V(A). Planned Program (Summary)

Program # 2

1. Name of the Planned Program
Food Safety

☑ Reporting on this Program

V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)

1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KA Code</th>
<th>Knowledge Area</th>
<th>%1862 Extension</th>
<th>%1890 Extension</th>
<th>%1862 Research</th>
<th>%1890 Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>Requirements and Function of Nutrients and Other Food Components</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703</td>
<td>Nutrition Education and Behavior</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711</td>
<td>Ensure Food Products Free of Harmful Chemicals, Including Residues from Agricultural and Other Sources</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712</td>
<td>Protect Food from Contamination by Pathogenic Microorganisms, Parasites, and Naturally Occurring Toxins</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>723</td>
<td>Hazards to Human Health and Safety</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724</td>
<td>Healthy Lifestyle</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>Human Development and Family Well-Being</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V(C). Planned Program (Inputs)

1. Actual amount of FTE/SYs expended this Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year: 2012</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Paid Professional</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Volunteer</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

1. Brief description of the Activity

• Develop new rapid methods for the surveillance, detection, isolation, and quantification of microbes and chemical residues in animals, plants, and food products. • Develop risk monitoring techniques to detect potential hazards in the distribution chain. • Validate the efficacy of techniques in controlling and eliminating microbial and chemical hazards. • Disseminate food safety and bio-security information through extension and research seminars, workshops, and resident and distance education programs, using a variety of media options and communication tools. • Offer safe food production, handling, and sanitation education to groups involved in all levels of food production and service. • Identify best management practices to prevent foodborne illness and to enhance the security of the food supply throughout the food chain. • Develop technology to reduce the hazards and improve the quality of animal food products, which will complement the development of HACCP programs by USDA. • Develop, complement, and maintain an aggressive technology transfer system that effectively communicates work about Food Safety to consumers, students, industry, government, and other scientific investigations.

2. Brief description of the target audience

• Growers and processors of agricultural commodities, commercial and non-commercial food service personnel, market and home gardeners, other food handlers, retail markets, consumers, and educator; • Families and individuals of all ages living in Kansas, including populations with limited resources; low literacy skills; varying ethnicities; disabilities, diseases, or impairments; and documented or identifiable health disparities; • Economic stakeholders, and policy and funding agencies; • Health care, education, and nutrition professionals; • K-State Research & Extension faculty and staff with responsibilities for food and/or nutrition; • Government; and • Consumer groups (i.e., STOP).

3. How was eXtension used?

   eXtension was not used in this program

V(E). Planned Program (Outputs)

1. Standard output measures
2012 Kansas State University Combined Research and Extension Annual Report of Accomplishments and Results - Food Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Direct Contacts Adults</th>
<th>Indirect Contacts Adults</th>
<th>Direct Contacts Youth</th>
<th>Indirect Contacts Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

   Patent Applications Submitted

   Year: 2012
   Actual: 1

   Patents listed
   A Nanoparticle Catalyst Capable of Forming Aromatic Hydrocarbons from CO2/H2

3. Publications (Standard General Output Measure)

   Number of Peer Reviewed Publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V(F). State Defined Outputs

Output Target

Output #1

   Output Measure
   - Number of rapid methods developed for the surveillance, detection, isolation, and quantification of microbes and chemical residues in animals, plants, and food products

   Year | Actual
   ----|-------
   2012 | 1     

Output #2

   Output Measure
   - Number of therapeutic, chemical, and physical treatments developed for animals and plants and their products to eliminate or reduce contamination with potential hazards

   Year | Actual
   ----|-------
   2012 | 1     

Report Date 07/05/2013
Output #3

Output Measure

- Number of ServSafe certification workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### V(G). State Defined Outcomes

#### V. State Defined Outcomes Table of Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O. No.</th>
<th>OUTCOME NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Increase knowledge level and improve attitude of clientele in safe food production, handling, and sanitation programs; best management practices to prevent foodborne illness; and social, economic, and communications issues related to food safety and agricultural biosecurity (Measured by number of participants increasing knowledge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Increase adoption of recommended safe food handling practices at the individual, family, community, production, and supply system levels (Measured by number of participants in food service manager certification class who successfully complete the exam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reduce incidence of foodborne illness (Measured by number of foodservice facilities with trained employees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Increase number of viable technologies to improve food safety (Measured by number of viable technologies developed or modified for the detection and characterization of food supply contamination from foodborne threats)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Increase understanding of the ecology of threats to food safety from microbial and chemical sources (Measured by number of students enrolled in Food Safety and Defense graduate certification)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome #1

1. Outcome Measures

Increase knowledge level and improve attitude of clientele in safe food production, handling, and sanitation programs; best management practices to prevent foodborne illness; and social, economic, and communications issues related to food safety and agricultural bio-security (Measured by number of participants increasing knowledge)

2. Associated Institution Types

- 1862 Extension
- 1862 Research

3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

3b. Quantitative Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**
The food industry requires a pool of individuals trained in food safety protection and defense to enter the workforce.

**What has been done**
The curriculum has been provided for educators to use. One article has been published outlining the results of an expert focus and what should be included in a food safety protection and defense curriculum.

**Results**
Curriculum results have been presented to the educators and researchers at the 2012 annual meeting of the National Center for Food Protection and Defense. Those results are being considered to structure for credit courses.

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KA Code</th>
<th>Knowledge Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>712</td>
<td>Protect Food from Contamination by Pathogenic Microorganisms, Parasites, and Naturally Occurring Toxins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>723</td>
<td>Hazards to Human Health and Safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome #2

1. Outcome Measures

Increase adoption of recommended safe food handling practices at the individual, family, community, production, and supply system levels (Measured by number of participants in food service manager certification class who successfully complete the exam)

2. Associated Institution Types

- 1862 Extension

3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

3b. Quantitative Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

Issue (Who cares and Why)
The U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2011 estimates that in the U.S. roughly one in six Americans (or 48 million people) get sick, 128,000 are hospitalized and 3,000 die of foodborne illness each year.

What has been done
In 2012, ServSafe Food Safety Manager Classes reached over 433 foodservice workers statewide with 394 receiving certification. Another 708 participants completed the ServSafe Starter Food Handler class. Our efforts resulted in more than 290 contact hours of food safety education. Fourteen percent of the participants in the ServSafe Food Handler classes self-reported being Hispanic, Black/African American, or other minority group.

Results
Participants indicated that they had increased knowledge and skills of best food safety practices. More than 91.5% of the participants indicated they plan to use what they learned at work and/or at home. Participants reported they intend to wash their hands, check food temperatures and use food thermometers more often, and to be more cautious of cross contamination and food left out at room temperature.

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KA Code</th>
<th>Knowledge Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>712</td>
<td>Protect Food from Contamination by Pathogenic Microorganisms, Parasites, and Naturally Occurring Toxins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome #3

1. Outcome Measures

Reduce incidence of foodborne illness (Measured by number of foodservice facilities with trained employees)

2. Associated Institution Types

- 1862 Extension

3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Action Outcome Measure

3b. Quantitative Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

Issue (Who cares and Why)
The U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2011 estimates that in the U.S. roughly one in six Americans (or 48 million people) get sick, 128,000 are hospitalized, and 3,000 die of foodborne illness each year.

What has been done
In 2012, ServSafe Food Safety Manager Classes reached over 433 foodservice workers statewide. K-State Extension also provides research-based information to citizens via the Food Safety website. In 2012, the website had 3,572 visitors. The most popular page was the Food Safety ServSafe site.
www.ksre.ksu.edu/FoodSafety/p.aspx?tabid=16 The second most popular page was Food Safety for Boomers and Beyond.
www.ksre.ksu.edu/FoodSafety/p.aspx?tabid=52

Results
This educational effort also resulted in 202 Kansas food operations, volunteer/community organizations, schools, nursing homes, assisted living facilities or day care centers having staff that are food safety trained.

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KA Code</th>
<th>Knowledge Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>712</td>
<td>Protect Food from Contamination by Pathogenic Microorganisms, Parasites, and Naturally Occurring Toxins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>723</td>
<td>Hazards to Human Health and Safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome #4

1. Outcome Measures

Increase number of viable technologies to improve food safety (Measured by number of viable technologies developed or modified for the detection and characterization of food supply contamination from foodborne threats)

2. Associated Institution Types

• 1862 Research

3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Action Outcome Measure

3b. Quantitative Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**
The livestock and meat industry and consumers are significantly impacted by shigatoxigenic E. coli (STEC), and the control of those types of hazards is the goal.

**What has been done**
The technique of electrostatic application of antimicrobial solutions to carcasses has been refined and is being evaluated for industry use.

**Results**
The electrostatic chamber at the Kansas State University Biosecurity Research Institute is available for use by industry and other researchers.

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KA Code</th>
<th>Knowledge Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>711</td>
<td>Ensure Food Products Free of Harmful Chemicals, Including Residues from Agricultural and Other Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712</td>
<td>Protect Food from Contamination by Pathogenic Microorganisms, Parasites, and Naturally Occurring Toxins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>723</td>
<td>Hazards to Human Health and Safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome #5

1. Outcome Measures

Increase understanding of the ecology of threats to food safety from microbial and chemical sources (Measured by number of students enrolled in Food Safety and Defense graduate certification)

Not Reporting on this Outcome Measure

V(H). Planned Program (External Factors)

External factors which affected outcomes
- Appropriations changes
- Public Policy changes
- Government Regulations
- Competing Public priorities
- Competing Programmatic Challenges

Brief Explanation

{No Data Entered}

V(I). Planned Program (Evaluation Studies)

Evaluation Results

TYPE of study:

Kansas State University has been designated as the education theme leader for the National Center for Food Protection and Defense, a Center of Excellence for the Department of Homeland Security and the USDA, AFRI CAP Grant focused on controlling shigatoxigenic E. Coli. Additionally, the validation of technologies to control microbial hazards for direct use by industry or inclusion into process deviation models is a major focus.

Over the next two years 40 interns will be trained in food safety, protection, and defense. Additionally, short term externships will also be conducted. Those individuals will learn about intervention technologies that are being validated. The food industry requires a pool of individuals trained in food safety, protection, and defense to enter the work force.

The industry also needs the technologies to control hazards. Eight interns are currently working with fulltime researchers with 22 to be added in the summer and fall 2013. The remaining internships (N=9) and externships will be completed in 2014.

TIME of study:
2013 - 2017 (Depending on continued DHS and USDA funding)

Type of MEASURES.
1. Number of internships and externships
2. Number of technologies validated
3. Number of process deviation models developed

Key Items of Evaluation