V(A). Planned Program (Summary)

Program # 5

1. Name of the Planned Program

Food Safety (Food Safety, Preparation, and Preservation)

V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)

1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
501	New and Improved Food Processing Technologies	10%	10%		
503	Quality Maintenance in Storing and Marketing Food Products	10%	10%		
504	Home and Commercial Food Service	10%	10%		
711	Ensure Food Products Free of Harmful Chemicals, Including Residues from Agricultural and Other Sources	35%	35%		
712	Protect Food from Contamination by Pathogenic Microorganisms, Parasites, and Naturally Occurring Toxins	35%	35%		
	Total	100%	100%		

V(C). Planned Program (Inputs)

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

Year: 2010	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
Plan	23.6	4.3	0.0	0.0
Actual	11.3	0.0	0.0	0.0

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

Extension		Research	
Smith-Lever 3b & 3c	**1890 Extension**	**Hatch**	**Evans-Allen**
190092	0	0	0
1862 Matching	**1890 Matching**	**1862 Matching**	**1890 Matching**
295213	0	0	0
1862 All Other	**1890 All Other**	**1862 All Other**	**1890 All Other**
753030	0	0	0

V(D). Planned Program (Activity)

1. Brief description of the Activity

At the end of 2010 the Food Safety, Preservation and Preparation PPT trained nearly 2112 Food Service workers across the state. Over 125 classes have been taught by 9 REA's. This training course has a very tough exam at the end of the course and once the individual has passed the test they become certified for 5 years. Also in 2010, 103 food processors were assisted through the Food Testing and Assistance Program. A Better Process Control School was conducted in the spring and fall in 2010. The spring class taught in Clanton, Alabama had 25 participants and the fall class had 10 participants. All 35 successfully completed the course of study which certified them by the Food and Drug Administration to process acidified foods. Participants in the course came from all over the United States.

2. Brief description of the target audience

Food Service Workers, general public and food processors.

V(E). Planned Program (Outputs)

1. Standard output measures

2010	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Plan	34000	142000	21000	87000
Actual	18527	1980650	17629	248011

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

Patent Applications Submitted

Year:	2010
Plan:	0
Actual:	0

Patents listed

3. Publications (Standard General Output Measure)

Number of Peer Reviewed Publications

2010	Extension	Research	Total
Plan	0	0	
Actual	0	0	0

V(F). State Defined Outputs

Output Target

Output #1

Output Measure

- This program area will include numerous output activities and methods as part of the Extension Team Projects (ETPs) which are described/explained in the prior "outcome activities and methods sections." The success of many of these outcomes will be formally evaluated/measured by using individual activity evaluation forms designed specifically for each activity, the success of other activities and methods will be measured by the level of participation in the activity. In the target boxes below for each year, we are indicating the number of individual activities within the ETPs for this program area that will be formally evaluated using an evaluation instrument designed specifically for that activity.

Year	Target	Actual
2010	3	2

V(G). State Defined Outcomes

V. State Defined Outcomes Table of Content

O. No.	OUTCOME NAME
1	A major outcome will be the number of food service workers who participate in Extension sponsored Food Safety Training.
2	Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements: Why: Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed What: Specifically what was done and how it was done. When: If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began. Where: Specific location-- the county or counties involved. Who and how many: The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served. So what: This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes. Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program. Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated.

Outcome #1

1. Outcome Measures

A major outcome will be the number of food service workers who participate in Extension sponsored Food Safety Training.

2. Associated Institution Types

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Condition Outcome Measure

3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2010	400	0

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

Issue (Who cares and Why)
{No Data Entered}

What has been done
{No Data Entered}

Results
{No Data Entered}

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
501	New and Improved Food Processing Technologies
503	Quality Maintenance in Storing and Marketing Food Products
504	Home and Commercial Food Service
711	Ensure Food Products Free of Harmful Chemicals, Including Residues from Agricultural and Other Sources
712	Protect Food from Contamination by Pathogenic Microorganisms, Parasites, and Naturally Occurring Toxins

Outcome #2

1. Outcome Measures

Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements: Why: Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed What: Specifically what was done and how it was done. When: If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began. Where: Specific location-- the county or counties involved. Who and how many: The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served. So what: This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes. Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program. Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated.

2. Associated Institution Types

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2010	18	2147

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

Issue (Who cares and Why)
Geberal Public about food Safety issues as well as the food service organizations and the food processors. Food Safety is a concern to everyone.

What has been done
Trained food processor and food service direstors in save food handling practices.

Results
2112 Food Service Workers were trained and 35 food processors were trained.

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
501	New and Improved Food Processing Technologies
503	Quality Maintenance in Storing and Marketing Food Products
504	Home and Commercial Food Service
711	Ensure Food Products Free of Harmful Chemicals, Including Residues from Agricultural and Other Sources
712	Protect Food from Contamination by Pathogenic Microorganisms, Parasites, and Naturally Occurring Toxins

V(H). Planned Program (External Factors)

External factors which affected outcomes

- Natural Disasters (drought, weather extremes, etc.)
- Economy
- Appropriations changes
- Competing Programmatic Challenges

Brief Explanation

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

1. Evaluation Studies Planned

- Before-After (before and after program)
- During (during program)
- Comparisons between program participants (individuals, group, organizations) and non-participants

Evaluation Results

2112 Food Service Workers were trained and 35 Food Processors were trained and evaluated.

Key Items of Evaluation

At the end of 2010 the Food Safety, Preservation and Preparation PPT trained nearly 2112 Food Service workers across the state. Over 125 classes have been taught by 9 REA's. This training course has a very tough exam at the end of the course and once the individual has passed the test they become certified for 5 years. Of the 2112 individuals completing the class, 76% of the individuals were able to pass the class and become certified.

Thirty -five processors successfully completed the Better Process Control School.