

# Food Safety

Food Safety

## V(A). Planned Program (Summary)

### 1. Name of the Planned Program

Food Safety

## V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)

### 1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
712	Protect Food from Contamination by Pathogenic Microorganisms, Parasites, and Naturally Occurring Toxins	100%		100%	
<b>Total</b>		100%		100%	

## V(C). Planned Program (Inputs)

### 1. Actual amount of professional FTE/SYs expended this Program

Year: 2007	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
<b>Plan</b>	4.8	0.0	5.0	0.0
<b>Actual</b>	5.9	0.0	3.0	0.0

### 2. Actual dollars expended in this Program (includes Carryover Funds from previous years)

Extension		Research	
Smith-Lever 3b & 3c 78793	1890 Extension	Hatch 130887	Evans-Allen
0	0	0	0
1862 Matching 78793	1890 Matching	1862 Matching 181061	1890 Matching
0	0	0	0
1862 All Other 478879	1890 All Other	1862 All Other 202017	1890 All Other
0	0	0	0

## V(D). Planned Program (Activity)

### 1. Brief description of the Activity

County Extension agents were trained and approved by the Texas Department of State Health Services qualified instructor for the Food Protection Management Program. Additional trainings were provided/identified so that instructors could maintain their instructor qualification status per the Texas Department of State Health Services.

The program was implemented in counties across the state that had an agent qualified to teach the program. In an effort to better reach Spanish-speaking audiences, all course materials were translated into Spanish.

The program impact was evaluated by surveying participants 30-days after the program was completed.

### 2. Brief description of the target audience

Individuals employed in the retail food service industry. This includes cooks, managers, and owners who were affiliated with foodservice establishments such as restaurants, school food service, bed and breakfasts, prisons, and other establishments that prepare and serve food to individuals.

**V(E). Planned Program (Outputs)**

**1. Standard output measures**

**Target for the number of persons (contacts) reached through direct and indirect contact methods**

	<b>Direct Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Direct Contacts Youth</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Youth</b>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>
<b>Plan</b>	2700	15000	400	0
2007	5065	41695	55	0

**2. Number of Patent Applications Submitted (Standard Research Output)**

**Patent Applications Submitted**

**Year Target**

**Plan: 0**

2007: 0

**Patents listed**

**3. Publications (Standard General Output Measure)**

**Number of Peer Reviewed Publications**

	<b>Extension</b>	<b>Research</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Plan</b>			
2007	0	22	22

**V(F). State Defined Outputs**

**Output Target**

**Output #1**

**Output Measure**

# of group educational sessions conducted.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	170	385

**Output #2**

**Output Measure**

# of research-related publications.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	25	22

**Output #3**

**Output Measure**

# of research-related projects.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	7	10

**V(G). State Defined Outcomes**

O No.	Outcome Name
1	FPM Pass/Fail Rate - the is the percentage of participants who pass the DSHS Certified Food Manager exam on the first attempt.
2	Self-reported adoption of using a food thermometer to measure internal temperatures of hot/cold foods being held (% of individuals who report practicing this behavior "always" after completing the program)
3	Self-reported adoption of washing hands for 20 seconds using soap and hot water (% of participants who report practicing this behavior "always" after participating in the program).
4	Self reported increase in the adoption of using a thermometer to determine the doneness of food (percentage of participants who report practicing this behavior "always" after participating in the program).

**1. Outcome Measures**

*Not reporting on this Outcome for this Annual Report*

**2. Associated Institution Types**

**3a. Outcome Type:**

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
------	---------------------	--------

**3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement**

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

**What has been done**

**Results**

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
---------	----------------

**V(H). Planned Program (External Factors)**

**External factors which affected outcomes**

Government Regulations

Other (Ability of program participants to implement knowledge/skills learned in the program.)

**Brief Explanation**

The reported changes in selected food safety practices by participants after completing the FPM program are significant and impressive. Although several fall shy of the targeted goal, the FPM program is clearly improving the food safety practices among food service workers. Reasons why the program did not meet all of its targeted goals are unclear, but one reason might be that some participants fail to realize risks associated with improper handling of food. Participant feedback from our 30-day followup survey also suggests that some participants are unable to practice what they learned in FPM due to restrictions made by their supervisor or owner. Because of this finding, beginning in 2008 we are assessing the extent to which FPM participants believe that they will have the ability to implement the practices learned in our course. Language and literacy challenges continue in spite of having materials translated into Spanish. In 2008, we will be offering an audio CD of the course book for participants who might have literacy challenges, or who are auditory learners.

**V(I). Planned Program (Evaluation Studies and Data Collection)**

**1. Evaluation Studies Planned**

After Only (post program)

Retrospective (post program)

### **Evaluation Results**

The "after only" evaluation reflects the customer satisfaction survey that was completed by nearly 1,100 participants in 2007. Based on a 1 to 5 scale (1 = very dissatisfied; 5 =very satisfied), the overall satisfaction with the program was 4.7. More than 90% of participants were either "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with the agent's knowledge of the subject matter, their presentation skills, and the manner in which they responded to questions raised by program participants. The "retrospective" evaluation reflects the extent to which participants adopted selected food safety practices as a result of completing the FPM program. Results have been featured in the outcomes section of this report.

### **Key Items of Evaluation**