



Michigan Department of Agriculture

Food Service Program Cycle 4 – Office Review Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide

Food & Dairy Division
Michigan Department of Agriculture
PO Box 30017
Lansing, MI 48909
Ph: (517) 373-1060

July 21, 2009

Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide

This guidance document was created to assist local health departments in completing the MDA Accreditation Worksheets used for self-assessments. This document, along with the MDA Accreditation MPR Indicator Guide, will provide instructions for completing the office worksheets, and provide guidance for determining compliance. A completed example has been provided for each worksheet.

RANDOM NUMBER SAMPLING:

There are several ways to randomly select samples from a list of establishments. As part of the accreditation process, MDA most often uses a free computer program to choose the random samples. The computer program we use is the Research Randomizer program; although other computer generated random number sampling program would also be effective. This program can be found at:

<http://www.randomizer.org/form.htm>

There are 6 spots to fill in.

Example:

Your agency has **693** licensed fixed establishments

How many sets of numbers do you want to generate?	1 set
How many numbers per set?	692 (go 1 less than the total number)
Number range (e.g., 1-50):	From: 1 (your first number on the list) To: 693 (the last number on the list)
Do you wish each number in a set to remain unique?	Yes
Do you wish to sort the numbers that are generated?	No
How do you wish to view your random numbers?	Place Markers Off

Just hit RANDOMIZE and you will have a list of random numbers for choosing facility files to be evaluated)

The only two exceptions are:

When a sample must be chosen during the evaluation, a random number generator calculator is used. When choosing samples for TFE evaluation, a process described in the Temporary Food Evaluation (MPR 5) section is used.

DETERMINING THE REVIEW CYCLE:

To make sure that no file is reviewed more than once, your review cycle consists of the day after the last day of your previous review through the first day of the new review.

**Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review
Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide**

When self-assessing for Option 2, the time period of the new review would be the date your agency begins the self-assessment process to prepare for the accreditation visit.

For the following cycles, the review will consist of a 3 year period, but for Cycle 4, the self-assessment might cover only a 2 year period. This concept is rather confusing, so I will give an example to attempt to explain it. (For additional guidance, see the MPR Indicator Guide, Annex 11, part A)

2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Cycle 3 Accred 6/1/07			Cycle 4 Accred 6/1/10			Cycle 5 Accred. 6/1/13
		6/1/09 Since you should do a self-assessment a year before the accreditation date, you would have to begin your S.A. now. Your review would only consist of a 24 month period (6/1/07 – 6/1/09) since your last review of 6/1/07.	6/1/10 When MDA evaluates your agency for Option2, we will look at YOUR self-assessment done in June of 2009. We DO NOT evaluate your files from 6/1/09 to 6/1/10. We evaluate how you did your S.A. and if it was done correctly. So we will only be looking at the same 2 year period you reviewed.		6/1/12 Your next accreditation review is due 6/1/13, so you would now begin your self-assessment for Cycle 5. Cycle 4 review encompassed 6/1/07 – 6/1/09. (Even though the accreditation visit was on 6/1/10). So for this self-assessment, you would review 6/1/09 through 6/1/12. (This is now a 3 year review cycle.)	6/1/13 Cycle 5 accreditation review: When MDA evaluates your agency for Option2, we will look at YOUR self-assessment done in June of 2012. We DO NOT evaluate your files from 6/1/012 to 6/1/13. We evaluate how you did your S.A. and if it was done correctly. So we will only be looking at the same 3 year period you reviewed for your S.A. done 6/1/12.

**Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review
Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide**

PLAN REVIEW

See the MPR Indicator Guide for materials needed, sample selection, program indicators, and judging compliance.

CHOOSING PLAN REVIEW SAMPLES:

Annex 6- Office Sample Size Chart
Annex 5- Approved Random Sampling Methods.
A maximum sample size of 10 plans are reviewed.

EXAMPLE of sample selection for district health departments:
District 20 has 3 counties: Salem County (has 40% of plan reviews- 4 chosen) / Boston County (has 40% of plan reviews- 4 chosen) / Denver County (has 20% of plan reviews- 2 chosen)

Use the facility selection worksheet below to document the samples chosen.

NUMBER OF PLAN REVIEWS IN REVIEW CYCLE _____ SAMPLE SIZE _____
(Insert the number of reviews for the 3 year review period.) (Maximum sample size is 10)

#	County	Facility	Address or City
1	This column is for district health departments with multiple counties Salem	Name of facility	
2	Salem	McDonalds	
3	Salem	Burger King	
4	Salem	Steak House	
5	Boston	Boston High School	
6	Boston	A & W	
7	Boston	Etc.	
8	Boston		
9	Denver		
10	Denver		

Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide

FILLING OUT THE PLAN REVIEW WORKSHEET:

The plan review worksheet is used to collect and interpret data for MPR 1, 2, 9, 11, and 12.

MPR 1: There are 14 items related to MPR 1 on this worksheet. Each set of plans reviewed need to have documentation specific to these items. The auditor is not questioning the professional judgment or approval of the plans by the plan reviewer, but merely trying to make sure that all aspects of the plans have been reviewed.

Of the 14 indicators, you must meet at least 80% (12 of the 14 indicators) to achieve compliance for each file reviewed. Mark at the top of the worksheet if MPR 1 is Met or Not Met.

Filling in the columns:

- **Facility Name:**
- **Type:** Fixed, STFU, Mobile
- **New:** Is this a newly built facility? Is it an existing facility that is being renovated to be a food facility?
- **Remodeled:** Is this a food establishment that is being remodeled or upgraded?
- **License year:** A license issued in May, 2009 would be considered a 2010 license.
- **Insp. Date:** List the Pre-opening inspection date. (The evaluation done, marked “approved to open”, showing that the facility is in compliance and may operate.)
- **License Signed:** Date of signature on the license application. If the facility is remodeling part of the establishment (example: the bar area); is already licensed and continues to operate during the remodeling phase; just document that there is an existing license.
- **Indicator:** Which MPR is being evaluated
- **Item Required:**
 - Application / Transmittal letter: Has an application been received? Can you determine what type of review is necessary? (Is this a simple remodel of the bar area, or is it a brand new facility built from the ground up?)
 - Menu: The preliminary menu might consist of only a list of items the facility has chosen to serve
 - Layout (site and floor) plan: The plan should include a site plan for the dumpsters, seating, etc.
 - Plumbing: For an existing facility, when the plumbing is embedded in the floor, you might only see the sinks, drain lines, floor sinks, how water tank, etc. on the layout plan. For a new facility, you would expect full plumbing plans. If the plumbing is “existing” in the facility and is determined to be adequate, a notation should be made in the plan review packet that the plumbing is adequate for the facility.

Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide

- Ventilation Hood: At a minimum you should be able to see where the hood is on the scaled drawings; if all cooking equipment is under the hood; and if the hood is constructed to be smooth, cleanable, and sealed well. (Look for spec. sheets.) If the ventilation is “existing” in a facility and determined to be adequate, a notation should be made in the plan review packet that the ventilation is adequate for the facility.
 - Lighting Plan: At a minimum you should be provided with a copy of the scaled drawings with the existing lights drawn in to scale. If the lighting is “existing” in a facility and determined to be adequate, a notation should be made in the plan review packet that the lighting is adequate for the facility.
 - Scaled Drawings: Drawings that are proportional between two sets of dimensions; or all objects on the drawing are proportional in size to each other. Dimensions must be included. Scaled drawings should include equipment location, sinks, ventilation, etc.
 - Completed Worksheet: MDA worksheet, completed by the applicant, to provide necessary information to evaluate the plans.
 - Equipment Specifications: You will usually see a packet of spec. sheets. Occasionally the equipment specs will be located on the mechanical plans. For existing equipment, the applicant might have located equipment information on the web, and printed this information for the file.
 - SOP's: Receipt of SOP's must be documented in the file.
 - Reviewer's Checklist: May use the MDA checklist or a comparable list. This is an excellent place to document “existing” fixtures that have been evaluated as acceptable.
 - Applicant informed of deficiencies: Is a flow of information obvious? Are there copies of emails, notes about phone calls, letters? Evaluate if there is effective communication between the applicant and the reviewer.
 - Formulas: Calculated for hot water, dry storage, refrigeration? If the minimum requirements are not met, is there an explanation on the calculation sheets (or elsewhere in the file) to show the reasoning for approval?
 - Approval letter: Make sure the approval letter has a unique identifier that ties it to the plan like a date or other unique code. Explanation of the scope of the operation may be some what general in nature like “new full service restaurant” or more specific like “renovation of existing building for an ice cream shop”. The scope statement should give the applicant a clear picture of what type of construction has been approved.
- **Status:** If an indicator is not met, an 'X' should be marked in this column.
 - **Notes:** Date, comments, etc. may be placed in this column.
 - **Problem:** If an indicator issue is marked in the **Status** column, the 'Y' should be circled.

Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide

MPR 2: There are 5 indicators under MPR 2, and all 5 must be in compliance to evaluate the file as met:

- Facility opened with NO critical items pending: A facility license may not be issued when outstanding critical violations are present.
- Pre-opening inspection in file: Inspection may be found in plan review file OR in the fixed facility file. The date of this inspection is placed at the top of the page under 'Insp. Date'.
- Is inspection marked approved to open? There may be many construction evaluations during the review process. The pre-opening inspection is the inspection that actually approves the facility to open, and that approval must be marked clearly on the form.
- Inspection dated on or before license approval date? The pre-opening inspection date must be checked against the date of the license approval. The license may not be signed until the facility is actually completed and approved to open.
- Inspection- Must use an approved inspection form. Was this form dated and signed?

MPR 9: All plan review records must be maintained in the health department for a minimum of 5 years. You must be able to locate the necessary plans, forms, and licenses.

MPR 11: There are 2 indicators under MPR 11, and both must be in compliance to evaluate the file as met.

One way to evaluate if the establishment was constructed prior to approval of the plans is to look at how close the approval letter date is to the opening inspection date.

EXAMPLE: In this example, the date of application approval was only 2 weeks prior to the pre-opening date. A full service restaurant constructed from the ground-up, or within a building that was not previously a food establishment, would take longer than 2 weeks to complete. However, a full service restaurant remodeled from a similar type of food establishment might be completed in 2 weeks.

The auditor should ask questions of the plan reviewer to assist in determining compliance.

When the LHD discovers that a facility is being built prior to plan review approval, the department must issue a stop work order. Documentation of when construction was discovered, and how the LHD responded, is critical to determine compliance of this MPR.

MPR 12: The follow-up inspection information is collected on this form, but compliance with MPR 12 is not dependent on this information.

**Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review
Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide**

EXAMPLE OF A COMPLETED PLAN REVIEW WORKSHEET:

MPR's 1, 2, 9, 11,12: Plan Review Worksheet

1 Plan review	12 of 14 indicators met = 86%	(80% required)	M	NM
2 Pre-opening		(100% required)	M	NM
9 Records		(100% required)	M	NM
11 Unauthorized Construction		(100% required)	M	NM
12 Follow-up evaluations		(80% required)	M	NM

Facility Name: _____ **Type:** Fixed / STFU / Mobile New Remodeled ___
License year: 2009 **Insp. Date:** 5-15-08 **Date License Signed:** 5-15-08

Indicator	Item Required	Status*	Notes	Problem
1	Application / Transmittal letter (new 1/01)	√	1-5-08	Y
1	Menu (new 8/86)	√		Y
1	Layout (site and floor) Plan	√		Y
1	Plumbing Plan	√		Y
1	Ventilation Hood shown (full plans needed for STFU's, mobiles)	√		Y
1	Lighting Plan &/or Specifications	√		Y
1	Scaled Drawings	√		Y
1	Completed Worksheet	√		Y
1	Equipment Specifications	X	No equipment specs in file	Y
1	SOP's Either note on reviewer's checklist, SOP cover sheet, or pre-opening insp.	√		Y
1	Reviewer's checklist used (1/04)?	√		Y
1	Applicant informed of deficiencies? Deficiencies resolved in writing or on revised plans. Is the flow between reviewer and applicant clear?	√		Y
1	Formulas calculated, documented for hot water, dry storage, refrigeration? (needed, proposed, justification for differences)	X	No formula for hot water calc in file, no notes on existing equipment	Y
1	Approval letter in file? Describe project scope & references. A unique identifier (ie: Date) marked on the approved plans.	√	Date: 1-26-08	Y
11	Was facility constructed prior to approval? (Note if approvals issued very close to or after opening inspection)	√		Y
11	Stop work order used as needed? Did department take appropriate action once it became aware of illegal construction?	√		Y
2	Facility opened with NO critical items pending?	√		Y
2	Pre-opening inspection in file?	√		Y
2	Is inspection marked approved to open?	X	Not marked approved to open	Y
2	Inspection dated on or before license approval date?	√		Y
2	Inspection on regular inspection form, properly completed, dated and signed?	√		Y
12	Follow-up inspection on separate form?	√		Y
9	Records	√	Records retained for: 5 years	Y

**Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review
Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide**

CALCULATING PLAN REVIEW COMPLIANCE:

To collect the information for all 10 plan reviews completed, you can use the following chart. Each mark indicates a file reviewed for each MPR.

PLAN REVIEW CALCULATIONS WORKSHEET FOR ALL FILES REVIEWED: EXAMPLE

	MPR 1	MPR 2	MPR 9	MPR 11	MPR 12
MET	IIII III	IIII IIII	IIII IIII	IIII I	IIII IIII
NOT MET	II	I	I	III	
	MPR 1 8 of 10 are met	MPR 2 9 of 10 are met	MPR 9 9 of 10 are met	MPR 11 6 of 10 are met	MPR 12 10 of 10 are met

MPR 1 shows 8 of 10 files were met. This is the only review of MPR 1, so these results can be placed on the MPR summary sheet.

EXAMPLE FROM SUMMARY SHEET:

MPR 1 Plan Review Summary

8 of 10 files were Met **MET** NM

80 % compliance rate. 80% required.

MPR 2 shows 9 of 10 files were met. This is the only review of MPR 2, so these results can be placed on the MPR summary sheet.

EXAMPLE FROM SUMMARY SHEET:

MPR 2 Pre-Opening Evaluations

9 of 10 files had no problems. **MET** MC NM

90 % compliance rate. 80% required.

MPR 9 shows 9 of 10 files were met. MPR 9 is reviewed for every MPR, so you would document on the summary sheet the compliance documented for plan review.

EXAMPLE FROM SUMMARY SHEET:

MPR 9 Records **MET** MC NM

Plan review 9 of 10 Vending ___ of ___ TFE ___ of ___
Fixed Files ___ of ___ Complaints ___ of ___ FBI ___ of ___

MPR 11 shows 6 of 10 files were met. This is the only review of MPR 11, so these results can be placed on the MPR summary sheet.

EXAMPLE FROM SUMMARY SHEET:

MPR 11 Unauthorized Construction - Stop Work Order Usage **MET** MC **NM**

More than one of the records reviewed showed the department to be ineffective in preventing construction prior to plan approval.

MPR 12 Plan review results are not used to evaluate MPR 12, but collected as an overall review of follow-up procedures.

**Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review
Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide**

FACILITY FILE REVIEW:

See the MPR Indicator Guide for materials needed, sample selection, program indicators, and judging compliance.

CHOOSING FACILITY FILE SAMPLES:

The number of facilities your department licenses can be obtained from the MDA Annual Report. Use this number to determine your sample size, using Annex 6 in the MPR Indicator Guide. The maximum number of files reviewed is 23. When choosing your samples, one STFU and one Mobile should be part of the sample (if these types of facilities are licensed in your jurisdiction) to assure that the evaluation of these types of facilities are evaluated according to law requirements.

EXAMPLE OF A DISTRICT HEALTH DEPARTMENT SELECTION PROCESS:

District 20 consists of 3 counties, and has 2000 licensed facilities. The sample size (Using Annex 6) is 23 facility files. The counties are: Salem County (has 40% of the licenses, with 9 facilities chosen); Boston County (has 40% of the licenses with 9 facilities chosen); and Denver County (has 20% of the licenses with 5 facilities chosen). (Sample size of 23 divided by 40% = 9; 23 divided by 20% = 5)

Use the facility selection worksheet below to document the samples chosen.

NUMBER OF ESTABLISHMENTS FOR REVIEW CYCLE: 2000 SAMPLE SIZE: 23

#	County	Facility	Address
	This column is for district health departments with multiple counties	Name of facility	If desired
1	Salem	McDonalds	
2	Salem	Salem High School	
3	Salem	Joe's Diner	
4	Salem	Lucky Cafe	
5	Salem	Koffee Kart	STFU
6	Salem	Olive Garden	
7	Salem	McDonalds	
8	Salem	Ponderosa	
9	Salem	Red Lobster	
10	Boston	Dan's Steak House	
11	Boston	McDonalds	
12	Boston	Lucky Cafe	
13	Boston	Olive Garden	
14	Boston	McDonalds	
15	Boston	Boston High School	

**Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review
Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide**

16	Boston	Ponderosa	
17	Boston	Red Lobster	
18	Boston	Dan's Steak House	
19	Denver	McDonalds	
20	Denver	Lucky Cafe	
21	Denver	Sally's Sandwiches	Mobile
22	Denver	Denver High School	
23	Denver	Olive Garden	

FILLING OUT THE FACILITY FILE WORKSHEET:

This worksheet is used to collect and interpret data for MPR 3, 6, 9, 10, and 12.

The top of the form is where compliance is calculated and documented. After explaining the requirements for each section, a completed example will be presented and the calculations and documentation described.

- **Facility Name:** Joe's Diner
- **Type:** **Fixed** **Mobile** **STFU** Circle the type of facility reviewed
- **Dates:** Place the date of each routine or follow-up evaluation in this column. Start with the first routine inspection done in the review period. For example the review period goes from 5/12/2006 through 5/12/2009 and the earliest routine inspection was on 8/20/2006. This would be the first inspection reviewed.
- **Activity Type:** Was the evaluation routine, follow-up, or enforcement. Circle the appropriate acronym.

Since many follow-up evaluations are done at the time of the routine evaluation, the assessment of MPR 12 could not be fairly evaluated unless the follow-up completed at the time of the routine evaluation was counted. Thus, if a critical violation was corrected during the routine inspection, you would mark both R and FU.

- **Routine Freq.:** This column is to document the required evaluation frequency. (Either every 6 months, or as determined by the Risk Based Evaluation Schedule: 6, 12, 18 months or S for seasonal) For follow-up evaluation, mark 30 days.
- **Time Between:** This column documents the time between evaluations.
 - For routine evaluations, a one month grace period is allowed. If an evaluation was done June 6, 2008, the next evaluation (if on a 6 month rotation) would be Dec 6, 2008. If the evaluation was done January 5, 2009, the frequency would be met. If the evaluation was done January 7, 2009, a not met would be given.
 - For follow-up evaluations, the inspection should be conducted within 10 days. A 30 day grace period is given. If the critical violation was found on 9/9/08 and the follow-up done on 10/9/08, a met would be given. If the evaluation was done on 10/10/08, a not met would be given.

Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide

- A date is not placed in this column for the initial evaluation documented. To determine if it was in compliance, you would need to review the previous evaluation, and since we never review a previously evaluated form, we do not count this date unless it is more than the routine evaluation frequency from the audit date. (I.E.: audit date is 3/3/09. The routine frequency for the establishment is 6 months. The first evaluation in the file is for 11/12/09, which is more than 6 months from the audit date. This would be a frequency violation.)
- **Notes:** Document all information gathered in this column.
 - Mark the number of critical violations found.
 - Mark the number of non-critical violations found.
 - Mark if any of the critical violations were corrected on site (COS).
 - If there is a MPR 6 problem noted (report writing), clarify the violation marked.
 - Was the violation properly and clearly written including the law summary, observation, and method or correction (MPR 6)?
 - Was the time frame for correction specified (MPR 6)?
 - Was an approved report form used, all administrative information complete, and form signed (MPR6)?
 - Were critical and non-critical violations properly cited (MPR6)?
 - Were there any chronic or repeat violations noted that may trigger enforcement (MPR 10)?
 - Were the follow-up reports properly documented, including the corrective action (MPR 12)?
 - ENFORCEMENT: Make notes on the worksheet regarding the types of violations in non-compliance. If you verify that critical or non-critical violations are chronic or recurring, make clear notations on the worksheet. At this point, you would want to check the department's enforcement policy to determine the triggers for enforcement. (Enforcement compliance will be discussed later.)

Since multiple problems might be documented in the "Notes" column, and the "Notes" column has limited space for writing, you may use the following chart to assist in writing the type of problems found. See the example of a completed worksheet on the following page for guidance.

A	Department uses unapproved evaluation form
B	* Administrative info. not complete on evaluation form
C	Findings do not properly document and ID: C and NC
D	Report does not summarize findings relative to law, is not legible and/or doesn't convey a clear message
E	Narrative does not state violations observed and corrections needed
F	Correction time frames not specified
G	* Report not signed and/or dated by Sanitarian
H	* Report not signed by establishment representative

Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide

- **MPR:** If a non-compliance of any MPR was noted, mark the number of the MPR in this column. There is the possibility that one evaluation report review could have multiple MPR issues written in each evaluation section:
 - MPR 3 - frequency
 - MPR 6 - report writing
 - MPR 12- a follow-up of a critical violation was done during the routine evaluation, but the corrective action was not documented
 - MPR 10- was enforcement begun if required

- **Problem:** If a non-compliance was noted in the 'MPR' column, circle the 'Y' in the problem column.

- **License year:** Typically a 3 year review of files is done. If the review is conducted in August 2009, you would look at licenses issued for the facility for 2010 (May 2009- April 2010); 2009 (May 2008- April 2009); and 2008 (May 2007- April 2008).

- **License in File:** Is a copy of the application and license in the file for each licensing year?

- **Date Appl. Signed:** Is the application signed appropriately? If there was a change of ownership, was the old license deleted and a new license issued?

- **Findings:** If the license is a seasonal license, is it noted on the application? Are the last 2 STFU evaluation dates on the application? If the license has a limitation, is it marked on the application? If a mobile, does the file contain a signed commissary form?

- **MPR:** If there are discrepancies noted, mark '9' in the MPR box showing non-compliance.

- **Problem:** If non-compliance was noted in the 'MPR' column, circle the 'Y' in the problem column.

**Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review
Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide**

EXAMPLE OF A COMPLETED FACILITY FILE WORKSHEET:

MPR's 3, 6, 9, 10, 12 Facility Folder Worksheet

3 Routines: 5 done 1 late = 4 DONE / 5 DUE= 80 % Compliance Routine = **M NM**
12 FU: 6 done - 1 late/report writing problems = 5 DONE / 6 DUE=83 % = **M NM**
6 5 Eval. w/o MPR 6 errors / 7 Total Inspections = 71 % Compliance Insp. = **M NM**
9 Even 1 violation makes this a NM **M NM**
10 A Not Met should be marked if an enforcement action was not needed
but was not taken. Even 1 Enforcement problem makes this a NM **M NM**

Facility Name: Joe's Diner

Type: Fixed Mobile STFU

Dates	Activity Type	Routine Freq.	Time Between	Notes	MPR	Problem
2/6/07	R FU Enf	6 MO		3 C 4 NC C : CA / DM / CH 1 COS NC : Hair res/ SS storage, seal shelves, NOTE : 3 critical violations were found, cold holding violation was corrected on site		Y
2/12/07	R FU Enf	30 Days	6 days	DM ,and CA violations were corrected (Method of correction was not discribed)	12	Y
8/6/07	R FU Enf	6 MO	6 MO	1 C 2 NC 1 COS 6- E (Observation not discribed) DM NC : light shield, wiping cloth storage NOTE : This is the 2 nd DM violation. It may help to circle it as a reminder to check for enforcement.	6	Y
3/7/08	R FU Enf	6 MO	Over 7 months	1 C 1 NC food stored on floor 1 COS DM NOTE : Depending on the agency enforcement policy, enforcement action should be determined. Look through the file. If there is a letter dated 3-12-08 asking the facility owner to come in for an office conference,, or a notation of a call made, you have now determined that enforcement has begun. The agency is meeting MPR 10. If there is nothing in the file showing that enforcement has begun, and the agency policy is for enforcement to begin after 3 consecutive critical violations, MPR 10 would be marked not met and the #10 placed in the 'MPR ' column.	3	Y
9/12/08	R FU Enf	6 MO	6 MO	2 NC NC : no paper towels at HS, floor in storage room dirty		Y

Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide

MPR 3 shows 23 of 23 files were met. This is the only review of MPR 3, so these results can be placed on the MPR summary sheet.

EXAMPLE FROM SUMMARY SHEET:

	MET	MC	NM
MPR 3 Evaluation Frequency			
A. Number of facilities in sample meeting evaluation frequency:	23		
B. Number of facility files reviewed:	23		
C. Percent of files meeting evaluation frequency $\{(A/B) \times 100\}$:	100%		
MET= $\geq 80\%$			

Since Cycle 1, we have never used D, E, F, or Method 2 to calculate evaluation frequency. The method was very difficult for a LHD to use because of seasonal facilities, different evaluation frequencies, etc.

MPR 12 shows 22 of 23 files were met. This is the only review of MPR 12, so these results can be placed on the MPR summary sheet.

EXAMPLE FROM SUMMARY SHEET:

	MET		NM
MPR 12 Follow-Up Evaluation			
A. Number of Files With $\geq 80\%$ Of Required Follow-Ups Completed With/In 30 Days and Corrections Noted	22		
B. Number Of Files In Sample	23		
C. Percent Compliance $\{(A/B) \times 100\}$ 80% Required	96%		

MPR 6 was also evaluated for these files, and 22 of the 23 files met MPR 6 requirements. MPR 6 is reviewed for fixed files, vending, and temporary licenses, so you would document on the summary sheet for MPR 6 the compliance determined for facility files.

EXAMPLE FROM SUMMARY SHEET:

MPR 6: Facility Files / STFU / Mobile	22 of 23 met
Vending	__ of __ met
Temporary	__ of __ met

MPR 9 shows 22 of 23 files were met. MPR 9 is reviewed for every MPR, so you would document on the summary sheet the compliance documented for facility file review

EXAMPLE FROM SUMMARY SHEET:

	MET	MC	NM
MPR 9 Records			
Plan review __ of __			
Facility Files 22 of 23			
Vending __ of __			
Complaints __ of __			
TFE __ of __			
FBI __ of __			

MPR 10 shows 23 of the 23 files were met.

There are 2 components to the enforcement review:

1. An enforcement policy that meets the evaluation criteria has been adopted by the agency, signed by the Health Officer
2. The policy is being followed by the agency, as is determined by at least 80% compliance of the file review.

This is the only review of MPR 10, so these results can be placed on the MPR summary sheet.

With 100% compliance on the reviewed files, and an approved policy, you would receive a MET. (Since receiving a MET for Enforcement is dependent on the policy AND the file review, it is critical to review the MPR Indicator Guide Document under Enforcement, number 3, How to Judge Compliance with MPR 10.)

Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide

- EXAMPLE FROM SUMMARY SHEET:

MPR 10 Written Enforcement Policy, Proper Use
23 of 23 files had no problems
Compliance 100%
80% required + acceptable policy

MET MC NM

VENDING

See the MPR Indicator Guide for materials needed, sample selection, program indicators, and judging compliance.

CHOOSING VENDING SAMPLES:

See MPR Indicator guide for:

Annex 5- Approved random sampling

Annex 6- Office sample size chart

MPR 4- Sample Selection for multiple vending machine operators in a jurisdiction.

Determine the HD policy for evaluation schedules / frequency.

In this example we'll say the department has 265 vending locations. Annex 6 shows that the sample size would be 21 locations. The department has 7 different companies operating vending locations. Use the MPR Indicator Guide (Annex 5, MPR 4, and the Sample Selection section) to randomly select a proportional number of facilities from all 7 companies, to determine the 21 required locations.

FILLING OUT THE VENDING WORKSHEET:

Use the vending worksheet to document the samples chosen. This worksheet is also used to collect and interpret data for MPR 4, 6, and 9.

Application/ License year DATE SIGNED: Vending license locations may vary widely year to year, and from vendor to vendor. It is critical to determine the time period that the location has been licensed to evaluate if frequency is met. Use this column to document the date the application was signed, if the application was properly filled out with all required information, and if the license is in the file. (MPR 9)

Date of Evaluation: You must check the LHD policy for licensing vending locations to determine the required frequency. Mark the date each evaluation was completed in this column. (MPR 4)

Activity Type: Mark if the evaluation completed was a routine evaluation, a Follow-up evaluation, or a complaint investigation. Complaint evaluations would not be counted as the required routine evaluation unless a complete inspection was conducted as part of the complaint investigation.

MPR 4: Was this vending location evaluated according to the department's schedule? Using the example from the completed vending worksheet on the following page, if the department was using the option of evaluating 1/3 of a company's vending locations every year, the evaluation on 3/16/08 would meet the requirements for MPR 4.

MPR 6: Were the violations clearly written; with observation, law summary, and correction time and method? If MPR 6 violations were found, they would be noted in this column.

MPR 9: Were the licenses signed, and all information on the application complete?

**Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review
Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide**

EXAMPLE OF A COMPLETED VENDING WORKSHEET:

Company Canteen License # SVN1517037743 Location Al's Metalworking
Writing the last 5 numbers of the license can make searching easier

App./ License/ Year DATE SIGNED	Date of Evaluation	Activity Type	MPR 4		MPR 6		MPR 9		Problem
			M	NM	M	NM	M	NM	
4/23/2009		R FU E	yes				yes		Y
4/22/2008	3/16/2008	R FU E	yes		No violations		yes		Y
426/2007		R FU E	yes				yes		Y
		R FU E							Y
		R FU E							Y
		R FU E							Y

Each worksheet has space for 4 vending location evaluations. (In this example, you would need 5 copies of the worksheet to review all 21 files.)

CALCULATING COMPLIANCE FOR ALL VENDING FILES REVIEWED:

MPR 4:

- With the RBI schedule allowing a 5 year evaluation schedule; it is very important that a department has a log or tracking system to allow the reviewer/auditor to determine if the evaluations are indeed done according to the agency schedule, since an accreditation cycle is over only a 3 year period.
- For this example, we will assume that your agency is on a “1/3 of every location evaluated every 3 years” schedule. The self-assessment would expect to find at least 1 evaluation done during the review period for every location.
- One evaluation was done at the site (3/16/08) which would meet the department’s evaluation schedule of 1/3 of the locations each year for a 3 year period.

For this example, let’s say that 20 of the 21 files met MPR 4 requirements. This is the only review of MPR 4, so these results can be placed on the MPR summary sheet.

MPR 4 Vending Evaluation Frequency

MET **NM**

Department's Evaluation plan:

Every 6 months

1/3rd each year

1/10th each 6 months

Summary

A. # of vending location files that meet frequency	20
B. # of vending location files reviewed	21
C. Percent Compliance {(A/B) x 100}80% required	95 %

Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide

MPR 6: There were no violations noted on the report, so for this location review, the MPR was marked as 'MET'.

For our example, we will say that 16 of the 21 files met MPR 6 requirements.

MPR 6 is reviewed for fixed files, vending, and temporary licenses, so you would document on the summary sheet for MPR 6 the compliance determined for vending.

EXAMPLE FROM SUMMARY SHEET:

MPR 6 Evaluation Procedures MET MC NM

Fixed files ___ of ___ met Temporary ___ of ___ met

Vending 16 of 21 met

MPR 9:

You should find a license application and license for each year licensed, and if the machines are removed from the location, you would look for a copy of a license application marked "delete" that was sent to MDA.

In this case, licenses were issued for 2008, 2009, and 2010; and the licenses and applications were completed correctly. Our example will show that 21 of 21 files were met.

MPR 9 is reviewed for every MPR, so you would document on the summary sheet the compliance documented for vending.

EXAMPLE FROM SUMMARY SHEET:

MPR 9 Records MET MC NM

Plan Review ___ of ___ **Vending 21 of 21** TFE ___ of ___

Fixed Files ___ of ___ Complaints ___ of ___ FBI ___ of ___

TEMPORARY FOOD ESTABLISHMENT

See the MPR Indicator Guide for materials needed, sample selection, program indicators, and judging compliance.

CHOOSING TEMPORARY ESTABLISHMENT SAMPLES:

See MPR Indicator guide for:

Annex 5- Approved random sampling

Annex 6- Office sample size chart

An easy way to determine how many licenses were issued over the review period is to get the number of temporary licenses issued annually from your MDA annual report. Multiply that number by 3 (3 year review period). Most departments store the temporary licenses and reports in the file cabinet by year. It would be difficult to create a 'list' of the licenses, and even more difficult to number the list and randomly select the corresponding licenses.

The Random Sample is best chosen by using a variation of Method #2 in Annex 5 of the MDA Accreditation MPR Indicator Guide titled, Select every Kth facility:

For example, you have 175 temporary food service establishments licensed over the 3 year review period, and Annex 6 tells you to select twenty (20) establishments from the list, do the following:

- Divide the total number of establishments (175) by the sample size (20). $175/20 = 9$. This means that every 9th temporary license will be selected for review.
- Have another individual select a number from 1-10 (the selected number may include 1 & 10). Let's say the number 7 is selected. Use the selected number (7) as the starting point.

Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide

- Now find the 7th establishment from the beginning of the files. (It doesn't seem to matter if you start from the current date, or the first date of the review period. All years will be proportionally reviewed using this method.) This is the first license / evaluation form that will be reviewed.
- Next count forward 9 temporary licenses to find the second license/evaluation to be reviewed. Continue until twenty (20) license/evaluations have been selected. If you reach the end of the list, continue counting from the beginning. You should have selected the following establishments: 7, 16, 25, etc.

FILLING OUT THE TEMPORARY ESTABLISHMENT WORKSHEET:

This worksheet is used to collect and interpret data for MPR 5, 6, and 9.

The top box of the form describes the MPRs being evaluated, and the MPR violations you might expect to find during the review. You will use this information when filling out the second box on the sheet, which is the review of the temporary evaluations and licenses.

Office: This column is for district health departments with multiple counties.

Year: The licensing year reviewed is written here. An accreditation review is usually over a 3 year period, so document which year each license was issued. Each year in the review should show a proportional sample using these criteria.

License Number: Each Temporary License has a license number printed on the top of the form. Write this number on the audit sheet to identify the license evaluated.

MPR 5: See the MPR Indicator Guide, Program Indicators.

- a. Was the event licensed prior to operation, but not in advance of being ready for the event?
- b. Application: Were sections A, B, food column of F and attachment A (when used) completed? Was the license signed and dated by the regulator?
- c. Was the license issued with no unresolved critical violations?

MPR 6: Were the violations clearly written; with observation, law summary, and correction time and method?

MPR 9: Record retention adequate time? Files can be located for review?

**Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review
Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide**

EXAMPLE OF A COMPLETED TEMPORARY ESTABLISHMENT WORKSHEET:

MPR 5, 6, 9 Temporary Food Worksheet

Note: Put letters in boxes as licenses are reviewed.

5	a.	Evaluated prior to licensure, but not in advance of event being ready for evaluation.
	b.	Application has sections A,B, food column of F and attachment A (when used) completed plus have application, inspection and license approval date plus sanitarian signature
	c.	License issued with no unresolved critical violations
6		See list in MPR indicator guide
9		Record retention adequate time. Files can be located for review.

	Office	Year	License #	5 a	5 b	5 c	6	9	specific problem noted
1		2006		√	√	X	√	√	Issued with uncorrected critical
2		2006		√	√	√	√	√	
3		2006		√	√	√	√	√	
4		2006		√	√	√	√	√	
5		2007		√	√	√	X	√	Correction not described
6		2007		√	√	√	√	√	
7		2007		√	√	√	√	√	
8		2007		√	√	√	√	√	
9		2007		√	√	√	√	√	
10		2007		√	√	√	√	√	
11		2008		√	√	√	√	√	
12		2008		√	√	√	√	√	
13		2008		√	√	√	√	√	
14		2008		√	√	√	√	√	
15		2008		√	√	√	√	√	
16		2008		√	√	√	√	√	
17		2009		√	√	√	√	√	
18		2009		√	√	√	√	√	
19									
20									
21									
22									
23									

MPR 5 17 of 18 files Met 94 %
 MPR 6 17 of 18 files Met
 MPR 9 18 of 18 files Met

**Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review
Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide**

CALCULATING TEMPORARY ESTABLISHMENT COMPLIANCE:

MPR 5 shows 17 of 18 temporary files were met (one license was issued with an uncorrected critical violation). This is the only review of MPR 5, so these results can be placed on the MPR summary sheet.

EXAMPLE FROM SUMMARY SHEET:

MPR 5 Temporary Food Service	MET	MC	NM
17 of 18 files had <u>no</u> problems.			
Compliance = 94% (80% required.)			

MPR 6: MPR 6 is reviewed for fixed files, vending, and temporary licenses, so you would document on the summary sheet for MPR 6 the compliance determined for vending.

In this example 17 of the 18 temporary files met MPR 6. (One evaluation had a problem related to MPR 6 indicators; the method of correction was not documented.)

EXAMPLE FROM SUMMARY SHEET:

Temporary 17 of 18 Met

MPR 9: There were no problems found in this example. 20 of 20 files were met.

MPR 9 is reviewed for every MPR, so you would document on the summary sheet the compliance documented for Temporary Establishment Evaluations.

EXAMPLE FROM SUMMARY SHEET:

TFE 18 of 18

**Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review
Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide**

CONSUMER COMPLAINT

See the MPR Indicator Guide for materials needed, sample selection, program indicators, and judging compliance.

CHOOSING CONSUMER COMPLAINT SAMPLES:

For sampling, you will require:

- The LHD complaint tracking log
- The LHD policy manual for Complaints
- Annex 5
- Annex 6

Using the complaint log, number the complaints received during the review cycle. Use annex 6 to determine how many complaints will be reviewed. Use annex 5 to determine random samples from the list.

For this example, we will assume that the department had 52 complaints over the review cycle, so we will need to review 16 complaints.

FILLING OUT THE CONSUMER COMPLAINT WORKSHEET:

This worksheet is used to collect and interpret data for MPR 15.

MPR 15: See the MPR Indicator Guide for program indicators.

Complaint ID: List complaint ID from complaint log (If the agency does not use an I.D. system, but only identifies complaints by the date or facility number, document that ID on the sheet.)

Log Maintained & Records Available for Review: Document the availability of a complaint log. (This could be a paper log or an electronic system.) Are the records accessible?

Results recorded or justification for no investigation: Evaluate the investigation of the complaint.

Working Days from Receipt to Start of Investigation: Maximum of 5 working days allowed.

**Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review
Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide**

EXAMPLE OF A COMPLETED CONSUMER COMPLAINT WORKSHEET:

Complaint ID	15 Log maintained & records available for review		15 Results recorded (or justification for no investigation)	15 Working Days from Receipt to Start of Investigation (Max. 5 working days allowed)	Met Not Met	Problem
	✓	✓				
06-01	✓	✓	✓	✓		Y
06-22	✓	✓	✓	✓		Y
06-30	✓	X	X	✓		Y
07-02	✓	✓	✓	✓		Y
07-10	✓	✓	✓	✓		Y
07-13	✓	✓	✓	✓		Y
07-19	✓	✓	✓	✓		Y
08-4	✓	✓	✓	✓		Y
08-12	✓	✓	✓	✓		Y
08-24	✓	✓	✓	✓		Y
08-52	✓	✓	✓	✓		Y
08-60	✓	✓	✓	✓		Y
09-5	✓	✓	✓	✓		Y
09-16	✓	✓	✓	✓		Y
09-21	✓	✓	✓	✓		Y
09-30	✓	✓	✓	✓		Y
MPR 15 ___ of ___ met				Met	MC	Not Met

Notes: One record was not available for review and no results of investigation found in food file.

CALCULATING CONSUMER COMPLAINT COMPLIANCE:

MPR 15 shows 15 of 16 consumer complaint files were met. This is the only review of MPR 15, so these results can be placed on the MPR summary sheet.

EXAMPLE FROM SUMMARY SHEET:

MPR 15 Complaint Investigation

MET **MC** **NM**

15 of 16 complaint investigations had no problems.

Compliance 94% 80% required

**Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review
Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide**

LIMITED LICENSE

See the MPR Indicator Guide for materials needed, sample selection, program indicators, and judging compliance.

CHOOSING LIMITED LICENSE SAMPLES:

It is unlikely that many licenses will have been limited over the three year review cycle; therefore a percentage allowance is not feasible.

- Obtain a list of all licenses limited during the review period. If there are only a few licenses limited during the review cycle, you would want to review all of the licenses to assess if the licenses were limited correctly. If many licenses were limited, you would randomly pick licenses to review. To statistically have a valid sample, choosing 10 reviews should be sufficient.
- Obtain a list of all licenses limited **before** the review period. This list will only be used to evaluate if license applications were marked as limited licenses **during the current review cycle**.
- If the health department has a policy for license limitations, this policy would provide evaluation information.

FILLING OUT THE LIMITED LICENSE WORKSHEET:

This worksheet is used to collect and interpret data for MPR 13, and to document the samples that were chosen for evaluation.

The 3 components to evaluate for license limitations are listed on the chart below. See the MPR Indicator Guide, MPR 13, Program Indicators, to determine compliance.

EXAMPLE OF A COMPLETED LIMITED LICENSE WORKSHEET:

MPR 13 LIMITED LICENSE WORKSHEET

MET NOT MET

Facility name	Reason license was limited (food law)	Proper notice provided Y / N	Opportunity for a hearing Y / N	License application filled out Y / N
Joe's Bar	This bar is limited to serving only drinks and prepackaged foods until on-site sewage system is upgraded	Y	Y	N
Boston High School Concession	Limited to single service tableware due to present inadequate warewashing facilities	Y	Y	Y
St. Mary's Church	Limited to cooking only non-grease vapor producing foods due to inadequate ventilation in kitchen	Y	Y	Y

**Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review
Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide**

CALCULATING LIMITED LICENSE COMPLIANCE:

Since this MPR does not have a percent rate, the reviewer should consider the overall practice of limiting a license when determining compliance. (See MPR Indicator Guide for judging compliance.)

An example of when a “met” might be given:

On one facility’s license application, the “limited license” box was not marked. It is possible that the license limitation was imposed after the routine license application had been approved and license issued, in which case no deficiency would be marked. The reviewer needs to ask questions to determine if policy is being followed.

An example of when a “met with conditions” might be given:

The department has a good limited license policy and forms. The policy is being followed and licenses are limited according to the law. However, the license applications were not marked as limited licenses on 3 applications. This could be considered a minor deviation that needs attention.

EXAMPLE FROM SUMMARY SHEET:

MPR 13 License Limitations	MET	MC	NM
Was the reason given for limiting the license? yes			
Was proper notice provided? yes			
Was the license application appropriately completed? yes			

**Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review
Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide**

VARIANCES

See the MPR Indicator Guide for materials needed, sample selection, program indicators, and judging compliance.

CHOOSING VARIANCE SAMPLES:

It is unlikely that many variances will have been issued over the three year review cycle; therefore a percentage allowance is not feasible.

- Obtain a list of all variances issued during the review period. If there are only a few establishments on the list, you would want to review all of the variances to assess if they were issued correctly. If many variances were issued, reviewing 10 random variances should be sufficient to statistically have a valid sample.

FILLING OUT THE VARIANCE WORKSHEET:

The health department's policy on variances will be needed to complete this worksheet.

There are 6 indicators for MPR 14 that need to be evaluated, and they are clearly explained in the MPR Indicator Guide under "Program Indicators" and are listed on the following worksheet.

EXAMPLE OF A COMPLETED VARIANCE WORKSHEET:

MPR 14 VARIANCE WORKSHEET					MET	NOT MET
Facility name	Specialized processing (HACCP)	Request in file	Statement of proposal- Relevant FC/FL #s	Public health hazards addressed	Department has formal procedure	Staff following procedure
	Y / N	Y / N	Y / N	Y / N	Y / N	Y / N
Joe's Diner	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mary's Cafe	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

CALCULATING VARIANCE COMPLIANCE:

Since this MPR does not have a percent rate, the reviewer should consider the overall practice of issuing a variance when determining compliance. A consistent deficiency in any one of the MPR 14 indicators would result in a NM.

EXAMPLE FROM SUMMARY SHEET:

MPR 14 Variances	MET	MC	NM
Special processing methods? None			
Request in file? Yes			
Citing relevant code section numbers ? Yes			
Department has formal procedure for issuing variance? Yes			
Staff following procedures? Yes			

**Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review
Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide**

FOODBORNE ILLNESS

See the MPR Indicator Guide for materials needed, sample selection, program indicators, and judging compliance.

CHOOSING FOODBORNE ILLNESS COMPLAINT SAMPLES:

For sampling, you will require:

- The LHD FBI complaint tracking log
- The LHD policy manual for FBI Investigation
- Annex 5
- Annex 6

Using the FBI complaint log, number the FBI complaints received during the review cycle. Use annex 6 to determine how many FBI complaints will be reviewed. A maximum random sample of 10 foodborne illness investigation records for the review period will be evaluated.

Use Annex 5 to determine random samples from the list.

FILLING OUT THE FOODBORNE ILLNESS COMPLAINT WORKSHEET:

This worksheet is used to collect and interpret data for MPR 19 and 20.

Complaint ID: List FBI complaint ID from FBI complaint log (If the agency does not use an I.D. system other than the date or facility number, document that ID on the sheet.)

MPR 20: See the MPR Indicator Guide for complete evaluation instructions.

- Was the complaint written on the log?
- Is there documentation that the log is reviewed for trends?
- Are IAFP 5th Edition procedures used? These include the use of Form A **and** either the approved gastrointestinal form; or Forms C1 and C2.
- Does the department have a standard operating procedure for FBI surveillance and investigation that includes:
 - A description of the investigation team
 - Duties of each member
 - Frequency for reviewing the complaint log, who will review, how is the review documented.
 - Communication methods used
- Is the department following the MDA February 3, 2006 FBI Reporting memo?

MPR 19: Timely response

Has the FBI complaint investigation been initiated within 24 hours?

If it was a defined foodborne illness investigation, was the final report submitted to MDA within 90 days of the close of the investigation?

**Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review
Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide**

EXAMPLE OF A COMPLETED FOODBORNE ILLNESS COMPLAINT WORKSHEET:

MPR 19 & 20 Foodborne Illness Investigations Worksheet

Complaint ID	20 Compl. on log	20 Log Review Timely?	20 IAFP Procedure Used?	20 Form A	20 Form C1,C2 Or Gastro. Form Used?	19 Invest. Initiated within 24 hours?	19 If Outbreak, Report to MDA w/in 90 Days of Closure?	Problem
09-001	√	√	√	√	√	√	N/A	Y
09-018	√	√	√	√	√	√	N/A	Y
09-07	√	√	√	X	√	X	N/A	Y
08-045	√	√	√	√	√	√	N/A	Y
08-016	√	√	√	√	√	√	N/A	Y
08-010	√	√	√	√	√	X	√	Y
08-022	√	√	√	√	√	√	N/A	Y
08-013	√	√	√	√	√	√	N/A	Y
07-006	√	√	√	√	√	√	N/A	Y
07-013	√	√	√	√	√	√	N/A	Y
Total								
%								

Notes: 20 - IAFP 5th edition on-site? **YES**

CALCULATING FOODBORNE ILLNESS COMPLAINT COMPLIANCE:

MPR 19: In this example 8 of 10 (80%) FBI complaint records reviewed met the indicators resulting in a “Met” for MPR 19. (Two of the complaints were not investigated within 24 hours.) The department did submit a copy of the final written report to MDA within 90 days after the investigation of a foodborne outbreak was completed.

This is the only review of MPR 19, so these results can be placed on the MPR summary sheet.

EXAMPLE FROM SUMMARY SHEET:

MPR 19 Foodborne Illness Investigations Conducted

MET MC NM

8 of 10 files had no problems.

Compliance 80%

80% required

MPR 20: In this example only one of the FBI complaints reviewed was missing a form A. If the department had an excellent policy, and was doing a great job of investigating FBI complaints; the evaluation would receive a met.

EXAMPLE FROM SUMMARY SHEET:

MPR 20 Foodborne Illness Procedures

MET MC NM

**Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review
Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide**

TRAINING

See the MPR Indicator Guide for materials needed, sample selection, program indicators, and judging compliance.

MPR 16: This MPR reviews the training records for each employee hired or assigned to the food program during the last review period. (For employees assigned to do only specialty food programs, see MPR 18)

There is no worksheet; all information is written on the summary sheet.

- List any employee hired or assigned during the review period.
- Determine if the training record indicates completion of required training in the six designated skill areas. (It is recommended that staff complete the ORA U. courses designated to meet the requirements.)
- Has the training been completed within 12 months of assignment to the program?

EXAMPLE FROM SUMMARY SHEET:

MPR 16 New Staff- Academic Training in 6 Areas **MET** MC NM

Marie Curie- completed all required training within 12 months of hire.

MPR 17: This MPR reviews the field training records for each employee hired or assigned to the food program during the last review period. (For employees assigned to do only specialty food programs, see MPR 18)

There is no worksheet; all information is written on the summary sheet.

- List any employee hired or assigned during the review period.
- Determine if the training record indicates if 25 joint evaluations, 25 independent evaluations under review of the trainer, and 5 evaluation inspections have been conducted with a LHD Standardized trainer.
- Has the training been completed within 12 months of assignment to the program?

EXAMPLE FROM SUMMARY SHEET:

MPR 17 New Staff- Evaluations with Standardized Trainer **MET** MC NM

Marie Curie- completed all required field training within 12 months of hire.

MPR 18: This MPR determines **if the supervisor has endorsed** all employees who evaluate specialty food service establishments (mobile, vending, STFU, temporary) as having knowledge of the food code, food law, public health principles, and communication skills. Each employee must be endorsed for each type of specialty food establishment they evaluate.

There is no worksheet; all information is written on the summary sheet.

- List any employee hired or assigned during the review period.
- Is there documentation to show supervisor endorsement before conducting independent evaluations?

EXAMPLE FROM SUMMARY SHEET:

MPR 18 Other Staff- Training for Mobile, STFU, Vending and TFE **MET** MC NM

Supervisor endorsement of all training requirements for specialty food evaluation was in the training file for Marie Curie.

**Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review
Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide**

COMPLETING THE MPR SUMMARY SHEET

At this point, most of the MPR evaluations have been placed on the summary sheet. MPR 6 and 9 are reviewed using many of the worksheets, so compliance is calculated after all required worksheets have been completed.

MPR 6:

This indicator is evaluated as part of the review of facility files, STFU files, Mobile files, Vending files, and Temporary license reviews. At this point you have all of the information to evaluate MPR 6.

Using results from the file reviews, the review of MPR 6 can be calculated:

From the Facility File review, we found: **22 of the 23 files met MPR 6 requirements.**

From the Vending file review, we found: **16 of the 21 files met MPR 6 requirements.**

From the Temporary License review, we found: **19 of the 20 temporary files met MPR 6.**

SUMMARY SHEET

MPR 6 Evaluation Procedures

MET MC NM

**A. Files w/6 MET: 38 Fixed/Mobile/STFU/Vending + 19 Temporary files = 57 Total files w/no prob.
57 Total files w/ no problems / 64 Total files reviewed = 89% Compliance. 80% required for MET**

NOTE:

Section B is very seldom used for calculating compliance, but is available if necessary.

B. If compliance =<80% And Problems Noted Were Due Only To Clerical Omissions (See Examples Asterisked Below), Re-Calculate:

_____ files w/no violation ID problems / _____ Total files= _____ % Compliance.

If A is close to 80% and B is ≥ 80% and approved forms are used, 6 is rated **MC**

The following chart is used to assist LHDs in determining weak areas of report writing. It is not a part of determining compliance for accreditation, but merely a list of ALL violations noted on ALL of the reports reviewed, even if the file has passed MPR 6.

	Evaluation problem specifics	Fixed/Mobile/STFU	Temporary	Vend	Total
	The # of times each problem was found from all evaluations reviewed. Total insp. reviewed= 214	#	#	List each time you cite a MPR 6 violation on a vending inspection	#
	Count every evaluation report you have reviewed in the assessment of facility files, vending, and temporary inspections.	List each time you cite a MPR 6 violation on a facility file inspection	List each time you cite a MPR 6 violation on a temporary inspection		
A	Department uses unapproved evaluation form				
B	* Administrative info. not complete on evaluation form				
C	Findings do not properly document and ID: C and NC	IIII III	I		9

**Food Service Program, Cycle 4 Office Review
Self-Assessment Worksheet Guide**

D	Report does not summarize findings relative to law, is not legible and/or doesn't convey a clear message	IIII II		I	8
E	Narrative does not state violations observed and corrections needed	II	III		5
F	Correction time frames not specified				
G	* Report not signed and/or dated by Sanitarian		Noted under MPR 5		
H	* Report not signed by establishment representative				

In this example, out of 214 evaluations reviewed, there were 9 examples of not documenting critical and non-critical violations; 8 examples of not describing WHY it was a violation per law; and 5 examples of not stating the observation observed.

MPR 9

MPR 9 is a review of overall records management for the program. A review of records management is a part of every MPR review (except, of course, MPR 9). You must evaluate:

- Are records maintained in accordance with Annex 3
- Is staff able to retrieve records necessary for the audit
- Are applications and licenses processed in accordance with law

During the assessment process, sections of the summary sheet for MPR 9 have been compiled, and it is now time to complete the evaluation:

MPR 9 Records

MET MC NM

**We have documented that no significant record keeping problems are noted.
Staff has been able to retrieve all necessary records.**

Plan review: 9 of 10

Vending: 21 of 21

TFE: 20 of 20

Facility Files: 22 of 23



Michigan Department of Agriculture

Food Service Program Cycle 4 Assessment Forms

Food & Dairy Division
Michigan Department of Agriculture
PO Box 30017
Lansing, MI 48909
Ph: (517) 373-1060

July 21, 2009

Food Service Assessment Forms Agency:

Review Dates: / / Review Period: / / - / / Reviewer(s): Initial Visit / Revisit

Executive Summary

MPR	Status		Findings
	M/MC	NM/NA	
Plan Review			
1			
Evaluations			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
Records			
9			
Enforcement			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
Staff Training & Qualifications			
16			
17			
18			
Foodborne Illness Investigations			
19			
20			
Important Factors - Not Used To Determine Accreditation Status			
	M	NA	
Industry and Community Relations			
IF 1			
Continuing Education for Regulatory Staff			
IF 2			
Program Support			
IF 3			
Quality Assurance Program			
IF 4			

M= Met
 MC= Met with Conditions
 NM= Not Met
 NA= Not Applicable

NOTE: Remember that CPA's must be written in the six element format described in Annex 1.

MPR Summary

MPR 1 Plan Review Summary

_____ of _____ files had **80% Compliance** **MET** **NM**
 _____% **compliance rate. 80% required.**
 Specifics (Problem and number of times it occurred):

MPR 2 Pre-Opening Evaluations

_____ of _____ files had no problems. **MET** **MC** **NM**
 _____% **compliance rate. 80% required.**
 Specifics (Problem and number of times it occurred):

MPR 3 Evaluation Frequency Method 1 (Calculated from files)

MET **MC** **NM**

- A. Number of facilities in sample meeting evaluation frequency: _____
- B. Number of facility files reviewed: _____
- C. **Percent of files meeting evaluation frequency $\{(A/B) \times 100\}$:** _____% (MET= $\geq 80\%$, if $< 80\%$ complete D-F)
- D. Number of **evaluations** conducted on time from all files reviewed: _____
- E. Number of **evaluations** that should have been conducted: _____
- F. **Percent of required evaluations completed $\{(D/E) \times 100\}$:** _____% (MC= C $< 80\%$ & F $\geq 80\%$)
- ERBIS in place for this time period: _____ to _____

Method 2 (Calculated from summary of all evaluations performed)

- A. Number of routine **evaluations** completed during review period _____
- B. Number of routine **evaluations** due during review period _____
- Percent $\{(A/B) \times 100\}$** _____%
- ERBIS in place for this time period: _____ to _____

MPR 4 Vending Evaluation Frequency

MET **NM**

Department's **Evaluation** plan:
 Every 6 months 1/3rd each year 1/10th each 6 months

Summary

A. # of vending location files that meet frequency	
B. # of vending location files reviewed	
C. Percent Compliance $\{(A/B) \times 100\}$ 80% required	%

Comments:

Food Service Assessment Forms Agency:

Review Dates: / / Review Period: / / - / / Reviewer(s): Initial Visit / Revisit

MPR 5 Temporary Food Service

MET MC NM

___ of ___ files had no problems.
Compliance = _____% **80% required.**

MPR 6 Evaluation Procedures

MET MC NM

A. Files w/6 MET: ___ Fixed/Mobile/STFU/Vending + ___ Temporary files = ___ Total files w/no prob.
___ Total files w/ no problems / ___ Total files reviewed = _____% Compliance. **80% required for MET**

B. If compliance =<80% And Problems Noted Were Due Only To Clerical Omissions (See Examples Asterisked Below), Re-Calculate:

___ files w/no violation ID problems / ___ Total files= _____% Compliance.
If A is close to 80% and B is ≥ 80% and approved forms are used, 6 is rated **MC**

Evaluation problem specifics	Fixed/Mobile/STFU	Temporary	Vend	Total
The # of times each problem was found from all evaluations reviewed. Total insp. reviewed=_____	#	#		#
Department uses unapproved evaluation form				
* Administrative info. not complete on evaluation form				
Findings do not properly document and ID: C and NC				
Report does not summarize findings relative to law, is not legible and/or doesn't convey a clear message				
Narrative does not state violations observed and corrections needed				
Correction time frames not specified				
* Report not signed and/or dated by Sanitarian		Noted under MPR 5		
* Report not signed by establishment representative				

MPR 7 FIELD- Interventions/Risk Factor Violations

MET MC NM

MPR 8 FIELD- Evaluations Result in food Code Compliant Establishments

MET MC NM

MPR 9 Records

MET MC NM

Plan review ___ of ___ Vending ___ of ___ TFE ___ of ___
Fixed Files ___ of ___ Complaints ___ of ___ FBI ___ of ___

MPR 10 Written Enforcement Policy, Proper Use

MET MC NM

___ of ___ files had no problems.
Compliance % _____ **80% required + acceptable policy**
Enforcement Policy Comments:

MPR 11 Unauthorized Construction - Stop Work Order Usage

MET MC NM

Food Service Assessment Forms Agency:

Review Dates: / / Review Period: / / - / / Reviewer(s): Initial Visit / Revisit

MPR 12 Follow-Up Evaluation MET NM

A. Number Of Files With $\geq 80\%$ Of Required Follow-Ups Completed With/In 30 Days And Critical Corrections Noted _____

B. Number Of Files In Sample _____

Percent Compliance $\{(A/B) \times 100\}$ 80% Required _____

MPR 13 License Limitations MET MC NM

Was the reason given for limiting the license? _____

Was proper notice provided? _____

Was the license application appropriately completed? _____

MPR 14 Variances MET MC NM

Special processing methods _____

Request in file ? _____

Citing relevant code section numbers ? _____

Department has formal procedure for issuing variance ? _____

Staff following procedure ? _____

MPR 15 Complaint Investigation MET MC NM

_____ of _____ files had no problems.

Compliance % _____ **80% required**

MPR 16 New Staff- Academic Training in 6 Areas MET MC NM

MPR 17 New Staff- Evaluations with Standardized Trainer MET MC NM

MPR 18 Other Staff- Training for Mobile, STFU, Vending and TFE MET MC NM

MPR 19 Foodborne Illness Investigations Conducted MET MC NM

_____ of _____ files had no problems.

Compliance % _____ **80% required**

MPR 20 Foodborne Illness Procedures MET MC NM

Food Service Assessment Forms Agency:

Review Dates: / / Review Period: / / - / / Reviewer(s): Initial Visit / Revisit

Important Factor I- Industry and Community Relations

MET NA

Department not attempting to meet this IF

Important Factor II - Continuing Education of Regulatory Staff

MET NA

Department not attempting to meet this IF

Important Factor III- Program Support

MET NA

Department not attempting to meet this IF

licensed establishments _____/150 = **A.** _____ recommended number FTE's
/225 = **B.** _____ minimum number FTE's

temporary licenses issued _____/300 = **C.** _____ FTE's needed for temporary evaluation

D. Total Minimum FTE's (B+C)= _____ **E.** Total Recommended FTE's (A+C)= _____

F. Actual FTE's assigned to FS program _____

Met if:

$F \geq E$

Important Factor IV- Quality Assurance Program

MET NA

Department not attempting to meet this IF

Written quality assurance program developed

Quality assurance review conducted every 24 months

At least 10 inspection reports for each sanitarian's food insp. or FBI records have been reviewed

Every employee assigned to program has completed 2 joint inspections with trainer every 24 months

Food Service Assessment Forms Agency:

Review Dates: / / Review Period: / / - / / Reviewer(s): Initial Visit / Revisit

PLAN REVIEW

NUMBER OF PLAN REVIEWS IN REVIEW CYCLE _____ SAMPLE SIZE _____

#	County	Facility	Address
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			

PLAN REVIEW CALCULATIONS FOR ALL FILES REVIEWED:

	MPR 1	MPR 2	MPR 9	MPR 11	MPR 12
MET					
NOT MET					
	MPR 1 ____ of ____ are met	MPR 2 ____ of ____ are met	MPR 9 ____ of ____ are met	MPR 11 ____ of ____ are met	MPR 12 ____ of ____ are met

Food Service Assessment Forms Agency:

Review Dates: / / Review Period: / / - / / Reviewer(s): Initial Visit / Revisit

MPR's 1, 2, 9, 11,12: Plan Review Worksheet

1 Plan review	of 14 indicators met =	% (80% required)	M	NM
2 Pre-opening		(100% required)	M	NM
9 Records		(100% required)	M	NM
11 Unauthorized Construction		(100% required)	M	NM
12 Follow-up evaluations		(100% required)	M	NM

Facility Name: _____ Type: _____ New Remodeled
 License year: _____ Insp. Date: _____ Date License Signed: _____
 ✓=yes, x=no, NA=not applicable

Indicator	Item Required	Status*	Notes	Problem
1	Application / Transmittal letter (new 1/01)			Y
1	Menu (new 8/86)			Y
1	Layout (floor) Plan			Y
1	Plumbing Plan			Y
1	Ventilation Hood shown (full plans needed for STFU's, mobiles)			Y
1	Lighting Plan &/or Specifications			Y
1	Scaled Drawings			Y
1	Completed Worksheet			Y
1	Equipment Specifications			Y
1	SOP's (10/04) Either note on reviewer's checklist, SOP cover sheet or note on pre-opening insp.			Y
1	Reviewer's checklist used (1/04)?			Y
1	Applicant informed of deficiencies? Deficiencies resolved in writing or on revised plans. Is the flow between reviewer and applicant clear?			Y
1	Formulas calculated, documented for hot water, dry storage, refrigeration? (needed, proposed, justification for differences)			Y
1	Approval letter in file? Describe project scope & references. A unique identifier (ie: Date) marked on the approved plans.		Date:	Y
11	Was facility constructed prior to approval? (Note if approvals issued very close to or after opening inspection)			Y
11	Stop work order used as needed? Did department take appropriate action once it became aware of illegal construction?			Y
2	Facility opened with NO critical items pending?			Y
2	Pre-opening inspection in file?			Y
2	Is inspection marked approved to open?			Y
2	Inspection dated on or before license approval date?			Y
2	Inspection on regular inspection form, properly completed, dated and signed?			Y
12	Follow-up inspection on separate form?			Y
9	Records		Records retained for: _____ years	Y

FIXED FILES- OFFICE REVIEW

NUMBER OF ESTABLISHMENTS FOR REVIEW CYCLE _____ SAMPLE SIZE _____

#	County	Facility	Address
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			

CALCULATIONS FOR ALL FACILITY FOLDERS REVIEWED:

	MPR 3	MPR 12	MPR 6	MPR 9	MPR 10
MET					
NOT MET					
	MPR 3 _____ of _____ met	MPR 12 _____ of _____ met	MPR 6 _____ of _____ met	MPR 9 _____ of _____ met	MPR 10 _____ of _____ met

Vending MPR 4,6,9

Company _____ Location _____ License # _____

App./ License/ Year / DATE SIGNED	Date of Evaluation	Activity Type	MPR 4 M NM	MPR 6 M NM comments	MPR 9 M NM	Problem
		R FU E				Y
		R FU E				Y
		R FU E				Y
		R FU E				Y
		R FU E				Y

Company _____ Location _____

App./ License/ Year / DATE SIGNED	Date of Evaluation	Activity Type	MPR 4 M NM	MPR 6 M NM comments	MPR 9 M NM	Problem
		R FU E				Y
		R FU E				Y
		R FU E				Y
		R FU E				Y
		R FU E				Y

Company _____ Location _____ License # _____

App./ License/ Year / DATE SIGNED	Date of Evaluation	Activity Type	MPR 4 M NM	MPR 6 M NM comments	MPR 9 M NM	Problem
		R FU E				Y
		R FU E				Y
		R FU E				Y
		R FU E				Y
		R FU E				Y

Company _____ Location _____ License # _____

App./ License/ Year / DATE SIGNED	Date of Evaluation	Activity Type	MPR 4 M NM	MPR 6 M NM comments	MPR 9 M NM	Problem
		R FU E				Y
		R FU E				Y
		R FU E				Y
		R FU E				Y
		R FU E				Y

Vending Location files that meet freq. _____ / total vending locations reviewed _____ = _____ %

Food Service Assessment Forms Agency:

Review Dates: / / Review Period: / / - / / Reviewer(s): Initial Visit / Revisit

MPR 5, 6, 9 Temporary Food Worksheet *** GET ANNUAL # FROM QUAR. REPORT**

Note: Put letters in boxes as licenses are reviewed.

5	a.	Evaluated prior to licensure, but not in advance of event being ready for evaluation.
	b.	Application has sections A,B, food column of F and attachment A (when used) completed plus have application, inspection and license approval date plus sanitarian signature
	c.	License issued with no unresolved critical violations
6		See list in MPR indicator guide
9		Record retention adequate time. Files can be located for review.

	Office	Year	License #	5 a	5 b	5 c	6	9	Specific problems noted
1									
2									
3									
4									
5									
6									
7									
8									
9									
10									
11									
12									
13									
14									
15									
16									
17									
18									
19									
20									
21									
22									
23									
MPR 5 ___ of ___ files Met _____ % MPR 6 ___ of ___ files Met MPR 9 ___ of ___ files Met									

Food Service Assessment Forms Agency:

Review Dates: / / Review Period: / / - / / Reviewer(s): Initial Visit / Revisit

MPR 15 Consumer Complaint Worksheet

#	Complaint ID	15 Log maintained & records available for review	15 Results recorded (or justification for no investigation)	15 Working Days from Receipt to Start of Investigation (Max. 5 working days allowed)	Met Not Met	Problem
1						Y
2						Y
3						Y
4						Y
5						Y
6						Y
7						Y
8						Y
9						Y
10						Y
11						Y
12						Y
13						Y
14						Y
15						Y
16						Y
17						Y
18						Y
19						Y
20						Y
21						Y
22						Y
23						Y
		MPR 15 ___ of ___ met		MET MC NOT MET		

Notes:

MPR 16 Staff Technical Training

Have new staff assigned to program during review period completed training in following within 12 months of assignment: 1. public health principles, 2. communication skills, 3. microbiology, 4. epidemiology, 5. food law, food code, related policies, 6. HACCP.

MPR 17 Fixed Food Service Evaluation Skills

Have new staff completed 25 joint training evaluations with standardized trainer, 25 independent evaluations reviewed by trainer, 5 evaluation inspections with trainer and have endorsement of trainer.

MPR 18 Specialty Food Service Inspection Skills

Do newly assigned staff conducting mobile, STFU, vending or temporary inspections have endorsement by supervisor?

