mechanism to publish CFP generated material in both peer reviewed and non-peer reviewed publications. Mr. Levee made a friendly amendment, Mr. Rosenwinkel seconded to include asking the question as to whether a procedure is needed. Mr. Luker asked if there was any further discussion, hearing none Mr. Luker called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Donna Garren was approved by the Board to chair this committee.

## August 2013

Ad Hoc Committee on Standards for Documents Published for CFP Website – Dr. Don Schaffner

Dr. Schaffner reviewed his previously submitted report including how to implement a policy dealing with published documents. The report includes a draft acknowledgement statement.

NOTE: The following “acknowledgement statement” is copied from the draft “policy” referenced:

*This manuscript was developed as part of the fulfillment of a charge to the (committee name) of the Conference for Food Protection. The Conference for Food Protection brings together representatives from the food industry, government, academia, and consumer organizations to identify and address emerging problems of food safety and to formulate recommendations. Any recommendations expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors, and do not necessarily represent those of the Conference for Food Protection or (committee name) members who are not authors.*

Discussion ensued including: what would be the process of how something may be submitted to a peer recommend journal, would it be part of an Issue Recommendation, is the leadership of the original Committee responsible for getting peer review done, must it only be done after approval by the Assembly, does a policy need to include that nothing can be submitted for publication that hasn't gone through the Issue acceptance process? The Board concluded that this issue is much greater than we thought and will require further thought.

Mr. Gifford moved and Ms. Fletcher seconded the motion that if members of a Committee feel their work is worthy of publication they can submit their draft manuscript for approval by the Board. Discussion continued.

Mr. Gifford and Ms. Nutt called the question. The motion passed unanimously.

The original motion (Gifford/Fletcher) was voted on. The vote was 10 yes, 4 no, with 2 abstentions. This item will need to be submitted as an Issue through the C&B Committee. The motion carried.

Mr. Finkenbinder moved and Ms. Albrecht seconded motion to acknowledge the ad hoc Committee's report. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Schaffner and the members of the ad hoc committee were thanked by the Board for the work they put into this subject

At the behest of Dr. McSwane, Ms. Everly introduced the new topic of “ownership/professionalism,” specifically whether documents created by the various committees are “owned” and by whom – the creator or CFP? (See page 3 of the Issue Committee Report for details.) Ms. Everly and Ms. Hale recommend that documents created within and on behalf of the members be the property of CFP once submitted (reports and Issues) as described in the following Policy Statement:

**Draft Policy Statement:** Committee-submitted documents reflect upon the professionalism of the Conference as an organization. Once submitted to the Executive Board, or submitted online via the Issue Management Program, all Issues, reports, and content documents generated by a Conference committee belong to, and are solely the property of, the Conference. Documents and Issues submitted to the Conference by an independent entity do not reflect upon the Conference as an organization and reflect solely on the professionalism of the submitter. All Issues and attached content documents, once finalized by the Issue Reviewer and accepted for council consideration become the property of the Conference for Food Protection and reflect on the professionalism of the Conference as an organization.

Mr. Roberson moved and Mr. Hicks seconded motion to accept the recommendations of Ms. Everly regarding ownership of CFP documents. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Everly stated that the question has been raised regarding whether or not committee reports, attachments, and Issues posted on the CFP web site are considered to be in the “public domain” and whether use limitations can or should be placed on those documents. The Board discussed the topic but no action was taken at this time.

### **May 2013**

Terry Levee reported that the Ad Hoc Committee on Standards for Documents Published on the CFP Website chaired by Don Schaffner will provide a report at the August Board meeting.

### **August 2012**

Report from the ad hoc Committee on Standards for Documents Published on the CFP Website

Committee Member Schaffner joined the meeting by phone. Levee distributed the Committee’s written recommendations with a request to accept their submitted guidance document (posted here: <http://foodprotect.org/media/positionreport/Publishing%20Guidance%20DRAFT.pdf> ). There was general discussion of whether the Committee should be expanded to address charges, whether CFP wants to get involved in peer review processes prior to publication of documents, whether we want to limit it to science-based reports, do we want to enter the arena of intellectual property, who owns it, etc. It was generally felt that these processes need to be well-thought out and further considered before moving forward.

Gifford moved and Garren seconded motion to thank the ad hoc Committee for its efforts thus far, to accept recommendations 2 and 3 in the report that encourages continued work and the addition of the Executive Director to the Committee. The motion passed unanimously.

### **April 2012**

No Action Issues (Peer Review of Web-posted Documents)

There was discussion regarding Issues from Council III deliberations that led to “no action” regarding the posting and distribution of educational materials and submitting documents to a peer-reviewed journal. One reason for no action was the lack of policy or procedure for posting educational materials on the web site. The Council requested that the Ex Board discuss their concerns. How do we deal with publishing articles from a committee as part of their final committee report? We “acknowledge” that we have received the document but we do not review the content.

A recommendation was made that the Executive Board form a small committee to discuss this Issue to determine process BEFORE the timeline for the next conference begins. It was suggested to include Katie Swanson or Don Schaffner to serve on this committee; they have relevant experience.

Some Ex Board members were not aware that the Conference has a place on the web site for educational materials. It was suggested that we create a disclaimer on the web site stating that document content is for educational purposes only.

Open questions: Who do the Committee documents belong to? Submitter or Conference? Who has ownership?

Hedman moved and Levee seconded motion that the Ex Board form an ad hoc committee to explore Constitutional and Bylaws procedures/issues and to conduct research regarding Bylaw

requirements to ensure that documents published on the web site meet scientific standards and to report back by August 2013 Ex Board meeting.

Linton agreed to serve but will not chair, Vicki Everly agreed to serve to ensure coordination with Issues process, Levee also agreed to serve and to chair. Cornman agreed to assist as C&B Chair.

There was no motion to form this Committee per Conference Chair.

### **August 2011**

Marlow shared a Food Safety Magazine report in which CFP was mentioned; there was some discussion about what types of CFP information can be shared publicly and to what extent a Committee member can "represent" his views as CFP views. Hedman recommends that the author of the article (Committee Co-Chair) should be cautioned that article should have been approved at least by the Committee before publication and probably by the Council and Conference Chair. The Chair was cautioned to not reference CFP but ignored the caution. Everly recommends that Council Chair position descriptions be modified to include a statement about referencing or using CFP or in speaking for CFP. Only the Board should have that authority. McSwane recommends we move cautiously with this since there are many opportunities to publicize CFP that may be of benefit to us. Girard spoke in support of caution. Lineberry will draft a statement to add to Council and Committee Chair position descriptions regarding this issue if the Board votes to do so. Cornman said that she will take a look at other nonprofit organizations and bring information back to the Board.

Garren moved and Gaither seconded motion to direct the Executive Director and Constitution & Bylaws Committee to create proposed language for a policy statement related to communications using the CFP name; policy should apply to use of CFP and intellectual property of CFP; and require communication through any designee to be preapproved. New language would be approved by the Executive Board by evote. The motion passed unanimously

### **April 2011, August 2010, April 2010, August 2009, and April 2009**

No reference to publications found.

### **August 2008**

Smith expressed reservations about the report submitted by the Inspection Form Scoring Committee with respect to reporting results and drawing conclusions based on a limited survey of only those agencies that have proceeded with inspection scoring system. Committee members stated that the report is summarizing the status of the committee's activities as of April 2008; it does not summarize any subsequent action. Garren reported that the Committee's intention is to pursue a more expanded survey in hopes of developing more "publishable" results. Committee is considering how to pursue funding for such a survey.

### **April 2008**

No reference to publications found.

*Review of minutes conducted back to April 2008.*