Conference for Food Protection – Committee Periodic Status Report

Template approved by the Executive Board May 2014

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

Council Chairs are required to submit committee reports to the Executive Director at least 30 days prior to each Executive Board meeting (held in Spring and Fall of each year); please submit reports far enough in advance of this deadline to permit review by the Council Chair. Committee Periodic Status Reports are intended to update the Executive Board on the status of the committee and the progress toward fulfilling the charges approved by the Assembly of Delegates or assigned by the Executive Board.

COMMITTEE NAME: Demonstration of Knowledge Committee

COUNCIL or EXECUTIVE BOARD ASSIGNMENT: Council II

DATE OF REPORT: March 18, 2015

SUBMITTED BY: Eric Moore & Michelle Haynes

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROSTER:

□ see attached roster for updated member listing and Executive Board approval

committee membership has not changed; see previously submitted and approved roster dated: 3.18.15 (the EB was asked to approve a roster change after this report was written, before the April Board Meeting. The attached roster reflects that request)

COMMITTEE CHARGE(s):

- 1. Review the current methods in Food Code Section 2-102.11 for demonstrating knowledge.
- 2. Identify the pro's and con's of the existing methods in Food Code Section 2-102.11(A) and 2-102.11(C) for the Person in Charge to demonstrate knowledge.
- 3. In lieu of Food Code Section 2-102.11(A) and 2-102.11(C), identify methods that could be used to demonstrate knowledge if/when the CFPM is not onsite.
- 4. Identify the pro's and con's of alternative methods to demonstrate knowledge if/when the CFPM is not onsite. Although not limited to the following areas, the committee should assess the pro's and con's of each alternative method in light of the following areas:
 - a. Differentiation between knowledge and application;
 - b. Emphasis on risk factors;
 - c. Ease of uniform assessment by regulators and industry;
 - d. Enabling the Person in Charge to demonstrate knowledge even when there is language barrier.
 - e. What corrective action should be taken when there is not a demonstration of knowledge from the Certified Food Protection Manager or the Person In Charge.
- 5. Report back to the 2016 Biennial Meeting.

COMMITTEE'S REQUESTED ACTION FOR EXECUTIVE BOARD (If Applicable): No action at this time

PROGRESS REPORT / COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES WITH ACTIVITY DATES:

1. Progress on Overall Committee Activities

- 10/19/2014 Michelle Haynes selected to as committee co-chair (replacing April Bogard)
- 11/14/2014 First call for the group, membership confirmed, charges and anti-trust statement reviewed, emailed feedback form to committees to provide analysis of Food Code references in charges.
- 12/5/2014 Second call, reviewed feedback forms received from committee members
- 01/15/2015 01/22/2015 Survey emailed to group for feedback on compiled analysis results of committee members
- 01/23/2015 Third call reviewed survey results, discussed recommendations for final language
- 02/09/2015 Fourth call continued review of survey results, discussed recommendations for final language
- 03/16/2015 Regulatory voting member April Bogard, Minnesota Department of Health resigns from committee service due to job change.
- 03/18/2015 Recommended local regulator Robert Erwin, Fairfax County Health Department to replace April Bogard as a regulatory voting member

2. Progress Addressing each Assigned Committee Charge

- 1. Review the current methods in Food Code Section 2-102.11 for demonstrating knowledge.
 - a. Charge has been completed.
- 2. Identify the pro's and con's of the existing methods in Food Code Section 2-102.11(A) and 2-102.11(C) for the Person in Charge to demonstrate knowledge.
 - a. This charge is approximately 80% complete.

Conference for Food Protection – Committee Periodic Status Report

Template approved by the Executive Board May 2014

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

- 3. In lieu of Food Code Section 2-102.11(A) and 2-102.11(C), identify methods that could be used to demonstrate knowledge if/when the CFPM is not onsite.
 - a. This charge is approximately 75% complete.
- 4. Identify the pro's and con's of alternative methods to demonstrate knowledge if/when the CFPM is not onsite....
 - a. This charge has not yet been addressed.