

V(A). Planned Program (Summary)

Program # 3

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
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 FTE/SYs expended this Program

Year: 2011	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
Plan	11.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Actual Paid Professional	14.9	1.3	0.0	0.0
Actual Volunteer	0.0	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
602753	93360	0	0
1862 Matching	1890 Matching	1862 Matching	1890 Matching
387192	93360	0	0
1862 All Other	1890 All Other	1862 All Other	1890 All Other
1068021	132078	0	0

V(D). Planned Program (Activity)

1. Brief description of the Activity

In 2011 the Food Safety, Food Preservation and Food Preparation Program Priority Team (PPT) trained 1113 Food Service Workers across the state. Just fewer than 100 classes have been taught by 9 Regional Agents in the Food Safety PPT. The training course has a very ridged exam at the end of the course to test for knowledge comprehension of food safety principles. Of the 1113 individuals completing the course 83% were able to pass the course. In 2010 one individual was required to have passed the course or the food service will have 5 points deducted from their inspection score and a new facility can not open until someone one staff has completed the course. With this certification Food Service Workers will be able to obtain employment as supervisors and increase their quality of life. While these individuals are better qualified employees, this program looks to reduce the numbers of food borne illnesses in the state of Alabama. We have seen inspection scores increase and food safety standards increase in those facilities that have completed the certification courses. Over 50 food processors were assisted through the Food Testing and Assistance Program. These individuals contacted the Regional Extension Agents and the Food Safety Specialist for assistance in starting their food processing businesses. We assisted them by testing their food products to assure that they qualified for processing under the minimum processing standards for "Acidified Food Products". These are products that under the FDA code are foods that have a pH under 4.6 or a water activity of less than 0.86. We also assist the beginning food processors with developing nutrition facts for their products. Over 80 food products were tested in our facilities and over 60 nutrition facts labels were generated for various food processors. We provide each food processor with assistance in the startup of their business and throughout the course of business with food processing questions. Twenty-five food processors took the Better Process Control School. With this course food processors learned how to safely process their acidified foods. This year we were able to open the food processing center in Clanton, AL, with this center we can assist farmers in further processing their fruits and vegetables to add value to their products.

Within the Safe and Secure Food Supply Project we assist consumers with becoming smarter shoppers through a program called the Smart Food Shopper. Through this program the consumers are taught to write a shopping list and stick with it, how to coupon and how to look for unit prices. Last year we completed over **30** of these programs in the state training over 500. With people trying to save money they are growing their own vegetables and fruits. With this we taught over **50** programs in Food Preservation training over 1300 individuals. We were even asked to train a group of agents from Arkansas. Through this training we provided them with our Master Food Preservation manual and other training materials to assist them with doing food preservation in Arkansas.

2. Brief description of the target audience

The primary target audience is food service workers, food processors as well as consumers.

3. How was eXtension used?

The Food Safety Community of Practice is lead by Alabama. There are a total of 202 members in the Food Safety CoP but only 44 are actively working the Community. We have posted over 100 articles on Food Safety on the website and we have published over 100 Frequently Asked questions. Many individuals post to the News site for Food Safety but they do not necessarily have to be members of the Food Safety CoP. In Alabama there are 16 members of the Community of Practice and 6 of these are core team members. Also the leader of the CoP is the Food Safety Specialist from Alabama.

V(E). Planned Program (Outputs)

1. Standard output measures

2011	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Actual	31178	1476303	7652	0

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

Patent Applications Submitted

Year: 2011

Actual: 0

Patents listed

3. Publications (Standard General Output Measure)

Number of Peer Reviewed Publications

2011	Extension	Research	Total
Actual	3	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	Actual
2011	3

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	Actual
2011	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

3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Actual
2011	3

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

Issue (Who cares and Why)

Food Safety Programs are required by the Alabama Department of Public Health and in order for a restaurant to keep operating they must have this certification. Therefore, food service workers, as well as, the general public are delighted that we offer this course to make the food safer when they eat out.

What has been done

Over 1000 restaurant workers have been trained in safe food practices. Over 50 food processors have been assisted with getting their food business started using safe food processing procedures. Twenty-five (25) of these processors completed the Better Process Control School.

Results

Food supply is safer for the consumer.

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
- Government Regulations
- Competing Programmatic Challenges

Brief Explanation

V(I). Planned Program (Evaluation Studies)

Evaluation Results

Of the 1113 food service workers given the certification exam 894 passed the exam.

25 individuals passed the exams required for the Better Process Control School.

50 processors food products were tested and certified to process under the acidified Food and Drug Administration regulations.

Key Items of Evaluation

894 of the 1113 food service workers tested passed the exam to complete certification requirements.

25 individuals passed the Better Process Control School Certification.

50 Processors successfully passed testing procedures required by FDA.