

OPERATIONS MANUAL CHAIR of the PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT COMPETITION

The Chair of the Product Development Competition is appointed. The Chair's duties and responsibilities shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Email information to all food science and related departments, food science clubs, and IFT Student Association Area Representatives early in the fall term of each school year. The information email should include a letter encouraging the school to participate and the web address for the rules and procedures.
2. Submit an announcement to be published in the Student Association Newsletter introducing the competition and stating deadlines for competition. Submit additional update articles for the Newsletter throughout the school year.
3. Send notices to Area Representatives to publicize competition in area newsletters and at area meetings.
4. Submit finalist teams information (such as university, product name, team members' names, abstract, any digital photographs, etc.) to IFT media, publications, and technical program staff members for inclusion in the Annual Meeting technical program, press releases, IFT Today, and Food Technology, etc.
5. Verify eligibility of all team members.
6. Submit finalist teams' product tasting equipment lists to the IFT Student Association Operations Chair and the IFT Manager of Meetings. Find out if the preparation facilities needed by the teams are available. If not, notify the teams immediately.
7. Confirm judges remaining on the panel, and select replacement judges for those rotating off the panel. Judges serve two-year terms, and are not allowed to serve consecutive terms. Each year two or three judges should remain from the following year, and two or three should be new. The IFT Product Development Division will assist with locating judges, when asked. One of the judges must be an employee of Masterfoods USA, the Competition sponsor.
8. Work with the judges to facilitate timely distribution and evaluation of entries.
9. Notify finalists two and one-half months prior to the Annual Meeting. Finalists must contact IFT office to obtain travel grant.
10. Coordinate competition at the Annual Meeting.
11. Recognize teams at the Annual Meeting that participated.
12. Submit any Competition Rule changes, approved by the IFTSA Executive Committee at the July Executive Committee meeting, to the IFT office no later than July 15. Any Competition Rule changes not submitted to the IFT office by July 15, will not take effect until September 1 of the following year.

13. Be sure that any changes in the Rules and Procedures are submitted to MasterFoods USA for their approval.
14. Send the participants of the competitions the final scores for their product and judges' comments.

CHAIR of the PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT COMPETITION Deadlines

- Sept 1 Send the IFTSA Web Editor and IFTSA Secretary full information on the competition, including your name, address, phone, fax, and email. Email information to food science and related university departments. Submit an announcement to be published in the Student Association Newsletter
Send notices to Area Representatives to publicize competition in area newsletters and at Area Meetings
- Sept 15 Send Mid-year report to IFTSA Secretary
- Oct 15 Confirm judges for the Competition - send Rules and Regulations and offer to answer any questions they may have.
- Feb 15 Deadline for Preliminary Proposals - confirm eligibility of all proposals, including team members' membership.
- March 1 *(As close to March 1 as possible:)*
Notify Finalists - Finalists must contact IFT Field Service Department with the payee and address for their travel grant.
Contact IFTSA President-elect with list of finalists for Welcome Assembly Program.
Send list of finalists to IFT Media Communications Manager.
Send list of finalists to IFT Field Service Associate for certificates.
Send list of finalists to IFT Field Service Director to verify travel advances.
- May 1 Deadline for Final Written Proposals
Notify IFTSA Operations Chair and IFT Manager of Meetings and Expositions of any special equipment needed for Product Sampling.
- June 1 Submit Annual Report to IFTSA Secretary. (Final Report is due after the Annual Meeting.)

Annual Meeting

- Arrive at Oral Session room at least 1/2 hour prior to start of session to check set-up, etc.
- Facilitate Informational Meeting with teams and judges prior to oral session.
- Act as Moderator for PDC Oral Competition and Product Sampling.
- Facilitate events during PDC Poster Session.
- Present Awards at the IFTSA Welcome Assembly and Phi Tau Sigma Awards Breakfast.
- Attend and participate in other IFTSA meetings and events, when possible.

Post Meeting

- Prepare appropriate reports

Advise IFT Field Service Office of winners for certificates for each team member of top three teams. Certificates should include winner's position, product, all team members' names, date and place of competition and sponsors.

Send the participants of the competitions the final scores for their product and judges' comments.

Organize PDC Chair files and records. Send them to the Incoming PDC Chair.

Chair's Competition schedule at the Annual Meeting

1. Have judges sign release forms.
2. Moderate presentations on Sunday.
3. Supervise poster displays and product sampling on Monday. (Judges evaluate poster displays during beginning of poster session.)
4. Monitor all Competition segments (presentations, posters, reports, conduct, etc.) to prevent / reduce the impact of potential Rule violations.
5. Compile all scores with judges.
6. Contact IFT media / publications staff with Competition results for publication in the following morning's *IFT Today*.
7. Announce winners and present Awards at the IFT Student Association Welcome Assembly and Phi Tau Sigma Awards Breakfast.

IFTSA Product Development Competition Proposal Evaluation Form

Judge: _____

Product Name: _____

Ranking: _____ of _____

Area of Evaluation <i>(Consult PDC Rules for definitions.)</i>	% of Total Points	Point Value	Points Given
Originality	10	0-10	
Profitability	10	0-10	
Marketing	10	0-10	
Product Description	20	0-20	
Process Description	20	0-20	
Safety/Shelf Life	15	0-15	
Technical Problem Solving	15	0-15	
Total	100	0-100	

Comments:

IFTSA Product Development Competition Final Evaluation Form

Judge: _____

Product Name/School: _____

Ranking: _____ of _____

Category	Area of Evaluation <i>(Consult PDC Rules for definitions.)</i>	Percent Area	Points Available	Points Given
Written Proposal	(40% of total score)			
	Originality	10%	10	
	Profitability	10%	10	
	Marketing	10%	10	
	Product Description	20%	20	
	Process Description	20%	20	
	Safety/shelf Life	15%	15	
	Technical Problem Solving	15%	15	
Total		100%	100	
Oral Presentation	(30% of total score) Quality, Organization, Communication, Interest Generated, Selling the Product		75	
Poster Session	(20% of total Score) Neatness and Organization		50	
Product Sample	(10% of total score) Delivery vs. Promise		25	
Total Score			250	

RANKING PROCEDURES TO BE USED IN FINAL ROUND

1. The competition shall have the final round judged by exactly **five (5)** qualified judges.
2. Judges will score finalists **independently** according to outlined score sheets/criteria in the Student Association Operations Manual. Judges will individually (**no judges conference**) submit their scores for all contestants following the conclusion of the competition to the Competition Chair. The panel of judges will validate and approve the final Competition results after calculation by the Chair, before the results are announced publicly.
3. Each Competition judge converts all individual scores to ranks (i.e. 1,2,3,...up to total number of contestants with rank 1 being for highest score from a given judge). Each rank number shall be used only once per judge. Fractions of ranks shall not be used. (For example, if two teams were scored "82" by one judge, they both cannot have rank "5" or "5.5" from this judge. One must be "5" and one must be "6". Only that judge can decide which is "5" and which is "6".)
4. Placing will be determined by the competition chair, in the presence of the panel of judges, per the following guidelines:

I. **First place** must be determined first based on the following rules:

- a) Any contestant with a majority (three of five judges) of 1 ranks will be first (regardless of the ranking by other two judges).
- b) If no majority of 1 rank exists, first place will be awarded to the contestant with the **lowest** sum total of ranks.
- c) If a tie still exists at this point, the use of judges' preference of the tied contestants determines first place (i.e. 3 or more out of 5 judges preferred one contestant over all others tied).
- d) If a tie still remains which is unbreakable by judges' preference, individual ranks (only for the tied contestants) will be converted to decimal numbers as follows:

1	=	1.00
2	=	.50
3	=	.33
4	=	.25
5	=	.20
6	=	.17

- The decimal equivalents are summed, and the **highest** total receives first place.
- e) If any tie still exists between only two contestants, it shall be resolved by judges' preference. This may involve discussion among the judges until an agreement is reached. If a tie still exists between three or more contestants, a blind draw will be used or a tie is called for placing purposes.

RANKING PROCEDURES (CONTINUED)

II. **Second place** must be determined next. Any contestants originally tied for first place that lost the tie breaker, are automatically awarded the successive places before consideration of contestants not involved in the preceding tie.

- a) If no tie existed for first place, a contestant who receives a majority (three of five judges) of 2 or better ranks will receive second place (if not previously assigned a placing per first place tie).
- b) If no contestant (not previously assigned a placing) receives a majority of 2 or better or if two contestants both receive a majority 2 or better ranks, the **lowest** sum total of ranks receives second place as in step I(b).
- c) If a tie still exists, judges' preference is used to determine rank as in I(c).
- d) Again, all tied contestants are awarded the next available placing before any more consideration is given to untied contestants.

III. **Successive places** are determined in a similar manner as far as deemed appropriate. Most SA competitions only award first, second, and third place so determining rank beyond third may be unnecessary.

Example #1

Contestant	Judge A	Judge B	Judge C	D	E	Total	Placing
One	3	2	2	3	1	11	Third
Two	2	1	3	2	2	10	Second
Three	1	3	1	1	3	irrel.	First

Contestant three got a majority of 1 ranks and received first place. Contestants one and two both received a majority of 2 or better ranks, so their placing was determined by low total rank.

Example #2

Contestant	Judge A	Judge B	Judge C	D	E	Total	Placing
One	2	4	3	2	5	16	Second*
Two	4	2	4	4	2	16	Third*
Three	1	1	5	1	4	irrel.	First

Contestant three received first place based on a majority of 1 ranks. Neither contestant one nor contestant two received a majority of 2 or better ranks **and** they tied on rank total. *Based on judges preference (Judges A, C and D preferred contestant one over contestant two), contestant one is awarded second place. Contestant two gets third automatically before moving on to lower placing 2 for untied contestants.

RANKING PROCEDURES (CONTINUED)

Example #3

Contestant	Judge A	Judge B	Judge C	D	E	Total	Placing
One	1	5	3	4	2	15	Third
Two	2	3	1	5	4	15	First
Three	5	4	2	1	3	15	Second
Four	6	1	5	6	6	24	Sixth
Five	3	6	4	2	5	20	Fifth
Six	4	2	6	3	1	16	Fourth

No contestant received a majority of 1 ranks so total ranks were summed, leaving three contestants tied for first (one, two, three). By judges' preference, contestant two gets first place (Judges A, B, C, E preferred 2 over 3 and Judges B, C, D preferred 2 over 1), contestant three gets second place (Judges B, C, D preferred 3 over 1), and contestant one gets third place before considering remaining untied contestants. Contestant six receives fourth place with a majority of 4 or better ranks (**note: this contestant does not receive second place because the placing of all of the tied contestants with lower rank totals must be resolved before consideration of this contestant**). Fifth place goes to contestant five with a majority of ranks 5 or better.

Example #4

Contestant	Judge A	Judge B	Judge C	D	E	Total	Placing
One	3	1	4	4	6	18	Second
Two	1	2	1	2	1	irrel.	First
Three	4	3	6	3	2	18	Third
Four	6	6	2	6	5	25	Sixth
Five	2	5	3	5	3	18	Fourth
Six	5	4	5	1	4	19	Fifth

Contestant two got a majority of 1 ranks so is awarded first place. No other contestant received a majority of 2 or better ranks and three contestants tied for low rank total (one, three, five). Of these three, no contestant is preferred by a majority of judges over both of the other tied contestants, so decimal equivalents are calculated for the three tied contestants per 1d and places second through fourth are awarded. Contestant six receives fifth place for having a majority of ranks 5 or better. Contestant four gives sixth. Following conversion to decimal equivalents for the contestants in places second through fourth, if a tie had still existed between two contestants it would have been broken on judges' preference.

Sample Letter

Jane Friedrich
Cornell University
NYSAES - Food Research Lab
Geneva, New York 14456
Phone: (315) 787-2240
Fax: (315) 787-2397
e-mail: jef18@cornell.edu

March 15, 1999

Dennis Zak
M&M Mars, Inc.
800 High Street
Hackettstown, NJ 07840

Dear Dennis Zak:

CONGRATULATIONS on surviving the first round of the Institute of Food Technologists Student Association Product Development Competition! IFTSA appreciates the time and energy involved in judging this competition.

The judges' scores were ranked according to overall score. These ranks were then added and ranked to give an overall rank, the lowest rank corresponding to the lowest total. When the total resulted in a tie the product with a majority preference of ranks was chosen to decide the overall rank (see the Preliminary Proposal Results form for clarification).

The six finalists are (in alphabetical order):

Cornell University B Sweet Spots
North Carolina State University B *Jamm* Singles
Purdue University B SOY-PRO
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign B Tater Stuffs
University of Minnesota B Sunrise Dippin= Duos
University of Wisconsin, Madison B Smoothie Pies

At this time you may dispose of the reports from the non-finalists, but please keep the Finalists preliminary proposals. I have attached a copy of your evaluation form and the Preliminary Proposal Results form.

The final report is due to me by May 1, 1999. I will over-night them to you on May 2, 1999. Please read and evaluate them prior to the IFT Annual Meeting in Chicago.

The schedule of events for the PDC in Chicago are as follows (locations yet to be determined):

Judge and Teams Meeting (closed to the public, we will go over any questions and allow the teams to get to know each other)	Sunday, July 24	9:00 AM to 10:00 AM
Oral Presentations	Sunday, July 24	10:00 AM to 12:00 PM
Poster Presentations	Monday, July 25	9:00 AM to 11:00 AM
Product Sampling (closed to the public)	Monday, July 25	12:00 PM to 2:00 PM

The results of the competition will be announced at the IFTSA Welcome Assembly and College Bowl Competition at 7:00 PM on Monday, July 25.

Again, thank you for all of your time and effort and I look forward to seeing you in Chicago.

Sincerely,

Jane Friedrich
1999 Product Development Competition Chair

Final Report -- Product Development Competition

Year

Committee Chair

1. Participants

School

Team Members

Product

Final Report -- Product Development Competition Continued

Year

Committee Chair

2. Judges

Name

Affiliation

3. Please comment on the space used for the competition, i.e. where, how much, tables, etc.

4. Please make any additional comments you feel will aid your successor.