

*National Environmental Health Science & Protection
Accreditation Council*

2005 Annual Meeting Minutes

Date:	June 24-26, 2005	Time:	8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Called by:	Scheduled	Place:	The Westin Hotel, Blackstone Room, 3 rd Floor
Purpose:	Annual business meeting of the Environmental Health Council, conduct the routine business of the Council, determine policies and consider the accreditation status of academic EH programs		

Day 1 – Friday, June 24

Members Present:	Harold Barnhart, Randy Bentley, Eliezer Bermudez, Patrick Bohan, Jim Dingman, Carolyn Harvey, Dan Harper, Keith Krinn, Phil Kneller, Sharron LaFollette (Chair), Michele Morrone, Barbara McCarthy, Vince Radke, Rick Rowe, Dale Stephenson, Chuck Treser, Don Williams
Guests Present:	Arturro Aguirre, David Gilkey, Tom Hatfield, Jack Hatlen, Tim Kelley, Alison McIntosh, Crispin Pierce, Fan Robinson, Gary Silverman and Alejandra Tres (via phone).

1.0 Call to Order and Introductions

- 1.1 The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by General Chair LaFollette
- 1.2 A quorum of 17 members was present.
- 1.3 Members and guests introduced themselves. (See above for the list of attendees.)

2.0 Approval of Agenda

There were a few adjustments to the meeting agenda. Radke inquired as to whether we could avoid running the meeting at the same time as the NEHA meeting. LaFollette responded that there would be an effort to allow members to attend the opening session, but that the schedule was very packed. Stephenson asked if we could move the EHAC Accreditation Item (36.0) up in the meeting. The answer was yes. Bermudez inquired as to the election item (32.0) and it was answered that paper ballots would be distributed on Day two of the meeting and returned before Day Three.

McCarthy also noted, with regards to possible conflicts of interest, that she would be leaving prior to the discussion of any program with which she had a conflict of interest, rather than only for the closed session/voting portion. LaFollette answered that there was no clear policy on that for the rest of the Council, and that people could determine that for themselves.

There was a motion to approve the agenda by Treser, seconded by Rowe and unanimously approved.

3.0 Announcements & Miscellaneous Actions

3.1 Review Process of Electronic Approval of Minutes

Rowe moved that we approve the 2004 meeting minutes, which was seconded by McCarthy, and unanimously approved. Bermudez called a point of order as the minutes were already approved via e-mail. Treser reviewed the process for the approval this year – noting the Secretary would send out the minutes for approval within thirty days of the meeting.

3.2 EHAC Pin

The Chair informed the Council that the EHAC Board had authorized the design and production of pin using the new EHAC logo. Pins were presented to all Council members and site visit team members through out the meeting.

4.0 Nomination Committee Report/Slate for Officers

Williams gave the Nominations Committee report, which included an update of the process, the number of candidates and the results. Congratulations were extended to the re-elected Council Members, Randy Bentley, Phil Kneller and Keith Krinn, and to the newly elected Council Members, Gary Silverman, Arturro Aguirre and Fan Robinson. Williams also updated the Council on increases in the number of states represented by Council Members, increases in diversity on the Council, and the number of women members.

Williams then gave an overview of the current nominations of officers. For Chair, LaFollette has been nominated. For Graduate Chair, Harvey has been nominated. For Undergraduate Co-Chair, Bermudez has been nominated, but one position is still open for nomination. For Secretary, Treser has been nominated. For Treasurer, Bentley has been nominated. Stephenson volunteered to nominate himself for Undergraduate Co-Chair.

LaFollette reminded everyone that nominations would stay open until the close of the meeting today and could be done privately with Williams. There will be a paper ballot. Rowe asked the Council designate that slate as the tentative slate, and it was agreed.

Bermudez inquired as to how many voted in the election of Council Members. Williams indicated that all but three members had voted. LaFollette thanked Williams for his service to the Council.

5.0 Bylaws Changes

LaFollette opened the discussion on bylaws by determining that eleven members would constitute a two-thirds majority for bylaw changes. Bentley then took over the discussion of bylaws.

5.1 The first change is an amendment to Article VII, which would change the wording to allow for electronic voting and clarify the thirty-day notice requirement. Harvey moved to accept the changes to Article VII, which was seconded by Rowe. The floor was opened to discussion.

Morrone expressed concern – she felt overall it was fine to do electronically, but was concerned about making sure everyone was made aware of changes to the bylaws.

Bentley suggested that a policy be created to ensure everyone must indicate their awareness of bylaw changes.

Radke moved that rather than the term "two weeks", the motion be changed to read "fifteen days" to remain consistent with the language. Barnhart seconded the motion, and Harvey accepted the amendment to her earlier motion.

The vote was called on the amendment to change it to fifteen days, rather than two weeks. It passed unanimously.

The vote was then called on the amended motion to change Article VII of the bylaws. It passed unanimously. Article VII would be changed to read:

19.0 These Bylaws may be amended by 2/3 vote of voting members present at any annual meeting or by 2/3 vote (e-mail, mail or facsimile) of all members between annual meetings. Suggested changes to the bylaws must be presented in the form of provided the notice of proposed amendment(s) and has been given in writing to the Secretary. The Board of Directors will review the proposed amendment(s) and determine whether to call for discussion and vote before the Annual Meeting. The Secretary shall send a ballot (by mail, e-mail, or facsimile) on any proposed amendments to these Bylaws to all Council Members. All and reviewed by Council members will have time to review/discuss proposed amendments by one of the following strategies: (1) receive proposed amendments via e-mail with the ability to discuss for two weeks fifteen days prior to call for vote, with two weeks time to cast the vote via e-mail; or (2) receive proposed amendment at least 30 days before the prior to the annual meeting with discussion at the Annual Meeting prior to a call for vote.

5.2 The next bylaw change was regarding Article II. Article II was amended last year to exclude the condition that the Executive Director of EHAC also be the Executive Director of AEHAP, but one instance of this requirement was accidentally looked over from the bylaws. Treser made a motion to accept the changes as written to Article II, and Krinn seconded the motion. The bylaw change would read as:

6.0 The Officers of the Council shall be the General Chair, Vice-Chair for Undergraduate Programs, Vice-Chair for Graduate Programs, Secretary and Treasurer. An Executive Director shall administer the Council's affairs. ~~The Executive Director shall also be the Executive Director of the Association of Environmental Health Academic Programs.~~

7.5 The Executive Director shall be engaged by the Executive Committee." ~~The Executive Director shall also be the Executive Director of the Association of Environmental Health Academic Programs."~~

Silverman stated that the original intent of that clause was to intentionally reduce flexibility between AEHAP and EHAC. AEHAP was created to support EHAC, rather than compete with EHAC and that clause was intended to ensure the relationship was non competitive.

Morrone clarified that the Council had made this decision previously and this is merely clean up from last year. Silverman indicated he wanted to provide history on the decision. Treser indicated he was in agreement about the intent of the clause but that it was necessary to find a different process to ensure collegial relationship. Treser also

thought that with the rate of growth of both organizations, the job might soon be too much for one person.

Morrone indicated that last year saw the change of Section 8.6.2, and the bylaws are now in conflict with itself.

The question was called. Fifteen voted in favor of the change, one abstained and the motion passed.

- 5.3 The next bylaw change regarded the use of the term "Executive Committee" in several places in the bylaws. As a result of the advice from the attorneys working to secure EHAC's 501(c)(3) status, it was proposed the term Board of Directors would be more appropriate – as the law recognizes a Board as being in control of an organization. This is a blanket change to the bylaws to replace the term "Executive Committee" with the term "Board" or "Board of Directors" wherever they appear in the bylaws.

McCarthy moved approval of the change, which was seconded by Harvey. All were in favor and the change passed unanimously.

- 5.4 The next bylaw change was of a similar nature -- as it would change the term "Council" to "Membership" in situations referring to the Council as a body. Harvey moved to approve this change and Harper seconded the motion. There was some question about where the change would take place, and it was answered that when referring to EHAC as an organization, the term would remain "Council" but when referring to the Council Members, the term would become "Membership."

There was a question about bylaws section 8.1.1., and the term Council within that section. Harvey moved to strike "Council" and insert "Membership" under 8.1.1. Bermudez seconded the motion. All were in favor of the amendment and it passed unanimously. The vote was then called on the amended motion, and it also passed unanimously.

- 5.5 The next bylaw change was to Article III, section 9. Bentley described the addition of several new points under section 9 to assist EHAC in applying for and receiving 501(c)(3) status. Morrone moved that we approve the additions to section 9 in total. Barnhart seconded the motion.

Stephenson inquired as to how these additions came to be suggested. Bentley described the process used by the lawyers to look through the bylaws and find any potential gaps or problems, and suggested this as a standard bylaw clause used by non-profit organizations.

Bermudez had a question about section 9.7 in that this provision states the Board can not be reimbursed for anything other than approved expenses. He inquired as to whether this included providing compensation to the Executive Director, who is listed as a member of the Board. There was some discussion as to whether the situation needed to be resolved. LaFollette asked for a motion based on the discussion. Barnhart made moved to strike the Executive Director from section 9.1, which was seconded by McCarthy. Harvey then inquired as to whether the Executive Director should also be struck from section 8.6.4. Treser indicated he would prefer to make that change to section 9.7. Harper inquired as to whether we might want to ask legal advice before

making such a change. LaFollette called the question on the motion to strike the term Executive Director from section 9.1, and all were opposed. The motion did not pass.

Treser then moved to change section 9.7 to read "Compensation. No compensation shall be paid to the Directors, as such for their services, with the exception of the Executive Director, but, by Resolution of the Board of Directors." Radke seconded the motion.

Krinn noted that Boards typically include at-large members on the Board of Directors, and he felt we would want to consider such an action. Kneller also added that previously, the membership has approved reimbursement of expenses, etc. and now such decisions are at the whim of the Board. Treser and LaFollette indicated while the Board may approve expenses, unless such items are in the budget, it is hard to approve outside expenses. Bentley responded that the Board should be elected to reflect the trust of the membership, and we could put in budget restrictions, but in reality, we operate within our budget and there is very little wiggle room.

Krinn indicated that only Board members could remove Board members – that was corrected by Bermudez who referenced section 9.3, which indicates a Director can be removed by a majority vote of the membership. Radke suggested we include a clause that would limit monetary compensation or reimbursement. Treser called for a point of order as these discussions did not pertain to the motion on the floor. LaFollette called for the motion, and it was approved with fifteen votes in favor and one abstention.

Krinn then moved to add two at-large members to the Board. Bermudez also indicated we should add an (s) to the term "Undergraduate Chair" and "Graduate Chair." McCarthy seconded the motion to add at-large members as well as the (s) option. Treser expressed his concern that nine members of the Board might be unwieldy.

Bentley agreed with Treser's sentiment saying it was difficult to ask people to volunteer to be an officer in the first place, and to have responsibilities and attend the meetings. Any at-large members must add value to the Board. Stephenson echoed this concern – what would an at-large member do? McCarthy suggested they facilitate communication between the Board and the Membership. Krinn suggested that one at-large member might be enough and would add legitimacy to the organization. Treser stated it might also be practical in case we lost Board members. Harvey suggested the Elections Chair role could be taken on by an at-large member. Treser thought that was a good idea but was wary of prescribing roles in the bylaws. Morrone added she felt the discussion indicated people were untrusting of the Board – and that was disturbing and upsetting.

LaFollette called for the vote on adding two at-large members plus adding the (s) to the Vice Chair positions. There were four in favor, eleven opposed and no abstentions. The motion did not pass.

Bermudez moved to add the (s) to the end of Undergraduate Chair and Graduate Chair to the bylaws section 9.1. Barnhart seconded the motion and all were in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Bentley expressed a desire to have a bylaws committee, to ensure changes were properly considered and written. LaFollette indicated she would be willing to create an ad-hoc committee to look over the bylaws. Harvey commented that there is already a standing bylaw committee.

McCarthy commented she felt that as the organization grows larger, she would very much like to see a person whose sole responsibility is to ensure correspondence and contact in between the membership and the board. Krinn commented usually anyone who takes on that role would be directing communications outside the organization, and he feels that staff should take on the responsibility of ensuring communication between Board and Members.

Morrone discussed her role, as a member of the bylaws committee, and the desire to have more notice of potential bylaw changes in the future. LaFollette agreed to put it on the board agenda.

There was a call for the vote on the changes to section 9 as a whole. The motion passed unanimously.

6.0 Policy Manual

LaFollette opened discussion on the policy manual. As chair, she would like to remind the Council that these documents have been available for review, but not each policy will be discussed at this meeting. Instead, she would like to create a list of policies to be discussed prior to discussion.

The list is to include: Communications Policy, Past Accreditation Decisions, Academic v. Non Academic, Elections Policy (2 representatives from the same school), Graduate and Undergraduate Faculty, Expense Policy, Layout of the Policy Manual, Code of Ethics, Conflict of Interest, and the Accreditation Evaluation Form. Morrone also added there were several existing policies that needed to be incorporated into the Policy Manual.

6.1 Code of Ethics.

Kneller commented he thought it was a good document and that it was very important that each member agree to abide by it. The Council was asked to sign the Code of Ethics and return it to staff.

6.2 Travel Policy.

Morrone questioned why Southwest Airlines was specifically mentioned in the policy. The answer was that it was an oversight, and the line was stricken from the policy.

6.3 Conflict of Interest Policy.

The next policy was the conflict of interest for site visitors. Harvey and Bermudez explained that the majority of the policy came from information from previous Chairs, particularly McCarthy. Harvey discussed the many problems they had this year in getting site visitors. Both Harvey and Bermudez encouraged site visitors to bring up potential conflicts early, as well as Program Directors.

There was some question as to why they included the line "Site visitors shall not be from the same state." Silverman explained that was one of the rules, while EHAC was recognized by the Department of Education. Some were concerned about the flexibility and ability to find site visitors given this rule. Bentley felt there was enough flexibility, and with the inclusion of the Conflict of Interest statement site visitors were required to sign, plus the Code of Ethics, these provided enough protection.

Barnhart commented that the 200 mile radius distinction seemed rather ridiculous – but Harvey explained it would allow site visitors from larger states – such as California, but might protect smaller states who had competing schools or health departments across state lines but within a close proximity.

Krinn inquired as to why program directors whose programs are under accreditation review could not be site visitors. LaFollette explained that this is to prevent any conflict or appearance of conflicts. Silverman added that that qualification was added to address department of education concerns -- the Department of Education wants accrediting bodies to maintain a pool of site visitors that is separate from the decision making body. He also commented that the Department of Education was uncomfortable regardless as the site visitor pool came from the decision making body.

There was some discussion about the pool of site visitors and whether it would be possible to exclude current council members. People were not inclined to consider this, but Silverman pointed out that as the organization continues to grow, that will also increase the pool of site visitors and it could be feasible in the future.

Bermudez also outlined a potential conflict that had come up this year while Harvey was sitting as Undergraduate Co-Chair, and her Program was also up for accreditation review. While the pair took great measures to ensure there was no conflict, it was important to consider making an additional policy about this matter.

The group agreed to strike the bullet prohibiting Faculty from being site visitors while their program is under accreditation review.

Silverman noted that the perception of others and possible conflicts of interest is very important to consider – while the Council may agree it is not a conflict of interest, the purpose of such policies is to remove the appearance and potential for conflicts.

6.4 **Site Visitor Evaluations**

LaFollette explained that the proposed site visitor evaluation form would be sent to the program directors after the site visit, with the request that they be returned after the final report had been submitted to the Council, but prior to the Accreditation Review meeting. The office, in conjunction with the Chair and Undergraduate/Graduate Chairs would review the forms, address any issues, and share a composite of the evaluations after the Annual Meeting.

Morrone asked the purpose of these forms. LaFollette responded that the purpose was to identify poor site visitors or poor team combinations, to get feedback on the process and use the feedback to improve site visit team effectiveness.

Kneller expressed concerns about the lack of feedback from the site visitors. Bermudez responded that there was a peer evaluation included, and that site visitors also had an evaluation period – namely in the closed door session. Morrone indicated she thought it would be good to include an improvement strategy for site visitors and possibly training.

LaFollette proposed that Council Members should send written feedback on the site visitor evaluations to the Chair, that the 2005-2006 year would be used as a test-run, and the Council could proceed from there. Bermudez asked that these dates be included in the calendar.

Treser inquired as to whether we thought we could get many responses as the form is rather lengthy. Bentley also asked if we could put it online. LaFollette suggested we finalize the tool first, then consider the method.

6.5 External Operations/Contents

Harper indicated he thought the Table of Contents should be more standardized. Currently, the External Operations section of the manual has completely different policies under the Undergraduate and Graduate headings. Others agreed.

6.6 Elections Policy

There were several concerns expressed. Among them were the balance of practitioners and academics, the geographic balance, a concern about having council members from the same school, a concern about a majority of practitioners being from federal agencies.

Bermudez noted that while these concerns were certainly valid, and the elections chairs have done their best to seek a wide variety of nominations, the Council still votes for its members, and if they don't elect ones that are a good geographic balance, there is little that can be done.

Treser indicated that it was possible for the elections chair not to accept nominations. Williams noted that for him, as the Elections Chair for 2004-2005, it was extremely difficult to exclude or include people, and there were no clear guidelines, and as a result, he made the decision not to do that.

Harper asked if such a two-tier process was acceptable. LaFollette answered it was provided for in the bylaws and that the Board approves the slate of candidates. Kneller wanted to know the reasoning behind excluding candidates. Williams indicated that it had not happened yet, but it would be to create balance and diversity. LaFollette also indicated it was the responsibility of the Board to create a high quality and well balanced slate of candidates. Harper commented that as the organization grows, the Board will need the ability to screen candidates.

Williams also reminded everyone that there is a 100-word limit for the bio-sketch, which few people followed in the nominations process.

Aguirre commented that he did not think the word "exclude" was appropriate for the Elections Policy. He suggested possibly evaluate. Other members agreed, and the consensus was to use evaluate and qualify, rather than exclude.

6.7 Potential New Policies

The first new policy up for discussion was a communications policy. Treser indicated he did not believe drafting policies during the meeting was not the best use of time. Everyone concurred, and McCarthy, Morrone and Treser agreed to draft the Communications Policy.

The next potential new policy was Prior Accreditation Reports, and their potential availability. Bentley suggested a records retention policy. LaFollette was curious if old site visitor reports could be put online for continuity. McCarthy, Dingman, Treser and Rowe agreed to seek input from Program Directors and work on such a policy.

Item 36.0 External Accreditation, was moved to this time slot.

Stephenson discussed the possibility of external accreditation. First, he asked Silverman to provide history on the subject. Silverman explained in the past, the Council ran very differently and was very disorganized. They wanted to seek legitimacy for the Council, and the Department of Education was, at that time, recognizing accreditation bodies. The purpose was to give EHAC structure and legitimacy. However, after several years of maintaining such accreditation, the Department of Education discouraged EHAC from re-applying.

Stephenson explained that the decision facing the Council was whether we should seek outside recognition – either by the Department of Education or by the Council on Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA). However, both are costly and time consuming and the question for the Council is what would it give us that we don't already have. Treser agreed that the Department of Education accreditation was both costly and time consuming, and noted that as long as we maintain our status and importance to our programs and their administrations, we probably do not need such accreditation.

LaFollette suggested we keep the item on the agenda for next year. David Gilkey commented that there are over 1200 accrediting bodies and 6000 accredited programs, and while recognition for EHAC might not be important, it is important to stay current with their practices and policies.

Several other Council members expressed concerns over potential questions from program directors and administrators regarding the legitimacy of EHAC. Treser answered that thus far, our relationships with CDC and the COSTEP program have given us that legitimacy. Silverman concurred and suggested the item be maintained on the Annual Meeting agenda and discussed each year. Bohan also suggested we collect a list of states and agencies that accept EHAC accreditation for job criteria or criteria to sit for an exam, as part of the justification for EHAC.

7.0 Financial management

Bentley discussed the current financial management situation of EHAC. First, he informed the Council members that they could view the latest budget or any reports at any time by using the online Quickbooks.

7.1 FY 2004 Final Financial Report

Bentley reminded the Council that at the time of the last meeting, there was little financial information available due to the situation with NEHA and our books. Our actual income in 2004 was \$23,600 (predicted \$25,500). Our administration expenditures were \$20,000 (budgeted 19,000). There were several other line items, but over all, in 2004, there was a net loss of \$1248.00.

7.2 FY 2005 Financial Report

Bentley reviewed this years' budget. At the last meeting, the Council determined it would be best to separate our finances from NEHA, and begin using a private accountant. This has been completed, and we are in the process of applying for non-profit status. Right now, the line item for the non-profit status budget is \$5000, which includes fees for the lawyer and the CPA firm.

Thus far, we have received \$28,000 in income, and have spent \$13,000 of the \$15,190 budgeted for administration. We have budgeted \$3760 for financial management, and have spent \$3500. We also budgeted \$3750 for site visitors in training, but have only spend \$1000.

Bentley had budgeted nearly \$8000 for potential back taxes, but it turns out the CPA estimates our liability at under \$1000. Bermudez inquired as to our tax liability as a non profit and Bentley answered that the amount in back taxes would be sent to the IRS along with our application. If they find our non-profit status is retroactive, it will be returned, but the money is a show of good faith on our part.

Hatlen mentioned that AEHAP had done something similar and had received retroactive non-profit status, however, Bentley reminded him AEHAP had been in existence a lot less time when they applied for 501(c)(3) status.

Morrone commented that this was the best she had ever seen the financial situation look and she commended Bentley for his hard work.

7.3 **2006 Proposed Budget**

The next item was the 2006 proposed budget. Bentley explained that our revenue would be approximately \$29,600. Potential expenses included the Annual Meeting, Fees for rooms at the meeting, Travel for staff and other items. Bentley also added that the previous years' amount for administration was \$1350 per month. As of October, that amount will increase to \$1600 per month to more accurately reflect the amount of time staff spends on EHAC items. 2006 will be a balanced budget.

There were questions about the current insurance coverage of EHAC. Bentley responded that we had Directors & Officers insurance, but not liability. Bentley agreed to look into insuring the Council in terms of liability.

Morrone made a motion to approve the 2006 budget, which was seconded by McCarthy. The motion passed unanimously. Staff agreed to place the 2006 revised budget online for Council members to view.

7.4 **Application for IRS 501(c)(3) Status**

Bentley explained the 501(c)(3) process as it currently stands. First, Bentley explained the potential tax liability. In 2002-2004, we owe Federal taxes of \$527. For those same years, we owe a new Oregon tax of \$280. These taxes represent Oregon paying taxes as a corporate entity.

Bentley explained the 501(c)(3) process. Since EHAC has been incorporated in Washington, but has been operating in Oregon, the lawyers decided it would be best to first create a new EHAC Corporation in Oregon, and register that corporation with the state. The corporations would then be merged into the Oregon Corporation, and that corporation would then file for 501(c)(3) tax exempt status.

Bentley moved to waive the mailing and notice requirement for the Agreement of Merger. The motion is seconded by Treser, and passes unanimously. Bentley then moved to accept the merger and the agreement and plan of merger as documented. The motion is seconded by Bermudez and passed unanimously.

Treser then makes a motion to accept any 501(c)(3) changes and agreements to assist in the process. Bermudez seconds the motion and all were in favor.

The Council was then shown Form 2848, the Form 990s and the Form 1023, all documents which pertain to the 501(c)(3) status and tax filings.

It being 12:15, the Council recessed for lunch for one hour.

The Council reconvened at 1:30 p.m.

8.0 University of Wisconsin Eau Claire, Undergraduate Re-Accreditation, Graduate Accreditation

As LaFollette was a site visitor for the University of Wisconsin at Eau Claire, LaFollette passed control of the meeting to Bermudez, who acted as Chair for this agenda item.

LaFollette provided the report of the site visit team for the Council. She gave a brief history of the UWEC program and their history of accreditation. LaFollette mentioned that the site team had requested additional information, and found Dr. Pierce forthcoming and willing to help. The site team found that the UWEC program exceeds requirements in math, meets the general education requirements for both the University and the Council. They do not have a formal advisory committee, but they do have a strong relationship with the state environmental health steering committee.

Epidemiology was not, at the time of the site visit on the advising sheet, but was being taught and the advising sheet has since been updated. Other requirements met include the internship component – Eau Claire students complete 400 hours of internship – well above the required 180 hours requirement. There are 2.2 FTE faculty positions, and plans are in motion to add another FTE.

The recommendations of the site team are as follows: Revise the additional syllabi, improve the consistency of the internship records, students requested more lab courses, to address the lack of advisory committee and encouraging undergraduate involvement in faculty research. The site visit team would like to commend UWEC on their web-based interface, their student oriented nature, their involvement of both the student environmental health club, and their involvement in WEHA and the community.

Dr. Pierce then took the opportunity to respond to the site visit team. Pierce thanked the site visit team for their assistance and hard work, he felt they were very thorough. He acknowledged the changes happening at UWEC had affected the program, but he is confident the changes will positively affect the program. He also thanked the site visitors for supporting the Program to the dean of the college. He is currently seeking a creative solution to the lack of curriculum. He addressed the site teams concerns about the lack of practitioner or practice experience among the faculty. Enrollment is currently increasing, and they are currently working to fix the problem with the advisory committee. Pierce also highlighted some of the students of the program and explained to the council their research and dedication to the program.

Bermudez then opened the floor to questions. Bohan inquired about the history of the graduate program. Pierce answered that it has been in existence since 1978, and has a variety of students and emphases. Harper then inquired about the diversity of the

student population. Pierce answered that Eau Claire was home to a very large Hmong population, and they are currently developing a recruitment tool to help community organizations learn about environmental health.

Morrone inquired about the current faculty search. Pierce responded that the dean is very supportive, and plans are in motion to begin the faculty search in fall 2005, with plans for the new faculty to start in Fall 2006. Morrone then inquired about toxicology course, and what the plans were. Pierce responded that the intent is to make it required. LaFollette clarified that toxicology is currently not required for graduate students, but it is for undergraduate. Pierce also responded that the course review is an internal process and it only needs to be approved within the department.

Morrone then asked about Chemistry 150. Pierce responded it is a biochemistry course offered for environmental health students and other similar majors, and the EH students take that, rather than taking the biochemistry class for chemistry class. Morrone then asked for clarification of the Math courses – 245 and 246. Pierce responded the math department had renumbered their courses and they were one in the same. There was then an inquiry about the environmental economics course. Pierce responded it is considered a general education elective.

Stephenson inquired about the tenure track at UWEC. Pierce responded his plan is to seek tenure in two years. Krinn inquired about whether or not there were an Registered Sanitarians on faculty. Pierce responded that Jim Dunning was indeed an RS, and that when the new faculty position is announced, they will seek out someone with practitioner experience.

Krinn inquired what happened to the advisory committee. Pierce responded that when the old professor left, the advisory committee fell apart, but he is interested in putting it back together. Krinn then asked about internship placement. Pierce responded that in the past, professors have set up internships for students, and now the trend is to let students know about internships, but to make them apply, create resumes and compete with other students for internships. Krinn asked about their relationship with the state environmental health association. Pierce responded that they sent students to the conference, students present at the WEHA conference, and the school provides scholarship funding. Harvey inquired about the designation of the graduate program. Pierce responded that it was a Masters of Science in Environmental Health, within the College of Health Sciences.

Visitors and Council Members with a possible conflict of interest were excused. LaFollette moved that the undergraduate program at the University of Wisconsin at Eau Claire be granted conditional accreditation for two years. The members present unanimously approved the motion. It was further moved and approved that if the UWEC were to meet the conditions, at the end of the two period, they would receive full accreditation for an additional four years. Dingman favored full accreditation for 6 years.

LaFollette then moved that the graduate program at the University of Wisconsin at Eau Claire be granted conditional accreditation for two years. Of the members present, 13 voted in favor, two were opposed and one abstained. It was then moved that if the UWEC graduate program were to meet the conditions, at the end of the two period, they would receive full accreditation for an additional two years. The motioned carried unanimously.

9.0 Undergraduate Guidelines Revision

Treser outlined the potential changes to the undergraduate guidelines. They included a few minor changes to the section regarding International Accreditation, changing the contact information from Undergraduate Chair to Office for purposes of consistency, and changes regarding the conflict of interest policy discussed earlier in the day.

Bermudez also suggested we remove the information regarding the dues increase that took place in 2000. The changes were approved.

10.0 Outcome Assessment Update

Stephenson and Tres (via phone) gave an update about the outcome assessment and the online test that took place with Boise State University during the 2005 year. Both spoke about the difficulties of testing the online system, including delays in getting the system up and running, and the difficulty in getting a good response rate. Stephenson added this was partially due to his short tenure thus far at Boise State, but also is a general problem getting responses to the outcome assessment survey. Stephenson explained that 80 letters were sent out, and thus far, there had been three responses. As a result, the program sent out follow up post-cards and called students with whom they had a relationship.

Several Council members asked if they could see the Outcome Assessment tool online. The office agreed to send it to the Council. Tres indicated the office was interested in doing more testing – ensuring that it fit the needs of the programs and ensuring that it works. There was a suggestion to offer incentives for the completion of the survey, but professors had concerns about the financial cost, as well as the anonymity concerns.

Silverman explained the surveys were used to evaluate EHAC's own guidelines and to provide benchmarks on its training. Bentley was concerned about this though – if the Council is having trouble getting responses from a large enough sample, how useful is the outcome assessment tool? LaFollette reminded the Council this discussion was not about the usefulness of the tool, but rather about the online program. Tres suggested that two programs try the online outcome assessment in the next year. The Board is to discuss next steps on this.

LaFollette reminded the Council that the deadline for outcome assessment is the same deadline as the self-studies – one that was not met this year. Council members seemed pleased with the progress of the online assessment tool, and are looking forward to the next year's trial. Stephenson added the best way to use the online tool would be via e-mail, with a hyperlink, rather than a letter with the information contained inside it. However, this also requires the e-mail addresses of graduates.

11.0 Annual Enrollment Update

Tres then gave the annual enrollment update. She explained the Council had requested new information this year, including specific information on race and ethnicity, age and gender. In the past, they have only asked for basic information on race/ethnicity.

This year's enrollment is up a little over 4%, marking a 5% increase over the last two years. Graduation is up nearly 21% over the last two years. Bohan inquired about the

graduates and where, in general, they seek employment. Tres answered that according to the guidelines review in 2000, 45% go to the private sector, 55% to the public sector and a small percentage go to places such as the Peace Corps.

12.0 Website Update

Tres explained the website is functioning well, and there will be another revision coming up in the near future. She encouraged everyone to look at and send comments about the website so the office could ensure it remains useful.

13.0 Recess

The meeting was recessed for the day at 5:00 p.m..

Day 2 – Saturday, June 25

Members Present:	Harold Barnhart, Randy Bentley, Eliezer Bermudez, Patrick Bohan, Carolyn Harvey, Dan Harper, Keith Krinn, Phil Kneller, Sharron LaFollette (Chair), Michele Morrone, Barbara McCarthy, Vince Radke, Rick Rowe, Dale Stephenson, Chuck Treser, Don Williams
Guests Present:	Arturro Aguirre, Darryl Barnett, Robert Blake, Richard Collins, Sandi Donohue, David Gilkey, Rom Grimes, Frank Gomez, Tom Hatfield, Jack Hatlen, Mike Herring, Tim Kelley, Steve Konkel, Alison McIntosh, Burton Ogle, Priscilla Oliver, Crispin Pierce, Fan Robinson and Gary Silverman.

14.0 Reconvene.

14.1 The meeting was reconvened at 8:30 a.m.

14.2 A quorum of 16 members was present.

14.3 Several procedural announcements were made. Agenda items 25 and 35 would be moved up to the beginning of the day's agenda. Williams passed out the paper ballots for the elections for the Board and announced that the ballots were due before the end of the day today.

25.0 Extension for the California State University at Northridge – Re-accreditation.

Tom Hatfield submitted a request to the Council regarding the accreditation of California State University at Northridge's Graduate Program. In 2002, the program originally came up for accreditation, along with the undergraduate program. At that time, they received accreditation for two years. In 2004, they received an additional two year period of accreditation, and are supposed to seek re-accreditation in 2006. However, CSU-Northridge is requesting an additional year extension on their graduate program and a reduction of one year for their undergraduate program so that both would be reaccredited in 2007. Hatfield has submitted a letter to this effect that was provided to the Council prior to the meeting.

Treser moved to suspend the rules to accept Hatfield's request, and review both the undergraduate and graduate programs in 2007. Harvey seconded the motion. Gilkey commented that Colorado State University had sought to do something similar to help minimize costs, but in his situation, the request was not approved by his Dean. The question was called and all were in favor of allowing California State University at Northridge to have an extra year extension on the accreditation of its graduate program.

35.2 2005-2006 Calendar (Moved from Day 3)

LaFollette explained that the Board had created a calendar for the previous year to assist with reminders, due dates, etc. She has also created a calendar for the coming year (2005-2006). The calendar was provided to the Council prior to the meeting. LaFollette indicated there were two calendars – a public one and an internal calendar. Treser inquired about the rationale for having two and stated his preference was only to have one public calendar. Harvey concurred and suggested that Program directors be informed of the existence of the Calendar so they are also aware of due dates and

deadlines. LaFollette requested that the Council receive notice of the calendar being updated. There was a brief discussion about the meeting dates for next year, but it was agreed to postpone this discussion until later in the agenda.

15.0 Committee Reports

15.1 Undergraduate Programs Committee. Bermudez gave the report. He informed the Council that all site visits had gone smoothly, and on time. There will be seven undergraduate programs in 2005-2006, and lots of work! He also reminded the Council that there needs to be two primary reviewers for each self-study, and that everyone must be responsible for their share of this work.

LaFollette concurred with this statement and let the Council know that the primary review deadline is the end of January. Bermudez also reminded the Council that graduate program faculty will need to review the Graduate programs coming up in the next year. Stephenson noted that it is very frustrating to have primary reviewers who do not complete their assignment, and then bring up questions about the self-study at the meeting. Barnhart reminded the Council it is technically everyone’s responsibility to review all self-studies.

15.2 Graduate Programs Committee. Harvey then gave the graduate committee report. Unfortunately, the elected Graduate Chair was unable to fulfill his duties because of his work, and Harvey had to take over mid-year. She noted that it was very difficult to find graduate site visitors.

15.3 Primary Reviewer Assignments for 2006. There was a call for volunteers to review self-studies. Assignments are as follows:

Institution	Program	Volunteers
California State University at Los Angeles	Undergraduate	Chuck Treser, Randy Bentley
East Carolina University	Undergraduate	Keith Krinn, Tom Hatfield
	Graduate	
University of Illinois Springfield	Graduate(New)	Carolyn Harvey, Don Williams
East Tennessee State University	Undergraduate	Gary Silverman, Chuck Treser
	Graduate	
North Carolina Central University	Undergraduate	Michele Morrone, Eli Bermudez
Salisbury State University	Undergraduate	Barbara McCarthy, Fan Robinson
Texas Southern University	Undergraduate	Dale Stephenson, Pat Bohan
Wright State University	Undergraduate	Vince Radke, Harold Barnhart
Instituto Tecnológico de Costa Rica	Undergraduate	All Council Members

Stephenson added he felt there should be consequences for turning in late self-studies. As of right now, there is no incentive to turn in the self-study on time. LaFollette concurred and agreed to look into this problem.

- 15.4 **Other.** There was then a discussion about Ferris State University, and whether they would be seeking re-accreditation next year. Several Council members spoke of writing letters or contacting the Ferris State administration, but with little luck. Most Council members believe there is nothing to be done and that Ferris will not be seeking re-accreditation next year. Then, Silverman indicated that the University in Costa Rica may possibly be seeking accreditation.

16.0 NEHA Linkages

Morrone updated the Council on her efforts to increase ties between NEHA and EHAC. She has approached NEHA about possibly having a Council Member sit as an ex-officio member of the NEHA Board. However, this was not met with a positive response. She did, however, indicate that NEHA has recently launched a student-area of their website. LaFollette indicated that AEHAP had also spoken with NEHA about possibly taking the initiative to re-develop student environmental health clubs, and NEHA also was not interested in participating. Bohan volunteered to help Morrone with her efforts. Kneller indicated he thought it was essential that NEHA work to give hiring priorities to our graduates.

17.0 Accreditation and Pre-Accreditation Actions

LaFollette introduced the next item. In 2004, there were three new programs which received accreditation from EHAC. These programs were the first in more than twenty years, and it has forced the Council to consider special actions for new programs. Possible actions include: first, doing nothing; second, making the standard accreditation period for new programs three years instead of six; or third, holding training for Council members on new programs.

Krinn inquired as to the Council's current appeal policy. Morrone explained that there would be an external panel convened, a panel to be agreed upon by the parties involved, and the hearing would take place at the expense of the appellant. However, this has never been tested. Harper suggested that we look at other accreditation bodies and their appeals policies. Staff noted that the current appeals policy is being reviewed by the lawyers' office.

Morrone noted that she preferred option number two for new programs. Kneller however, disagreed commenting that there were wonderful programs coming up the pipeline – and why should they be handicapped? Barnhart suggested we give new programs resources such as mentors and consultant and work harder to help them. Bentley commented that the second option would allow programs to submit an update after the initial three year period, and possibly receive the remaining three years. Treser indicated this option would allow new programs to address any potential issues in the three year period.

Morrone made a motion to accept the second option of only granting new programs a blanket three years if they met the accreditation criteria. The motion was seconded by Rowe. There was some question as to why it was set at three years, and the answer was

it was arbitrary. Krinn made an amendment to change it from "three or four years" to "three years" to better clarify the policy. The vote was called on the amendment, and 15 were in favor and one was opposed. The motion on the amendment passed.

Harper inquired about other accrediting bodies – and whether they offered shorter initial periods of accreditation. Silverman responded that it was customary at the Department of Education to give shorter initial accreditation periods. Morrone also added that the Council needs to consider how difficult it is for new programs to seek accreditation. Hatlen inquired as to whether this policy would also include or address programs that have sought accreditation previously, but have a new program director who has not yet been through the process.

Bermudez inquired as to when this would apply? LaFollette answered that the Council would vote on whether to take action on this item, and if they voted to take action, details would be worked out during the year and it would apply for programs seeking accreditation next year. Hatfield reminded people that mandating three years would not remove the potential for conflict or hurt feelings.

There was discussion about the sentence: "To minimize costs for re-accreditation after this shorter first period, the programs may if the council chooses only submit an update rather than undergoing a full site visit for extension to the six year limit." Morrone suggested that the Council strike the text "May, if the Council chooses" and insert, "Must." Bohan seconded the motion. Morrone then added to her motion to strike the words: "to the six year limit" and instead replace it with: "for extension of accreditation" which was seconded by Bermudez.

Bentley suggested that we make a decision about the concept first, and worry about the policy and language later. LaFollette called a vote on the amendment. Thirteen were in favor and three abstained.

LaFollette then moved to the main motion – she explained that voting on this would mean the council would create and approve a policy over the summer. Voting on this would create two tracks – new accreditation and re-accreditation. The vote was called. Seven were in favor, seven were opposed and two abstained.

Harper made a motion for a re-vote which was seconded by Bentley. McCarthy suggested to the Council that this might improve transparency. Radke suggested it would be a probationary period. Treser suggested that the policy is trying to create a level playing field for new programs. There was a call for the vote on whether to reconsider the question, which passed, with 10 voting in the affirmative and five voting against.

The vote was called again. Six voted for the original motion, eight against and one abstention. The motion did not pass. Morrone agreed to work on a potential solution and policy during the year.

18.0 California State University at Fresno

Bentley begins the report for the site visit team. The site teams' observations include: a program that has undergone many changes in the past several years, but it is a well established program with very qualified faculty. Fresno meets the FTE requirements, and the course requirements meet the guidelines. There are many excellent resources on a modern campus, and lots of job opportunities for students. They have a supportive

Dean, and a family atmosphere. However, the program also lacks dedicated lab space, could improve their record keeping and transcripts, and could improve their lab inventory.

Sandi Donohue took over to give the Fresno response. She was very pleased by the site team visit – she felt they had a great time, and a delightful site visit team, and she thanked them for coming. Since the site visit, she has gone to the Provost with her request for dedicated lab space, and she is hopeful that she will receive a classroom with teaching lab space. She felt that the suggestions for her record keeping were excellent suggestions, and is attempting to integrate the suggestions into the system. She also appreciated the site visit team suggestion that the Advisory committee undergo a strategic planning session.

The floor was opened to questions. Barnhart inquired as to what the students receive by the way of lab experience. Donohue responded that two years after she arrived, the College went through changes and a move – at which point they took away dedicated lab space. Now, students receive demonstration lab classes, and Donohue is working to increase their lab exposure and lab background.

Bohan inquired about the size of the University and the Program. Donohue responded that the University has 22,000 students, and two years ago, they had 22 students, and now they have 52 students with more coming in every day. This spring, they graduated their largest class since her arrival. Bohan then asked about California's recognition of the accredited programs. Donohue responded that California has its own registration, but her students are allowed to sit immediately for an REHS exam. She also added that the local health departments fight over her graduates. Krinn asked about out of state internships. Donohue responded that occasionally she has students who leave the state, but that overall, her students are very content to stay in the local area. She has been encouraging students to go into the Public Health Service, however, many of her students are not citizens – they are Hispanic, Asian, Hmong, Vietnamese and East Indian, and this prevents them from going into the COSTEP program.

Morrone inquired about their communications skills. Donohue responded that her students had to do 51 units of general education, which includes communication and business writing. Morrone also inquired about small group work, and Donohue responded that it comes in a variety of classes, including Occupational Health. Stephenson inquired about the degree title, and the response was it is a Bachelors of Science Degree in Health Science with an option in Environmental/Occupational Health. Stephenson inquired about faculty research expectations, and Donohue answered that faculty were required to do research and publish. Donohue is up for early tenure next year, and has been, among other things, publishing papers with local environmental health departments. Donohue also added that one very positive result of the site visit team was a guarantee of \$5000 to purchase equipment.

Visitors and Council Members with a possible conflict of interest were excused. Bentley moved that the California State University at Fresno be granted full accreditation for six years. The members present and Dingman voting by proxy unanimously approved the motion.

19.0 Boise State University

McCarthy led the Site Visit team and began the presentation regarding Boise State University. She gave an overview of the site visit report, and highlighted a few strengths, including the strong administrative support for the program, the additional courses, the collaboration with the Environmental Studies department to better define both fields, the great fundraising and undergraduate research undertaken by Professor Stephenson. Several weaknesses of the program are Professor Stephenson's heavy workload, the departure of the previous Program Director, and the lack of continuity between the two Program Directors – which has resulted in a loss of student files.

McCarthy added that the faculty and students are very committed and enthusiastic about the program. McCarthy noted the recommendations of the site team, including improving the teaching lab, utilizing the computer lab, possibly improving the Risk Communication component, a possible mentoring program, and marketing in the Boise area. The site visit team also recommended that when Boise undergoes a faculty search, they seriously consider faculty with more traditional environmental health experience.

Stephenson responded to the concerns of the site visitors. He thanked the site visitors for their visit, and provided for the Council a revised faculty list, which increased the contribution of Dr. Reischel, and includes a new 50% FTE to be sought. With Dr. Reischel, the FTE support will be 2.0. Stephenson also echoed the support for the Program Administrator, Glenda Hill, originally made by the site visitors. He also thought the suggestion for an annual meeting of adjunct faculty was a great idea, and is trying to develop a professional development fund.

Krinn had a few questions about the latest table that Stephenson provided, and Stephenson went through the document, explaining each Professor's role and designation. Treser inquired about the faculty to be hired. Stephenson explained they would look for someone with Public Health experience, with a Masters Degree and a R.E.H.S. license.

Kneller inquired about the concentration of the program – and whether the emphasis was occupational or environmental health. Stephenson responded that he has two adjunct faculty with core environmental health and REHS background. Stephenson himself has no traditional environmental health experience, and has replaced non-applied environmental health science classes with occupational health classes. Barnhart asked if the classes proposed in the Table 1 were accepted, and Stephenson responded that yes, they were accepted and were included in the new online course catalog.

Visitors and Council Members with a possible conflict of interest were excused. McCarthy moved that the undergraduate program at Boise State University be granted full accreditation for six years. The members present, and Dingman voting by proxy, unanimously approved the motion.

20.0 Eastern Kentucky University

Bermudez gave the site visitor report for Eastern Kentucky University. Bermudez noted the site visit was a wonderful experience, that ECU is a very strong program, that meet all the requirements and experience strong support from the administration. The faculty are well prepared, with seven FTEs and one visiting professor. All faculty are tenured or tenure track faculty. They met with 25 students, who were all pleased with the program and their internships. However, the students did express that the technical writing course did not meet their needs. The site visit team also noted that the teaching load is

high – particularly for tenure track faculty. EKU also maintains an elective which prepares students for the REHS exam, and the students enter research competitions and even put on a symposium every year.

Darryl Barnett responded to the site visitor report. He began by thanking them – he said it was a great experience, and a thorough review. In response to the site visit team recommendation, they are making adjustments to the technical writing course. However, there is nothing that can be done about faculty teaching loads – there is a 12 hour requirement for everyone, and the credits are dependent on the number of students enrolled.

Radke, a member of the site visit team, stated that the graduates were very enthusiastic, and the library was excellent. Radke also commended them on their diversity initiatives, and thanked the other site visitors for their assistance and training.

LaFollette opened the floor to questions. Morrone asked about Chemistry 112. Barnett responded that it is the same Chemistry course that all science majors take. Bermudez noted that he felt students really had all the resources they needed to succeed at EKU. Barnhart inquired if the Program had thought about capping enrollment. Barnett felt that space and scheduling would dictate that, but that the enrollment limit has not yet been reached. He noted that the department teaches several night classes in addition to regular classes. Kneller inquired about the lab situation and whether students had the necessary access to lab classes they needed. Barnett answered that the lab classes were offered every semester, rather than alternating semesters.

Priscilla Oliver explained that she has in the past been working with EKU and wanted to let the Council know that EKU has been working hard to increase the diversity of the program, and has been implementing a diversity initiative. Barnett also added that Captain Harper was assigned to EKU from CDC to assist the program.

Visitors and Council Members with a possible conflict of interest were excused. Bermudez moved that the undergraduate program at Eastern Kentucky University be granted full accreditation for six years. The members present and Dingman, voting by proxy, unanimously approved the motion.

21.0 Western Carolina University

LaFollette was a site visitor for Western Carolina. She asked Harvey to take over as Chair for the remainder of this agenda item.

LaFollette presented the Council with the site visitor report. Western Carolina University has been accredited since 1984, and the environmental health program is one of the premier programs on campus. They enjoy extreme support from their administration, and enjoy a great State University system. Over 40% of their funding comes from the State of North Carolina.

Students can enter the program at any time, and express a great admiration for the faculty. There is a family atmosphere on campus. WCU exceeds the requirements in sciences, and have the three required courses. Students participate in 400 hours of internship and take advantage of the COSTEP Program. They currently have 2.5 FTE, but one of the .5 is retiring.

The site team was very pleased with the self study, and was also impressed with WCU's recruitment efforts. The site team feels the program is training highly educated general environmental health specialists. The site team recommends the hiring of an additional faculty to assist the program, particularly since WCU is starting a graduate program. WCU currently does not have an advisory committee – although they are very well connected within the community - and the site team recommends they develop one. The site team also recommends WCU increase their relationship with the North Carolina Environmental Health Association. Overall the site team was extremely impressed with the students.

Michael Herring was also a site visitor to Western Carolina. Herring noted that he could not have been more impressed with the program. He has worked with their graduates in the past, and has been impressed with the quality of the graduates. In general, the students are very proud of the program. Graduates were also very pleased with the quality of education they received at WCU. Overall, it was a very impressive site visit.

Burton Ogle, the WCU Program Director then took over for his response. Ogle thanked the site visit team for their recommendations, and visiting the campus. Ogle thought that the site visit was beneficial to both students and the program – it was very exciting to the students! The students were also excited that both LaFollette and Herring listened to and considered their opinions.

As for the Advisory Board recommendation, Ogle is open to suggestions and opinions, and would like advice to help them avoid problems they've had in the past. Internships is one of the components Ogle feels makes the program the strongest. Ogle has been very pleased with his first few years at WCU – he thinks the students have been great, as have the faculty. He feels there is room for improvement, and is very excited about the coming years. Ogle also hopes to hire a practitioner for the open faculty position.

Harvey opened up the floor for questions. Morrone inquired about the move from the Environmental Technology Department, the status of the Masters Program, and the status of the Environmental Studies degree? Ogle answered that the Environmental Technology degree was being phased out – and he was hopeful that they would receive the faculty position upon the ending of the program. As for the masters program, Ogle has been the primary administrator, and there are 15 students waiting for the administration to approve the program. However, there is a need for additional faculty, and Ogle wants to keep his focus on the undergraduate level. As for the Environmental Studies degree, there are six students and the departments often collaborate, attempting to find the best fit for the students.

Harper inquired about the diversity of the program. Ogle responded that it is predominantly white female students, with some African-American and Native American students. There are plans to increase recruitment efforts with Latino students, but right now, faculty are stretched thin with their teaching loads.

Harvey asked how Ogle planned to replace the retiring faculty member. Ogle responded that his administration has promised a full FTE, rather than a half – with the additional potential to add an entirely new FTE at a later date.

Visitors and Council Members with a possible conflict of interest were excused. LaFollette moved that the undergraduate program at Western Carolina University be granted full accreditation for six years. The members present and Dingman, voting by proxy, unanimously approved the motion.

37.1 New Agenda Items – Guidelines Revisions

Silverman requested that the Council briefly discuss the next guidelines conference. According to the bylaws, the next review of the guidelines will take place in 2008, and it is important to begin seeking outside finding and involvement, and to solicit input from the environmental health community. LaFollette agreed to put this item on the Board agenda.

There was discussion about Table 2, its revision and the way it would fit into the Guidelines Conference. Treser agreed to continue to work with the Table 2 Committee to create recommendations to move forward and implement. LaFollette agreed that this item would also be placed on the first Board conference call.

Item 32.0 was moved to this portion of the meeting.

32.0 Election of Officers

Williams reported that all ballots had been returned for the Election of Officers. LaFollette was elected as Chair. Harvey was elected as Graduate Chair. Stephenson and Bermudez were elected as Undergraduate Co-Chairs. Treser was elected as Secretary. Bentley was elected as Treasurer. 16 ballots were distributed and 16 ballots were returned.

Williams agreed to serve as Elections Chair again. LaFollette thanked him for his service.

37.2 New Agenda Items – EHAC Certification Mark

Bentley also requested the Council briefly discuss a recommendation made by the lawyers' office. The lawyer suggested the Council consider creating and registering a certification mark. This mark is not a logo, and is not related to a possible trademark of the logo. Instead, this would protect the "certification" that EHAC provides from infringement. This would render the accreditation decision of EHAC akin to the NSF seal or Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval, and allow the Council legal rights if someone used the EHAC accreditation improperly or illegally. Bentley explained the initial fees would be approximately \$1500, with minor fees coming after five years, and then maintenance required every ten years. Treser and Radke suggested the Board look into it. Rowe made a motion the Board review the item, and its potential cost. McCarthy seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

22.0 ABET Proposed EH Accreditation Program

Stephenson explained the potential accreditation of EH Programs by ABET. EHAC has programs which are also currently accredited by ABET. ABET is attempting to recognize programs that do not fall under its current guidelines – which includes Industrial Hygiene, Safety, Industrial Hygiene & Safety, and Occupational Health & Safety. As a result, ABET has approved accreditation criteria sponsored jointly by AIHA and ASSE – and from Stephenson's understanding, this is largely an experiment to see if the two can partner

together, rather than a serious attempt to accredit EH programs.

Stephenson also explained this designation would only apply to programs that were entitled "Environment, Health & Safety" – which is a designation only one EHAC program could claim. Stephenson did say he felt this confused things for EHAC – but that EHAC would only need to keep alert and continue to attempt to communicate with ABET. Bohan inquired about ABET's accreditation fees. The answer was yearly accreditation fees are \$10,000.

Stephenson agreed to continue monitoring this item.

23.0 Update on the Accreditation of International Programs

Kneller provided an update on the possible accreditation of international programs. After last years Guidelines change, Kneller does not believe the guidelines need further updating. Thus far, he has only received inquiries from two programs – one which was unknown and has not yet responded, and the other, Costa Rica, with which Silverman has been in contact.

Stephenson also explained he had been asked to, and attended a site visit to a school in the United Arab Emirates, which was designed to look for potential deficiencies prior to the school potentially applying for accreditation.

Silverman explained he was very excited about the possibility of Costa Rica applying for accreditation. He felt it would be very interesting for the Council to review this program. Silverman did explain the materials would be prepared in English, and that the Program Representative who came to attend the accreditation review would also speak English, but that the potential site visit team would need to speak Spanish.

Hatlen commented he felt it was critical for people to read the self-study and make a concerted effort to send comments and questions with the site visit team. He particularly emphasized that if the Council allowed Costa Rica to seek accreditation, it would be very important not to waste their time, effort and resources. Silverman also added the site visit team would need to be extremely careful about the arrangements for the site visit team. He also added questions and concerns would need to be brought up and addressed early on in the process.

Treser mentioned this brought up an interesting point – while we could find Council members who were capable of conducting a site visit in Spanish, it might be more difficult to find Council members fluent in other languages in the future and that this is something the Council needs to consider. Morrone proposed that if the Costa Rica school did seek accreditation, that the entire Council should be primary reviewers for the self study. Others concurred.

24.0 Presentation from Ron Grimes, President of the National Environmental health Association

Ron Grimes, Incoming NEHA President, Richard Collins, Incoming NEHA First Vice-President and Robert Blake, Incoming NEHA Second Vice-President entered the meeting. They gave a brief overview of the work they hope to accomplish in the coming year, and stressed the importance of working both with the Council and with the accredited

programs and students. Mr. Grimes emphasized that he is trying to pass on agenda from one president to the next. He is anxious to work with the Council on areas of common concern. He noted the following points.

- Workforce development is a major component of the NEHA strategic plan to be put into place by next AEC
- There is a need to develop a recruitment tool for HS and College students
- He would like to see the development of a portfolio of successes, i.e., what is being done right?
- There is a need to consider the impact of the current emphasis on (and funding for) Bio-terrorism and emergency response and the need to start with teaching students. This is to be a special concern of Vice-President Rick Collins
- The needs to be more done to market the profession. Rob Blake will be looking into this issue.
- And finally, it is recognized that Registration will be an issue that will need to be considered.
- Response

Treser thanked them for coming to the meeting, and noted that AEHAP is working to re-establish a National Student association, similar to SNEHA. Grimes responded that NEHA has created a student section of the website, and is hopeful this will assist students. Treser expressed a desire to work with NEHA to ensure that the efforts of NEHA, EHAC and AEHAP were mutually reinforcing.

Bohan then explained to Grimes that his vision for the accreditation Council, and as the incoming AEHAP President, is to have an accredited program in all fifty states, to have graduation from an accredited program be a requirement for sitting for the REHS exam, and is welcoming the opportunity to work with NEHA. He is hopeful that together, they can collaborate to target a state and work with NEHA to make this a reality. Grimes thanked him for his comments and suggested Michigan might be an appropriate state to begin.

Krinn agreed with Bohan's comments, and explained to Grimes that graduation from an accredited program must mean something. Grimes explained he was in favor of a multi-faceted approach – which involved finding people to enter the field through academic programs, finding people ready to step into leadership positions, and encouraging current practitioners to continue their education.

Morrone commented that the Council is always willing to work with NEHA, and she applauded their good intentions. She stated she was hopeful they would allow us to be involved in their committees or workforce development initiatives. Krinn also applauded Grimes for bringing both Blake and Collins with him. Everyone thanked Grimes, Collins and Blake for coming to the meeting.

25.0 Request for Extension – CSU Northridge.

(This agenda item was moved up on the agenda and has been completed.)

26.0 Recess for the day.

Day 3 – Sunday, June 26

Members Present:	Harold Barnhart, Randy Bentley, Eliezer Bermudez, Patrick Bohan, Carolyn Harvey, Dan Harper, Keith Krinn, Phil Kneller, Sharron LaFollette (Chair), Michele Morrone, Barbara McCarthy, Vince Radke, Rick Rowe, Dale Stephenson, Chuck Treser, Don Williams
Guests Present:	Arturro Aguirre, Marsha Black, Bill Carter, Franklin Carver, Clint Chamberlain, Gary Coleman, Alan Dellapenna, Michael Fletcher, David Gilkey, Frank Gomez, Harry Grenowski, Tom Hatfield, Jack Hatlen, Victor Ibeanusi, Alison McIntosh, Priscilla Oliver, Moses Omishakin, Fan Robinson and Gary Silverman.

27.0 Reconvene.

27.1 The meeting was reconvened at 8:00 a.m.

27.2 A quorum of 16 members was present.

27.3 LaFollette announced that the Accreditation review of the University of Georgia would take place until approximately 9:30 a.m., at which time, the Council would break for the presentation of the Student Awards during the Opening Session of the NEHA Meeting, until approximately 10:30, at which time the Council would reconvene.

28.0 University of Georgia Athens Re-Accreditation

Krinn provided the report from the site visit team. Krinn first commented that, despite their hard work, they could find no shortcomings or mistakes or problems with the self-study. Krinn noted that he asked Franklin Carver, the other site visitor, to review the Curriculum, while he reviewed the internship side.

Krinn reviewed the site visitor report regarding internships. At the site visit, he found the records to be thorough and very complete. Krinn even requested that UGA send their internship forms for other programs to review and potentially use as a model.

Including the Program Director, Dr. Fischer, there are two additional dedicated, full time faculty, with a total of 6 FTE's in the program. The faculty load is typical for the college. Krinn did note that the information on funding was slightly fuzzy, but that was a result of the recent move to the College of Public Health and at the site visit, the program demonstrated adequate funding.

Carver took over for the remaining portion of the site visit report. He noted he was very impressed, as usual, with the program at UGA. The institutional history of excellence continues. He noted that the site visit team met with the Provost, who assured them that the program had been in transition, but is settling in the College of Public Health. The curriculum covers and meets all guidelines, and is distinct, but excellent. Carver did note that often the advising sheets were not up to date, and that was one recommendation of the site visit team.

Krinn noted they had a great session with the students as well. He outlined the recommendations of the site team. Recommendations including filling one of the upcoming vacancies with a practitioner, to increase ties with NEHA, to re-activate the advisory committee, to continue their relationship with the Georgia Environmental Health Association, and to work to revitalize the Student environmental health club. Krinn also noted that they recommended more students seek internships in the public sector. Currently, the majority of students seek internships in the private sector, and as a result, that is where they seek jobs after graduation.

Marsha Black took over with the response from the University of Georgia. She thanked the site visitors for coming and noted that she had a great time, and learned a lot from the site visit team. She noted that since the site visit, the program has been given the go ahead to advertise for one position. She is hopeful they will be given the go-ahead to seek for the second position, which will be a public health/practitioner focused position. Black noted that they had also been given the go-ahead to seek more adjunct faculty, which could be drawn from local practitioners. She noted that the faculty is currently compiling a list of potential advisory committee members, and are also working to increase internship opportunities in the public sector as well as out of state. Black also noted that they are currently attempting to improve the lab courses – some of which had been cut back due to budget constraints.

LaFollette opened the floor for questions. Radke inquired if the site team was able to meet with graduates. Krinn responded that they had, and that the program had clearly prepared them for working, and that all the graduates they met were working in the private sector. Carver noted the graduates felt that they should have been required to take a second language while in college, but that they felt the internships were the best part of the program. Bentley commented that the focus on the private sector was unusual and asked where they went. Black noted that they often go to power companies or affiliates, and that pay is often a consideration for the graduates. She noted many also attend graduate school.

Bohan inquired about the number of majors in the program. Black answered that at one time, there were as many as 85 to 90, but that it had dropped to 50, and now it is once again climbing. Morrone noted that she was one of the primary self-study reviewers and commended Black on the quality of the self-study. She did inquire about the two untenured faculty. Black answered that one of the two had submitted their application for tenure, and the second was encouraged to submit the application for tenure, but decided to wait for one year.

Visitors and Council Members with a possible conflict of interest were excused. Krinn moved that the undergraduate program at the University of Georgia at Athens be granted full accreditation for six years. The members present and Dingman, voting by proxy, unanimously approved the motion.

29.0 University of Findlay, Graduate Program Accreditation

Hatfield and Coleman gave the site visitor report. They gave a short background on the history of the program, and information about the set up of the program – namely that students can take classes either on a full-time or part-time basis, and either in a classroom setting, or online, or a mixture of both. The program has a large population of international students, most of whom take classes at the University itself. The

program emphasizes Industrial Environmental Health & Safety, although they do have some involvement with community health. Biology and Physics are not required, although all students the site visitors spoke with had this background, and an effort has been made since the site visit to include these courses in a newly developed bridge course. Epidemiology is also not a pre-requisite or required under the curriculum, and the site visit team expressed this concern to the program administration.

The site visit team was impressed with the amount of resources the University has dedicated to online/distance education, and the entire program can be completed through these online courses. It was noted that the curriculum is lacking some of the requirements normally required (biology and physics) but the biggest gap is epidemiology and statistics. They were impressed with capstone projects that are required. It was noted that they offer a certificate program that is entirely separate, in Environmental Management and Emergency IH. There are 8 full time faculty / 6 on a regular basis –with a great deal of experience with industry. Tenure tends to be a moving target in as far as the requirements for promotion and tenure are concerned.

The students are highly supportive of the program and its faculty. Administrative support is high and the program has adequate resources, with its own budget. The availability of equipment could be better understood if there were a list of the equipment available to the faculty and students. Class size is reasonable and the student files were complete and easily accessed. It was noted that International students preferred in class vs. on-line courses.

The site team was also impressed with the departmental resources, support and SEEM (School for Engineering and Emergency Management) and CTP (Center for terrorism preparedness) centers. The site team also expressed concern over the lack of an External Advisory Committee, and the department is in the process of re-establishing this committee.

Bill Carter, University of Findlay's Program Director took over to give his response. First, he thanked the site visitors for coming, and for their assistance, and then he gave a brief history of the program. The program has been in existence since 1994, but only in 2000 did it change to be a Masters of Science in Environment, Health & Safety Management. Currently, the program has 146 students, 27 of whom are international students. Another large portion of the student body take classes online.

In response to the site visit team, the Program created a bridge course, which requires the students who can not show proficiency in many topics to take a course to help them in chemistry and biology. Also since the site visit, epidemiology was added.

LaFollette opened the floor to questions. Hatfield inquired about international students who might take classes online? Carter responded there were a handful – perhaps 2 or 3 who live in Canada. The majority of the international students take classes at the University. Hatfield also inquired about the physics requirement. Carter stated that Physics is an expectation, but that it hasn't been included in the bridge course. He stated that all prospective students show a proficiency in physics. Carter also noted they added epidemiology to the Core courses.

Krinn inquired about how Findlay recruited students, particularly with three undergraduate accredited programs in close proximity. Carter stated they have not

specifically recruited from those undergraduate programs, although there are a few students from those programs. A good portion come from the University of Findlay's undergraduate program, some come with a background in medical health, and then another portion are international students. Krinn also inquired about the percent of students who take courses online. Carter responded that 110 of the 146 students took at least one course online last semester, but that some students take classes online and in the classroom. He also noted many of the graduates either go to or come from Marathon Oil – with whom Findlay has a very positive relationship.

Krinn inquired about microbiology and how the graduates show that competency. Carter answered that microbiology is included in the biology bridge course and that it is included in the learning objectives. Krinn asked if the course had a lab component, and Carter answered no – it did not, it was an independent study approach which allowed students to demonstrate their competencies but required them to understand fundamentals. Stephenson asked about the title of the program. Carter responded it is a Masters of Science in Environmental, Safety and Health Management. Stephenson inquired about where the traditional environmental health courses and topics were taught? Carter answered they were covered in ENVM 510.

Stephenson inquired about the students, and the ways in which they take classes. Carter responded they have fully online students, traditional students and students which take courses both places. Carter acknowledged this is a challenge to maintain the consistency of instruction, but noted they worked hard to ensure this, and that evaluation strategies may change from method to method, but the standards do not change. Evaluation strategies include papers, presentations, group work, discussion boards and tests.

Radke inquired about why site visitors mentioned the international students in their report. Hatfield answered that it is a very important portion of the curriculum – they have a large number, and it is a niche and emphasis for Findlay. Carter also mentioned a large majority of their students come from the India/Nepal region due to a college recruiter who works in those countries. He said this is an emphasis of the University as they have come to better understand globalization. Radke inquired about where the international graduates went – Carter stated he did not have good information about that. Due to ever-changing INS rules, they must be enrolled full time, and can do a training program for two years after they graduate, but then they must find permanent employment or return to their home countries.

McCarthy inquired about the percentage of part-time students. Carter responded that 20-30% of the students are international students, and therefore full time, and the remaining 70 – 80 % split evenly between full time and part time. McCarthy asked about the average time for completion – Carter answered that full time students complete in two years, and part-time students have a limit of seven years. Carter acknowledged they are having difficulty tracking their retention rates of part-time students, particularly the online students.

Coleman inquired about the advisory committee. Carter answered that representatives from a community college, the medical school, industry, NIOSH and others were coming together and would be meeting this summer. They are still working to find a local practitioner to participate.

Visitors and Council Members with a possible conflict of interest were excused. Hatfield moved that the graduate program at the University of Findlay be granted conditional accreditation for two years. The members present and Dingman, voting by proxy, approved the motion with 11 in favor, none opposed and four abstentions.

It was then moved that if the program were able to meet the conditions, that at the end of the two year period, the program would receive full accreditation for four years (i.e., an additional two years). The motion carried unanimously.

30.0 Spelman College, Undergraduate Accreditation

LaFollette began the item by introducing everyone to Dr. Ibeanusi, and letting him know the way the meeting would run. Morrone took over to provide the site visitor report.

Morrone noted that the Provost met with the site visitor team twice, and is very supportive of the program. The new faculty position has been posted. As a liberal arts college, Spelman and the Program prepare its students to be critical thinkers and problem solvers. The program currently has two FTEs and meeting the accreditation guidelines. They currently have fifty students – which is an increase from one student six years ago. The statistics requirement is met through a math class, the toxicology requirement is met with a science class, and the epidemiology class has been taken across the street at Morehouse. The students receive in depth coverage of environmental chemistry, environmental biology and environmental microbiology.

The internship is an in-depth experience in problem based learning. It is unique in that students are only required to do 160 hours, but they are also required to do significant community service, for which they do not receive credit. The site visit team met with eight students, all of whom plan to go to graduate school which is typical of Spelman's students.

The site team commended the program on its great resources and facilities, the interdisciplinary nature of the program, and its location – which is very close to the CDC, and the program could develop the CDC as a resource. Morrone also explained that Dr. Ibeanusi is the greatest strength of the program – he helps his students become well rounded women. The concerns of the site visit team were the epidemiology course, the lack of an external advisory committee (the program has an internal advisory committee), and the suggestion to include practitioners as guest lecturers.

Dr. Ibeanusi took over with Spelman's response. He thanked the site visit team for their participation and explained it had been quite a journey! He explained the development of the program – it started with the concept to enhance the college by creating a department that engaged other programs and departments. He also stated that in 2000, there were 8 students, and the program has convinced the institution to embrace the technical nature of the program. Ibeanusi recently received tenure as well.

He also responded that after the site visit, the provost approved a new course in epidemiology to be taught at Spelman (rather than at Morehouse), and someone will be hired with a background in toxicology, epidemiology, and the course will be taught in the Spring of 2006. Recently, the program has become a major, and the students are excited about the possibility of accreditation. Ibeanusi is also working to develop a further relationship with CDC and ATSDR.

The floor was then opened to questions. Radke inquired about how much community service the graduates complete. The answer was 20 to 30 hours per semester. Krinn was concerned about the field experience, as he felt the students were only required to do 160 hours and EHAC requirements state they must complete 180 hours. Ibeanusi answered that there is an Environmental Research Course which gives students the opportunity to complete research, plus the students are required to do internships from the time they are sophomores until they graduate – although these are non-credited, and on top of this, the students complete community service. Morrone supported that statement. Ibeanusi also added the students to do summer internships outside of the Spelman/Morehouse campus, and often go to CDC or Proctor & Gamble. LaFollette inquired as to how the student files document these internships. Morrone answered the team did not see the complete files.

Stephenson inquired as to whether or not the students reflected upon these experiences. Ibeanusi answered they were often required to write thesis or journals about their experiences. Harper noted the partnerships with CDC and ATSDR, and encouraged participation with FDA, EPA and local health departments. Ibeanusi responded that they have relationships with both EPA and FDA. Harper felt these relationships would supplement the curriculum, which lacks a food safety component. Priscilla Oliver, a Spelman graduate circulated a list of Spelman graduates currently employed at EPA, along with their position titles. She also commented that students were incredibly innovative, and often sought out experiences without letting their professors know!

Kneller inquired about the degree. Ibeanusi responded it is a Bachelor of Science in Environmental Science. LaFollette inquired as to how Ibeanusi plans to designate the accredited students? Ibeanusi responded that with the liberal arts focus, which has served the program very well, it has been difficult to create a clear department, but both students and faculty have been concerned about that. Oliver noted that the Morehouse Institute of Public Health was a place at which students had the opportunity to take many great classes, and students grabbed at the opportunity to take classes to fulfill the requirements.

Visitors and Council Members with a possible conflict of interest were excused. Morrone moved that the undergraduate program at Spelman University be granted conditional accreditation for two years. The members present and Dingman, voting by proxy, approved the motion, with 14 voting in favor, 1 opposed and no abstentions.

It was then moved that if the program were able to meet the conditions, that at the end of the two year period, the program would receive full accreditation for four years (i.e., an additional two years). The motion carried unanimously.

31.0 Mississippi Valley State University, Graduate Accreditation

Frank Gomez and Rick Rowe were the site visit team for Mississippi Valley State University, and they provided a report to the Council. Gomez reported he was very impressed with the graduate program. It has been in existence for several years, and is a student centered program and is the premier graduate program on campus. They have a low student to teacher ratio, and the students graduate to take jobs in the local Mississippi Delta. The program can't fill all the internship opportunities available, and

students often end up working for companies that they began internships with. The local area loves the graduates of the program and is very pleased.

The site visitor team recommended an additional graduate assistant, they also recommended that the graduates be encouraged to use peer-review journals in their research and in the classroom. The site visit team noted they were well received by the College, and the Dean thanked them profusely for their visit and suggestions. They also noted that the students were employed at a very appropriate level upon completion of the program. Gomez particularly noted that the President of the University is attempting to create a Valley of scholars in the Delta – and this program is an essential part of that plan. Overall it was a very enjoyable visit. Rowe also noted that he was a member of the initial undergraduate site team, and was very pleased with the progress of the institution.

Both site visitors noted they encouraged the program to pursue GIS. Gomez also noted this is not an institution with many resources, but they are willing to utilize the resources they do have.

Ademola Omishakin is the program director, and he took over to respond to the site visit team. Omishakin expressed his gratitude to the site visitors and said they have done a wonderful job. He stated the program has created a committee to implement the suggestions that came from the site visit. The funding for two graduate assistants has already been committed, as well as additional release time for the program coordinator.

Bentley is curious about the culminating experience. Omishakin responded it is an internship which includes work with a preceptor to develop a program and topic of research study. The program is then written up and submitted to the program. Gomez noted that as the mission is to become a research institution, the site visit team suggested implementing a thesis requirement.

Krinn noted that the students should be aware that at some point, there will not be additional jobs in the Delta valley for all these graduates and that the program should encourage them to leave. Omishakin noted the program and the faculty were consistently telling the students this! But as of yet, it has not been a problem. Gomez also noted the retention rate for the graduate program is extremely high. Harvey also noted one of the graduate students is presenting a poster at the NEHA meeting, and it was a great paper. Morrone inquired about the number of students. Omishakin replied that currently there are 27, and the program has capped enrollment at 35 to ensure student involvement and the low-student teacher ratio.

Visitors and Council Members with a possible conflict of interest were excused. Gomez moved that the undergraduate program at Mississippi Valley State University be granted full accreditation for six years. The members present and Dingman, voting by proxy, unanimously approved the motion.

32.0 Election of Officers

This agenda item was completed earlier in the meeting.

33.0 Linkages with AEHAP

Mike Fletcher, current AEHAP Board President came to the meeting to give the Council an update on AEHAP and its progress. He highlighted AEHAP's recent strategic planning session, and resulting plan, which can be found online. He also highlighted a new partnership with NSF International, which provides funding for a student to work at a local health department for the summer. Other AEHAP initiatives include increasing enrollment and retention rates, as well as encouraging student environmental health clubs.

Kneller inquired about the effort to revitalize student environmental health clubs, and AEHAP's role. Treser answered there was a committee formed to examine student involvement, and possibly re-starting the Student National Environmental Health Association. The activities are underway. Krinn inquired about potential new programs in the pipeline, and staff answered the list could be found on the AEHAP website.

Bohan then outline his vision of having an accredited program in all fifty states, but commented that we needed a plan – AEHAP and EHAC could not accomplish this goal alone. McCarthy also commented there will be a severe lack of faculty trained to teach environmental health in the coming years. LaFollette encouraged AEHAP to look into recruiting graduate programs. Morrone also commented that in partnership with Alejandra Tres, AEHAP's Executive Director, there would be an article coming in the Journal of Environmental Health which featured their messaging research.

At this point, a guest, Harry Grenawitzke, was introduced and was asked to say a few words about the Ferris State University situation. Grenawitzke introduced himself as a local practitioner who had been working in Michigan to attempt to stop the close of Ferris State. He explained it was only in January of this year did the State environmental health association learn of the closure of the program – despite the fact the process to close a program takes over two years. He read a letter he had received from the President of Ferris State, which outlined the process and issues with the Program.

Grenawitzke commented that it is necessary for state associations to meet with local universities, and encourage partnerships between the two. Grenawitzke was concerned about future retirements and the future leadership of the field. There was discussion about the potential factors that led to the close of the program, and the events at the last site visit. Bohan commented that this underscored the need to increase collaboration and advisory committees at accredited programs. The council thanked Grenawitzke for his time and comments.

34.0 EHOPAC Presentation

Alan Dellapenna of the U.S. Public Health Service came to give a brief presentation on the state of the COSTEP program and the previous year, as well as hints for applying for the next round of COSTEP internships.

In the past year, COSTEP had 54 applications, 32 of whom were selected. The majority went to the Indian Health Service and the Coast Guard. In the past, FDA and CDC have also had COSTEPs, but not this year. 18 schools sent in applications, of which 12 were selected. Reasons for selection included: students being directly recruited, good references, good grades and a good fit for the program – i.e., students must want to participate in COSTEP and be willing to complete the lengthy process. Reasons for students not being selected included: there were not as many open positions, students did not have sophomore standing, the student did not have transportation to complete the assignment, or they have had an arrest record in the past.

For the coming year, the deadline to turn in the first portion of the application is December 31. Suggestions include filling out the online application, following up with the COSTEP Officer, building a relationship with either the recruiter or Alan himself, keeping copies of everything and using agency contacts.

Bohan thanked Dellapenna for attending the meeting, and commended him and his fellow Officers for visiting the accredited programs. Bohan also thanked him for ensuring that accreditation is a qualification for participation in the program. Dellapenna thanked everyone for their feedback and supplied Council members with a survey for additional feedback.

35.0 Announcements and Citations

LaFollette began with a discussion of potential meeting dates for the next year. There was some concern about holding the meeting earlier in order to be completed prior to the NEHA meeting, but there was also concern because the International Environmental Health Federation's World EH Congress to be held in Dublin, Ireland, June 18-23. However, after discussion, it became clear the meeting would remain the Thursday, Friday and Saturday before the NEHA Meeting – on June 22 – 24, 2006.

LaFollette then moved on to citations. First, she thanked all the Council members for their hard work during the year, and the site visitors for their dedication and time spent. She also thanked the other members of the Board for their work during the year. She particularly commended Bentley for his work on the financial situation and 501(c)(3) application; Harvey and Bermudez for their work preparing for and ensuring the site visit and accreditation process for all nine programs Treser for his work on the Policy Manual; and Alison for all of her hard work. Harvey then thanked LaFollette for her work as Chair over the past year – particularly on all of the Policy items and working to improve the transparency and standardization of the Council operations.

36.0 EHAC Accreditation

This agenda item has been completed earlier in the meeting.

37.0 Other Items

Several new items were introduced and discussed during the course of the meeting. (See items 37.1 and 37.2 on pages 21 and 22 respectively.) There were no new items introduced at this time and a motion for adjournment was entertained.

38.0 Adjournment

The vote to adjourn the meeting was unanimous. This concluded the 2005 Annual Meeting of the National Environmental Health Science & Protection Accreditation Council.

Respectfully Submitted

Alison McIntosh, Staff and
Charles D. (Chuck) Treser, Secretary