

Harold Barnum Industry Award

WHO WAS HAROLD BARNUM?

The Harold Barnum Industry Award is named in honor of Harold Barnum, who was a Chief Milk Sanitarian for the city and county of Denver, Colorado for more than 20 years before his retirement, at which time he became involved with the development of the Whirl-Pak Bag for NASCO International. Mr. Barnum served as IAFP President in 1953.

The Harold Barnum Industry Award recognizes an active IAFP Member for dedicated and exceptional service to IAFP, the public, and the food industry. The award consists of a plaque and a \$1,500 honorarium sponsored by **MERCK Animal Health**.

Qualifications for nominees

- Be a non-student Member in good standing at the time of nomination and during the IAFP Annual Meeting (when receiving the award)
- Be employed (or retired within the last 2 years) in a food industry-related (nongovernmental, non-academic) profession
- Have a minimum 5 years of experience in a food industry-related profession
- Previous recipients of the Harold Barnum Industry Award, IAFP Executive Board Members, and IAFP Awards Committee Members are not eligible for this Award

Criteria for nominations

Please provide *specific information* on the following:

Career highlights—length of service and positions held in the food protection profession

Provide a resume or summary of positions held related to food protection and other activities that highlight the nominee's dedication to the profession and that demonstrate the nominee's high personal standards. CVs must be no longer than 20 pages maximum.

• Leadership roles and specific achievements or accomplishments in the food industry: Provide a listing of activities where the nominee was in a leadership role (e.g., supervisory responsibilities, committee or task force chair, project or program initiator, etc.).

Provide a listing of specific activities and their outcomes that would be considered significant achievements or accomplishments (e.g., developed a process or procedure that increased specific food safety; developed and/or performed audit system that improved plant safety; initiated and/or participated in improved regulation change, etc.).

Educational activities in food protection offered directly or indirectly to food industry
Provide a listing of involvement and specific roles in training programs, publications and/or
other forms of educational communications (e.g., organized workshops or other training
programs, authored or co-authored papers published in recognized journals or magazines,
etc.).

Participation in IAFP activities

Provide membership history and listing of past and present involvement in IAFP committees and PDGs, Annual Meeting attendance and program participation (e.g., speaker, symposium organizer, etc.), and other IAFP activities.

• Peer assessment of nominee

Provide no less than two and no more than three letters of support* from professional peers in addition to a nomination cover letter.*

Additional points to consider under the criteria for evaluating nominee

Other activities or characteristics of the nominee that are not specifically covered under the above criteria may be provided to emphasize the nominee's dedication to food protection and demonstrate the nominee's high personal standards (e.g., other associations, volunteer, and community activities, etc.).

Submitting nominations

Nominations must be submitted as one PDF to awards@foodprotection.org by Tuesday, February 13, 2024. Please follow directions carefully to avoid errors. Nominations received by email directly to the IAFP office or by mail will not be accepted. If you have any questions about this award or the required documents, please contact Susan Smith at ssmith@foodprotection.org.

Once you have submitted your **complete** nomination, you will receive an acknowledgment of receipt from Susan within 48 hours. (If you do not, please contact Susan.)

^{*}Nomination letter and letters of support cannot be from a current IAFP Board Member

IAFP Harold Barnum Industry Award Judging Procedure

Procedure for evaluation of each candidate

This procedure was designed with the intention of providing a matrix to help the award jury select a winner with a relatively equitable, semi-quantitative method. Nominators have been instructed to provide specific information on the candidate that reflects the expectations and specific intent of the Harold Barnum Industry Award: *To honor an active IAFP member for dedicated and exceptional service to IAFP, the public, and the food industry*. Each criterion listed in the next section has a weight factor that is considered to reflect its importance relative to the specific intent of the Harold Barnum Industry Award.

The jury's task is to evaluate the nominee by measuring his or her performance against the criteria listed above and applying the 1-10 Rating Scale given below. To obtain each criterion's *weighted score, multiply the criterion's % weight (in decimal format) times the score that was assigned from the 1-10 Rating Scale. Nominees should be ranked for each criterion on their own merit and should also be ranked in relation to other nominees. The table provided on the next page should be used to organize the evaluation data. Add the weighted scores in order to obtain the overall ranking of the candidate.

Rating Scale

9.0 –10.0	Outstanding: performance exceeds judge's expectations for criterion			
8.0 - 8.9	Above average: performance is above average expectation level for criterion.			
7.0 - 7.9	Average: performance meets average criterion expectations			
6.0 - 6.9	Below average: performance below expectations			
5.9 or less	Unsatisfactory or not applicable: performance does not meet criterion			
	expectations or the criterion does not apply to the candidate			

The following is an example showing a nominee receiving a perfect score (10 in each criterion).

Award Criteria	Criterion % Weight	Judge's Score	Weighted Score
Career Highlights	(x Factor) 20 % (0.20)	10.0	2.0
Leadership and Achievements	40 % (0.40)	10.0	4.0
Educational Activities	10 % (0.10)	10.0	1.0
Participation in IAFP	20 % (0.20)	10.0	2.0
Peer Assessment	<u>10 % (0.10)</u> 100 %	10.0	<u>1.0</u> 10.0

^{*}Weighted score = criteria score given based on rating guideline times criteria weight factor: (e.g., If Leadership and Achievements score is 8, then 8 x 0.40 = 3.2 weighted score)