Address contributions for *CHP News* and "CHP Corner" to:

Editor
Kyle Kleinhans, CHP
Work: 865-241-1024
Email: klink17@tds.net

Associate Editor
Harry Anagnostopoulos, CHP
Work: 702-295-3489
Email: H.Anagnostopoulos@NV.DOE.GOV

Nominating Committee

Kathryn H. Pryor, CHP, Chair

The Nominating Committee is composed of nine Plenary Members of the Academy, whose job is to put together a slate of candidates for open positions on the Academy Executive Committee and the American Board of Health Physics (ABHP). Nominating Committee members represent a wide variety of geographical areas and disciplines of health physics. It is this diversity on the committee that helps in identifying a larger and more diverse pool of candidates for elective office.

Members who are continuing terms on the Nominating Committee are Keith Anderson, Daniel Burnfield, Steven King, Kyle Kleinhans, and Max Scott. New members are John Hageman, Glenn Sturchio, and Kent Lambert (ABHP vice chair and ex officio member). Kathy Pryor begins her term as chair this year after concluding her three-year term as a member.

The Nominating Committee would like to thank those members who concluded their term this past year for their service: outgoing chair Carl Paperiello, member Stephen Brown, and ex officio member Jim Tarpinian (ABHP chair).

The Nominating Committee's activities are described in SOP 2.5.1, which can be found, along with the committee's charter, in the "Members Only" section of the American Academy of Health Physics Web site (http://www.hps1.org/aahp/). The Nominating Committee members contact potential prospects for elective office, review their eligibility and willingness to serve, rank the candidates, and forward the slate of candidates to the Executive Committee. The committee also selects and ranks candidates for open positions on the ABHP, working closely with the ABHP to determine its needs and consider its recommendations. Finally, the Nominating Committee recommends nominees for the Joyce P. Davis and William McAdams Awards to their respective awards selection committees.

AAHP Appeals Committee

Robert N. Cherry, Jr., CHP, Chair

Believe it or not, the American Board of Health Physics (ABHP) denies certification to some candidates following examination or may reject the certification renewal application of a certified health physicist. If this ever happens to you, you may appeal the ABHP's decision. This article discusses the procedures that the American Academy of Health Physics (AAHP) has in place for handling such appeals.

First of all, having these procedures for appeals of ABHP decisions is a standard of practice for certification programs such as that of the ABHP. The Council of Engineering and Scientific Specialty Boards (CESB) (www.cesb.org), of which the ABHP is an accredited Member Board, accredits certification programs. The ABHP's appeal process predates its membership in the CESB, and its process has always been in compliance with CESB requirements.

To attain CESB accreditation, a certification program must be consistent with the requirements that the CESB prescribes. To that end, the CESB evaluates certification programs against its guidelines.

The CESB's General Guidelines applicable to all programs prescribes, among other things, responsibilities to applicants. Specifically, the CESB says that "the Certifying Body shall prescribe, maintain, and publish procedures that certification candidates can use to appeal actions and decisions of the Certifying Body pertaining to the candidate's application and certification." The ABHP

meets this requirement as described in the *Bylaws of the American Academy of Health Physics* (January 2006). The ABHP Prospectus (available on the ABHP Web site, http://www.hps1.org/aahp/abhp/abhp.htm) says, "Any applicant denied certification may appeal the action of the Board by contacting the Executive Secretary within six months of notification of results."

Section 6.3.3 of the Bylaws, in describing one of the relationships of the ABHP to the AAHP, says, "The actions of the ABHP in awarding certification or certification renewal are final except that an individual who has been denied certification or certification renewal may request a review of that decision by the Appeals Committee established by the Academy."

Section 7.1.6 of the Bylaws establishes the Appeals Committee as a standing AAHP committee. Section 7.10 says, "The Appeals Committee consists of three Plenary Members of the Academy excluding current members of the ABHP or its Examination Panels." The current members of the Appeals Committee are Greg Hall, Nick Panzarino, and me.

Section 7.10.1 through Section 7.10.6 of the Bylaws lists the specific procedures for an appeal:

7.10.1 The Committee is responsible for reviewing the appeals of health physicists who have been denied certification or certification renewal by the ABHP.
7.10.2 The review of the Committee shall be limited to a determination as to whether the policies and procedures of the ABHP have been properly carried out.
7.10.3 The results of these reviews are reported to the President and the ABHP Chair.
7.10.4 If there is a finding of a failure to comply with a policy or procedure, the President shall refer the Appeals Committee's report with recommendations to the Chair of the ABHP for resolution.
7.10.5 The President shall inform the affected individuals of the outcome of the Appeals Committee's review.
7.10.6 The Committee shall provide an annual report to the Executive Committee prior to the Annual Meeting of the Academy.

With these committee procedures in mind, the prospective appellant should fully document how he or she believes that the ABHP did not properly carry out its policies and procedures. Electronic versions of the ABHP Policies and Procedures are available from the Executive Secretary upon request. Note that the actual grade on an examination is not appealable; only flaws in following the ABHP policies and procedures are appealable.

As indicated above, the Appeals Committee does not make the decision about the appeal. That is the duty and responsibility of the ABHP chair. The committee studies the appeal as the appellant presents it and provides the written results of its review and recommendation to the AAHP president, who may add his or her own comments and recommendation before forwarding the package to the ABHP chair for final disposition.

The Appeals Committee has an important function in the certification scheme but rarely has to perform it. Presently, the committee members stand by until we are needed. So, if you want to be an important part of maintaining the integrity of the certification process, participation on the AAHP Appeals Committee may appeal to you.

As a final note, the AAHP Executive Committee is considering whether the Appeals Committee should remain as a standing committee. Although it uses few resources, some feel that the Appeals Committee might be better utilized as an ad hoc committee when an appeal arises. If I may be allowed to editorialize, I think that it is better if it remains a standing committee so that the AAHP president could not be accused of "stacking the deck" against an appellant. Let your elected AAHP officials know what you think about it, as I just did (if they read this far!).

ABHP Examination No. 1—June 1960

An additional 10-point question from the first ABHP exam is listed below. Candidates were required to answer 15 out of 20 10-point questions, plus a 50-point essay in an exam time limit of three hours.

Part III - Answer 4 questions (10 points each)

9. a) Give the NCRP limits for external occupational exposure applicable to the whole body and to the extremities.
   b) Discuss the basic principles used in establishing maximum permissible body burdens of internal emitters for occupational exposure.