

*National Environmental Health Science & Protection
Accreditation Council*

**Draft Minutes
2006 Annual Meeting of the Council**

Date:	Thursday, June 22, 2006	Time:	8:30 a.m. – 5:45 p.m.
Purpose:	Annual business meeting of the Environmental Health Council to conduct the routine business of the Council, determine policies, and consider the accreditation status of academic Environmental Health programs.		
Members Present:	Randy Bentley, Pat Bohan, Eli Bermudez, Jim Dingman, Dan Harper, Carolyn Harvey, Tom Hatfield, Phil Kneller, Keith Krinn, Sharron LaFollette, Barbara McCarthy, Michele Morrone, Vince Radke, Fan Robinson, Rick Rowe, Gary Silverman, Dale Stephenson, Don Williams.		
Guests Present:	David Gilkey, Alejandra Tres, Alison McIntosh, Phil Scheuerman (via phone), Dan Sprau, Alice Anderson, Tim Kelley.		

1.0 Call to order and introductions.

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. on June 22, 2006. Introductions occurred.

2.0 Approval of Agenda

After reviewing the agenda, Rowe made a motion to approve the agenda, which was seconded by Hatfield. All were in favor.

3.0 Review Process of Electronic Approval of Minutes

LaFollette reviewed the approval of the minutes. She reviewed the approval process for last year. This year, minutes will be distributed to the Council within thirty days, by July 26, 2006, with approval due within forty-five days, or August 10, 2006.

4.0 Nominations Committee Report, Slate for Officers

Williams presented the Nominations Committee Report. The newly elected Council Members are Diana Rawlings, (Practitioner), Alice Anderson (Academic), Tim Ryan (Academic), Michael Fletcher (Academic), and Lynn Burgess (Academic). Rick Rowe (Practitioner) and Carolyn Harvey (Academic) were both re-elected to second terms.

Williams showed the Council information and slides on the geographic, gender and racial diversity of the Council. Next year, there are one practitioner and two academic seats open.

Williams then called for nominations for the Board. The slate is:

- Chair: Randy Bentley
- Graduate Chair: Carolyn Harvey
- Undergraduate Co-Chair: Eli Bermudez
- Undergraduate Co-Chair: Dale Stephenson
- Treasurer: Gary Silverman
- Secretary: Jim Dingman

The nominations will close in the afternoon, and ballots will be distributed to Council Members by tomorrow morning to be returned by Saturday morning.

5.0 Policy Manual

LaFollette took over the discussion of the Policy Manual. Last year, the Board of Directors and Council developed a Policy Manual, and have since continued to expand upon and revise the manual. This year, there are four new policies to be reviewed and approved as part of the manual. They are the Policy for Appealing Accreditation Decisions, Records Retention Policy, Communications Policy, and Policy regarding Requests for Extension.

Appeal Policy for Accreditation Decisions. This policy is a revision of an existing policy. Bentley explained that after an initial review of the policy, the Board determined that it would be best to send it to the lawyer for a legal review and assistance. The changes outlined in the policy are those suggested by the lawyer, then reviewed by the Board.

Krinn inquired as to why the policy lays out reasons for appeal. Bentley answered that there must be objective reasons for the process and basis of the appeal, and that the Council has acted improperly in the past in relation to its action on appeals. Bentley indicated also that these reasons were broad enough to cover virtually any scenario.

Kneller inquired about the potential hearing panel members. The policy indicates that Program Directors could be selected for the panels, and he inquired as to whether this was made clear of them. LaFollette answered that the policy was attempting to define the pool of candidates, but that anyone initially selected could decide not to serve.

There were several additional minor changes to grammar and language. McCarthy then inquired about a conflict of interest policy for the panel members, and it was agreed to include this in the policy. Krinn inquired about members from the same state, and LaFollette replied this would be included in the Conflict of Interest policy as well. Bentley added that the Conflict of Interest was not as large a concern because the members would be selected and agreed upon by both parties. LaFollette indicated the policy would be amended as indicated and discussed.

Communications Policy. This policy was written to govern communications between the Board and the Council. The first question was regarding updating accreditation status, and there were inquiries as to why decisions were being sent back to the Council for ratification. LaFollette explained that in the instance of programs that had received conditional accreditation, they may fulfill the conditions at any time during the two-year period. Should they fulfill the requirements directly after the Council Meetings, the Board may need to act upon this in the interim. Silverman indicated that these decisions were such that he would prefer the entire Council was informed and participated in this process.

Silverman then inquired about the expense line item in the policy. Included in the policy is a statement regarding expenses that might fall outside the budget. There was reference to the Bylaws, and an allowance for the creation of expenses outside the budget. Radke suggested that the Policy include a line that referenced the Bylaws. LaFollette ended the discussion by tasking the next Board and Chair to review the Policy Manual and Bylaws to be in agreement. Tres noted that the creation of the Board of Directors represents a change in culture for the organization, but this work was necessary and important, and will improve the functioning of the Council.

Records Retention Policy. The first inquiry was by Silverman, with regards to keeping things electronic, and the possible scanning of documentation. Bentley indicated that the policy dictated that all records and documents should be kept electronically. LaFollette added, however, that this policy would not be retroactive. There would be no effort at this time to gather old files and documents and scan them into a computer. Silverman then inquired about duplicate copies of the records. Bentley indicated that the office was examining options for an off-site storage system, such as a company that provided backup. Radke noted that, as learned from the example of Katrina, off-site storage should not be located in the same area. McCarthy noted that Jim Dingman should be thanked for his hard work on this policy. LaFollette presented Dingman with a certificate of appreciation for his hard work.

Requests for Extension. LaFollette noted that this policy had been discussed and approved last year, but there was a small change, which created a timetable for response. There is also a potential guidelines change regarding these requests, which is next on the agenda. There were no comments or questions.

Peer and Site Team Evaluations. The last item for discussion regarding the Policy Manual was an update on the peer and site visit team evaluations. It was noted by staff that nearly half of the forms have been completed and returned. No major issues have come up. McCarthy questioned how this information would be used. LaFollette indicated that it would identify teams or members that worked particularly well together, or ones that needed additional assistance or training. McCarthy noted that the evaluations did not evaluate the team as a whole, and would therefore not reflect whether or not the team was a good one. There was some discussion about changing the form to better reflect this purpose. Bentley however noted that it was not smart to change the form without first reviewing the data from this year. It was determined that the data would be compiled and sent to the Undergraduate and Graduate chairs for review. It was also suggested by Gilkey that we look to the National Organization for Competency Assurance. They work with groups similar to EHAC and might be able to provide assistance.

6.0 Guidelines Revision

Both the Undergraduate and Graduate guidelines indicate that for programs seeking re-accreditation, requests for extension are due at the same time as the self-study, which is six months prior to the Annual Meeting. However, as indicated by the discussion above, should the Council or Board deny the request for extension, the existing guidelines do not give a timeline or provision for submitting the self-study. As a result, the indicated guidelines change would give Programs thirty days from receipt of the letter from the Undergraduate or Graduate Chair to request an extension. The Board would then have thirty days to respond. McCarthy commented that the deadline for this request could create problems for programs that are just beginning their fall semester in September. Hatfield responded that given the importance of the issue that the timeframe should not be a problem, and program directors should be able to respond.

LaFollette indicated that the Undergraduate and Graduate Chairs could remind programs seeking re-accreditation in the spring before their self-study. McCarthy indicated that getting the Administration to approve requests for extension could be the problem – not necessarily the lack of notice. She suggested giving forty-five days to request an extension, but LaFollette noted that would not solve the problem for schools starting in mid to late September. There was no further discussion of this point. The Undergraduate and Graduate Chairs agreed to add a reminder in the spring as an informal notice of the upcoming re-accreditation.

Bentley made a motion to approve the Undergraduate Guidelines change as indicated, which was seconded by Bermudez. All were in favor. McCarthy made a motion to approve the Graduate Guidelines change as indicated, which was seconded by Harvey. All were in favor.

7.0 Undergraduate Guidelines Conference

The Undergraduate Guidelines were last reviewed in 2002, and based on the six-year schedule for their review; the next review should take place in 2008. Based on the experiences of the last conference, it was thought best to begin planning and applying for funding at this time.

Bentley indicated that he was working to find a location that would minimize both costs and travel time for participants. At this time, based on the current locations of the predicted attendees, Indianapolis seems to offer the best location, price and amenities. However, this is under discussion, and the Board will attempt to find a good location. LaFollette suggested that a University could possibly host the Conference, thereby saving on the potential hotel costs.

Tres informed the Council that the office and Board had written a proposal to the Centers for Disease Control for a grant to assist with the conference. This grant was used to fund the last guidelines review. However, the CDC is facing much more serious budget cuts, and while the grant scored well this year, it

did not receive funding. It is the intent of the Board to continue applying for funding. The proposed conference would include Council Members, and accredited programs not currently represented on the Council. It could include a pre-meeting for special topics, and would also include additional practitioners. There needs to be a committee formed to address these issues, and other details such as the location, invitees, the dates, content, and process. LaFollette indicated she would like to discuss the creation of a specific graduate outcome assessment survey as well.

Tres indicated that the conference in 2002 received \$30,000 from CDC; however, this conference would need to find more creative funding due to government budget cuts. Other things that could possibly be included in this conference include site visitor training, training for council members, and reflections on the work and role of the Council. Silverman reminded the Council that the guidelines revision is a serious undertaking. He does not feel as if these other topics will be able to be incorporated due to the time available. He also indicated the last conference was data driven – that the Council had commissioned papers prior to the conference to aid in the revision.

Tres indicated that the conference grant written to CDC was based on the model of the 2002 Guidelines Conference. She also indicated that we have more funding possibilities with the 501(c)3 status, for which EHAC has applied. Bentley and LaFollette both called for volunteers to the Committee. Stephenson, Bermudez and Silverman all volunteered, and LaFollette requested they involve people from outside the Council as well. Tres indicated this conference is a good way to increase outside and new involvement with the Council. It was determined that fall is the best time to hold the meeting, and the committee is tasked with working towards this goal.

8.0 Annual Enrollment Update

Tres gave her Annual Enrollment Update. She noted that while enrollment dipped slightly this year, enrollment overall continues to increase over the previous three years. She explained the process for gathering and revising the current information to the Council as well. Tres also noted that graduation is up – for the third year in a row. She noted the importance and significance of these increases as well.

Silverman was interested in learning more about what is happening to existing programs, rather than seeing increases in enrollment from newly accredited programs. Stephenson requested that the faculty be broken down to show which faculty have expertise in environmental health versus other fields. Bohan indicated this item would be addressed later in the day during AEHAP's report.

There were concerns about the correlation between enrollment and graduation, as well as the different ways of counting students as "enrolled" in the program. Tres indicated that the responses to the questionnaires are varied, and the office tries to standardize as much as possible prior to analyzing. She also indicated that the best way to examine the retention and graduation rate would be to track via a cohort system. Tres indicated she was interested in looking into a professional retention study. However, next year there will be a question requesting that programs self-report their retention rate.

Several Council Members indicated that the Council needed to be careful making assumptions about retention rates. Hatfield mentioned that his university in particular has a large population of students who work full time, and therefore take longer to complete the degree program. Bermudez then noted that the differences in enrollment and graduation between 2001 and 2006 were essentially non-existent, and this is troublesome. Tres suggested that next year, the presentation be prepared early and distributed to allow time for questions and the opportunity to request certain charts, tables and analysis. She also asked if there were suggestions on improving the data.

Gilkey noted that he thought Tres had done a great job preparing the data, particularly given the various formats and detail included in the Annual Update. There were requests that the Office request assistance from a statistician to further analyze the data. LaFollette suggested putting a call out to member program faculty, while Stephenson suggested a graduate student and faculty project. Tres suggested perhaps AEHAP could put together an RFP for data analysis. McCarthy indicated she had several questions, and would volunteer to put together a list of possible topics and items to be included in the analysis. The

Council asked that the Board address this issue. This item was tabled due to lack of time. Tres offered to do preliminary analysis based on requests, and return the information to the Council.

9.0 Financial Management

Bentley presented the financial report. First, Bentley presented the Fiscal 2006 report. He indicated that thus far, EHAC is slightly over budget, for expenses such as the Annual Meeting. However, adjustments have been made and he doesn't foresee any significant problems. One other area that is over budget is the tax liabilities. He noted that the IRS imposed penalties for two years, but we believe that this is the last responsibility we have to the IRS. These penalties were imposed because of the organizations failure to file taxes.

Bentley also noted that we paid for services from a Certified Professional Accountant (CPA) to complete a compilation. This is not an audit, but merely a review of the finances. Audits require a greater investment of time and money, as they assume liability for the CPA. Bermudez inquired about the tax preparation expenses, and the office agreed to compile that information.

Silverman inquired about Directors & Officers insurance, and as to whether it covered the entire Council and site visitors. The office will inquire. Bentley also requested the office inquire into a possible umbrella policy that would cover volunteers and site visitors.

The proposed 2007 budget includes a projected income of \$32,000. The Annual Meeting expenses are estimated. With the budget discussion, Bentley mentioned the possibility of moving the Annual Meeting location. At the moment, we are committed to working with the National Environmental Health Association (NEHA). This means we must participate in the contract they set with the hotel. For instance, this 2006 Meeting, the hotel was very expensive. There is also the possibility that in the future, the hotel could set a room rental rate, and food and beverage minimums. EHAC itself might be able to secure a better rate and deal if we book on our own. LaFollette noted that we would want to hold the meeting right before NEHA, and near the Conference hotel, but outside the hotel. Tres indicated that she would have a conversation with Nelson Fabian, NEHA's Executive Director, and relay the message to NEHA that EHAC has made a decision based purely on finances. Based on previous conversations, Tres does not believe this will damage our relationship with NEHA.

Bentley returned to the budget. In 2007, there will be a slight increase in the cost for administrative services, from \$1600 to \$1650, essentially to pay for cost of living increases in pay. Bermudez inquired about the budget for web services, and if we were to undergo a major website overhaul, if the budget would accommodate. Staff answered that yes, they believed it would. However, Bentley also noted that should we choose to pay for a web-based survey tool for the outcome assessment, we might not have the budget available. Silverman indicated he felt we should table the budget until the end of the meeting as other possible expenses may be added during the meeting. Krinn also inquired about the Undergraduate Guidelines Conference, and possible expenses from that. Bentley responded large projects would receive a separate budget, outside the regular budget.

Bentley then gave an update on the 501(c)3 status. We are still under consideration. The IRS has assigned a final case agent, and we are awaiting approval.

The next item under the budget discussion is a potential increase in dues. Bentley indicated that if the organization continues to grow, and improve, it will cost additional dollars. Right now, Bentley indicated that EHAC is relying on AEHAP's generosity, and EHAC continues to consume more than it pays. We either need to consume less or pay more. Silverman indicated that his memory was that AEHAP was founded to support and subsidize EHAC. Bentley felt that the organizations are two separate entities, and EHAC needs to acknowledge their contribution. Bentley indicated that the office has spent lots of time getting the organization in order and building infrastructure.

Hatfield inquired about a "worst-case" scenario for an increase in dues, and Bentley responded that 15 – 20 % would be sufficient. The last increase in dues was in 2000. Silverman responded that there were many options to cut the budget. Bentley inquired that since we have dues, didn't it seem reasonable to

consider increasing them as services increase, rather than freezing in perpetuity? Silverman responded that the operating budgets at Universities have not changed. There was discussion about the increase in budget, and things that might subsidize, including an increase in staff time, or the possible increase in infrastructure to account for possible recognition of EHAC. LaFollette felt it was important to remember that EHAC could apply for grants, and that lines of communication with AEHAP would prevent their competing for similar funds. LaFollette then proposed that the next Board and Treasurer examine the budget, and all possibilities for maintaining and increasing both the budget and the organization, and present a long-range forecast for the budget needs in coming years.

Krinn inquired about the contract with AEHAP for services, and its schedule for review. Bentley answered that it was reviewed annually. Silverman asked that we look at what administrative services we are paying for, and whether there might be room for cuts. He also asked to see detail on the administrative services. Bentley replied that while the hours were available, EHAC consistently overused staff time and that the overages were not inappropriate.

The Council recessed for a lunch break.

10.0 East Tennessee State University

Upon reconvening, Michele Morrone joined the meeting, as did Philip Scheuerman via telephone. Gary Silverman, Keith Krinn and Barbara McCarthy were the site visitors for East Tennessee State University's Undergraduate and Graduate Program.

Silverman provided the report for the Undergraduate Program at East Tennessee State University (ETSU). He noted that the program is quite strong – much stronger in fact than was reported in the self-study. The faculty is a mix of old and new faculty, who receive good support and are enthusiastic. The organization of the department makes sense within the structure of the University. ETSU is currently starting a doctoral program in environmental health, and they are very excited. ETSU believes that the doctoral program will further support and enhance the undergraduate and masters level programs, rather than take away resources.

The students at ETSU follow a documented curriculum, and enjoy the faculty and courses. The EHAC guidelines indicate that the site team should be available to the students, and this was not initially provided, but after discussing the matter with ETSU, it was taken care of.

The curriculum at ETSU's Undergraduate program initially raised many questions, however, after review, it is clear that the program fully meets the guidelines. The guidelines require students to acquire skills and knowledge in writing and communication, which was not clear in the self-study, but after visiting the program, it is clear they meet the guidelines. The internship is done through the Cooperative Education Department on campus. It was a difficult system to understand initially, but the site visit team was satisfied that the students are having good internship experiences.

As noted in the site team report, the labs are good and have good support, but they have a sharp chemical odor, which is most likely due to poor ventilation and a lack of fume hoods. The program is also getting more space within their existing building, which is good.

The site team recommendations are that the program work to ensure that the doctoral program will not become all consuming or take away resources from the undergraduate program, that they work to solve the ventilation problem with the lab, and strengthen their relationship with NEHA – although it is important to note they have a good relationship with the Tennessee Environmental Health Association.

Professor Philip Scheuerman responded to Silverman's comments. First, he thanked the Council for accommodating him with his inability to attend the meeting in person. He also thanked the site team for their review and visit. He noted that he had learned a lot about the accreditation process, as this was the first self-study he has himself prepared.

First, Scheuerman addressed the impact of the doctoral (Ph.D.) program. Financially, the program will receive its own budget, and that will benefit the program. It will also receive \$30,000 in student research funds, stipends for students, a new faculty position, a funded post-doctorate, and an increase in resources overall. The current plan is that ETSU admit no more than four Ph.D. students per year.

Scheuerman noted that a new Dean will be starting on July 1, 2006, and one of the first things that will be requested is improved ventilation and more space within the College. He is already supportive of these requests.

Scheuerman also noted the space concerns, as well as the concerns about the ventilation in the laboratories. He noted that the program is going to have increased access to lab space as the College of Nursing moves to new facilities. Also, he noted the University is moving towards CEPH Accreditation for the College, and this will increase funding for lab renovations.

The floor was then opened to questions.

Council discussed the Undergraduate Program first. Radke inquired about the odor – as to whether there was any health concerns for students and faculty. Scheuerman noted that while there is an odor, they have measured the exposure with both passive and active monitoring, and have not yet been able to document that there is a level that would cause concern. The Tennessee Occupational Safety and Health Administration has inspected, which resulted in an increased number of safety showers and ground fault protectors, but no detectable levels of exposure from chemicals. The Environmental Health Department within the University also monitors, and has found no standards violations.

Radke then asked for more clarification about the Internship program that is run through the Cooperative Education Department. Scheuerman noted that CED provides administrative support, makes contacts, keeps track of student hours and sets contracts. The contracts are sent to the Department for review and approval. The CED fills an administrative role, with the Department giving oversight and approval.

Bentley inquired about the Ph.D. Program, and with admitting up to four students per year, after 4-5 years, how many students would be involved in the program? Scheuerman responded that the average Ph.D. candidate would take five plus years to complete. There would only be one faculty to begin with, with more added later. However, the program will not grow above twenty students, and the department plans to cap admission should a problem arise.

Morrone inquired about a plan to increase recruitment for undergraduate students. Scheuerman responded that they have hired an Executive Aide who was a recruiter for the military. The department has and will continue to participate in local high schools, as well as recruitment days on campus. The faculty is also planning to work with guidance counselors at high schools to get into classrooms to increase knowledge of environmental health at the high school level.

Morrone then asked for an update on the External Advisory Committee. Scheuerman noted that it had been formed, and the first meeting will be in the fall after the Ph.D. program is finalized. They may add additional people as the committee continues.

Krinn then presented the Graduate Program report. He indicated that reviewing the programs (Undergraduate and Graduate) presents difficulties. The majority of the problems are the same – i.e., will the Ph.D. program pull resources away from the program, and the HVAC issue in the labs. Specific to the graduate program, Krinn indicated that the self-study did not contain all the necessary information. The outcome indicators for the Masters degree are not clear, although the curriculum is strong and appropriate. The students complete a final project. However, there are no requirements designed to ensure competencies.

Scheuerman responded. With respect to the graduate program, he indicated that this fall would see the implementation of an exam, or outcome indicators for Masters students, which will help develop bench markers. In the past, the graduate program has been too many things, and the department is currently refocusing its priorities. There is currently an Administration concentration, and a Specialist

Concentration. The program has struggled to keep the core and flexibility within the risk assessment and management courses.

Scheuerman also noted the concerns of the site team with respect to the Doctoral Program. He noted that this program, specifically the budget for this program, was developed with the intent to maintain support for the Masters program. The Doctoral program will receive its own faculty position, as well as additional funding for resources. Scheuerman noted that the program and administration believe the addition of a Ph.D. Program will only enhance the current programs.

Silverman asked for clarification on the risk assessment skills, and whether almost all students received those skills, or whether all students received those skills. Scheuerman responded he believed that all students received risk assessment through other courses, and they also receive management skills in other courses, although the students might not necessarily get the opportunity to further their skills unless they take specific courses. He also noted he didn't believe that they had done a great job of documenting these competencies, but they are hoping the written exam will assist and clarify these competencies.

There were no further questions. LaFollette recognized the site team of Keith Krinn, Barbara McCarthy and Gary Silverman and thanked them for their hard work. Scheuerman seconded that, and indicated that the site team was very helpful and he was interested and willing to work with the Council however necessary to address any deficiencies or problems. The meeting then went into closed session, and visitors left the room.

The Undergraduate Program at East Tennessee State University received full accreditation for six years. The Graduate Program at East Tennessee State University received conditional accreditation, and upon meeting those conditions, a full six-year accreditation. The conditions for ETSU's graduate program are that the program would need to demonstrate that within the curriculum, all graduates within both tracks meet requirements for competency in risk assessment, administration, risk communication and management.

Return to Agenda Item 8.1, Annual Enrollment Update

The next item on the agenda, the Re-Accreditation of East Carolina University, was postponed while the remaining faculty member from the school arrived. Tres continued her presentation from earlier in the day. She noted that several requests had been made, including separating out the newly accredited programs by number of students and diversity. She also noted that there had been a request to separate out programs by geographic area. LaFollette asked for other comments and questions.

Stephenson noted he was interested in breaking down faculty by experience within Environmental Health and other allied fields. Tres noted that AEHAP had recently completed an informal survey of its faculty to determine the level of experience both within and outside academia. Bohan took over the discussion, and noted that over the past several years, there has been a significant amount of discussion about the lack of practical or field experience by faculty at EHAC programs. However, based on the AEHAP survey, that seems untrue. Of 31 faculty members responding, 28 had experience outside of academia, and 23 of 31 had more than five years experience. Bohan noted this would be discussed more in depth at AEHAP's meeting.

McCarthy inquired about the Annual Update, and whether the office had concrete data on the number of full time versus adjunct faculty. Tres answered yes, but as with most questions on the Annual Update, the office provides detailed instructions to the programs to answer the questions, but then the faculty answer these questions how they see fit, so the data is often not uniform. She noted that everyone deciphers questions differently, and different people answer the survey each year.

Morrone noted she felt this is important data, and that it is not necessary to do more analysis. She noted that as long as the Council sees the limitations of the data, it will be fine as is, and should Council members wish, they can do analysis how they see fit.

11.0 East Carolina University

The next item, the re-accreditation of East Carolina University (ECU) began. Drs. Dan Sprau and Alice Anderson entered the meeting. The site team for East Carolina University, both Undergraduate and Graduate, included Michele Morrone, Dan Harper and Carolyn Harvey.

Morrone began with the Undergraduate report. She noted that the site team had a very good impression of the program and the University. The faculty is fully staffed, and they receive outstanding support from their Administration and the Chair of their department. There are currently making improvements to their facilities, which are ongoing. There are also several "visiting" faculty, which is the label for adjunct faculty.

The Undergraduate curriculum presented no major issues. They comply with methodology, issues and topics. They meet the guidelines for internship requirements.

Harvey then described the Graduate curriculum. ECU is currently undergoing a major transition, and is currently changing focus from a Masters in both environmental health and industrial hygiene to a Masters degree in environmental health, with both a research option and an applied option. They meet and exceed the Masters/Graduate program guidelines. There is an online program for the Masters degree, which is the applied option. The requirements for this track include an RS or REHS certification to be admitted, and the degree is geared towards working professionals who wish to further their education.

Morrone then discussed the remainder of the site team visit. She noted they met with students and alumni of both programs, which were very positive. ECU is working to improve their student association, and students demonstrated an understanding of potential changes in the program curriculum and administration. The site team was satisfied with both the Undergraduates and Graduates in the program.

The recommendations from the site team are purely to enhance the program. There are no recommendations to rectify requirements or bring into compliance with the guidelines.

Professor Dan Sprau then took over and provided a response. He thanked the reviewers for their visit. He noted that in the past several years, the program has been in significant turmoil. Several years ago, the program was on the chopping block, and was saved through the hard work of AEHAP, Alumni and other local support. Sprau noted they were then transferred to a new college, within Health and Human Performance, where they receive significant support. Currently, the program has moved into temporary trailers while the building is being remodeled. When it is completed, they will receive twice as much office and lab space, and two new faculty slots. Sprau did note that faculty searches have been difficult in the past as the University requires terminal degrees, and finding qualified candidates is a problem.

Sprau also noted that enrollment has been an on-going issue, but has improved. He also has been given a lightened teaching load in the fall to focus on recruitment efforts. Another change Sprau noted is that he is officially going back to the U.S. Public Health Service, but will remain as a faculty member at ECU.

The third member of the site team, Harper, made a few comments. First, he noted he was very impressed with the diversity of the program at ECU, both within the faculty and the students. He was also impressed by the emphasis on practitioner skills, and especially after meeting with employers and learning of the quality of the student skills.

Professor Alice Anderson then provided brief comments regarding the graduate program. Anderson noted that the graduate student enrollment is increasing, and will be 15 in the fall. She also noted the new building will address many needs. She also noted many of the graduate students will be funded through grants and research. Professor Max Zarate of East Carolina has been working with community groups in the area, and securing monies to assist graduate students.

The floor was opened to questions. Morrone inquired about whether the displacement of faculty would factor into tenure decisions. Anderson replied that the plan for the next year for her position would address this issue, while Dr. Zarate's research allows him access to other lab space and buildings.

Krinn inquired about a recruitment strategy for the fall. Sprau answered that they are hoping to reach out to guidance counselors, as well as North Carolina's Community College system. However, the majority of students come to the program from on-campus. The department is also planning a presentation to the freshman introductory course, as well as alternate timing of courses to appeal to students. Krinn asked about the 2nd internship that the self-study described. Sprau answered that it is often something students elect to do, and it is typically on campus – within the Environmental Health & Safety Office or the Utilities building. Many students are not interested in leaving the East North Carolina area and many are first generation college graduates. However, Sprau is working to increase opportunities, including one he just returned from, with the International Atomic Energy Association, which took students to Chernobyl.

Silverman inquired about how the department ensured that students have a background in sciences for the graduate program. Sprau and Anderson answered that the student transcripts are reviewed, and ones without a strong science backgrounds are asked to make up the courses. However, Anderson stated this was an informal policy, and they are considering making a formal policy for this background requirement. Silverman asked about the students in the applied option program, and ensuring they graduate with research skills. Anderson answered that they are required to take a biostatistics methods course, and the program also offers a research options course. Sprau also indicated that they are required to complete a professional paper. Silverman then inquired about ensuring competencies or background in toxicology, epidemiology and risk assessment. Anderson answered that students are required to take twenty-one credit hours from a certain group of classes, including toxicology. While toxicology isn't necessarily required, students are not allowed to choose their classes on their own. Sprau also indicated that toxicology is included in the Industrial Hygiene/Risk Assessment classes, the Introduction course covers toxicology, which is a required course along with statistics and epidemiology. Risk Assessment is also covered under an industrial hygiene course.

Silverman asked about the administration skills required under the guidelines. Anderson answered that it is covered in the Environmental Health Program Management & Law (EHPML) course, which is a required course for the applied track. It is not required for the research-option, but thus far, everyone has taken it. McCarthy asked if this course included Risk Assessment, and Silverman asked that they outline all the courses that include Risk Assessment. Sprau answered that it is included in Biostatistics, Epidemiology, Environmental Health Program Management & Law, and Industrial Hygiene. Biostatistics and Epidemiology are both required. EHPML is not required but all students have taken it, and Industrial Hygiene is not required, but most students take this class.

There were no other questions. LaFollette thanked the site visit team, Michele Morrone, Carolyn Harvey, and Dan Harper. She asked visitors and Council Members with a potential conflict of interest to leave the room.

The session was re-opened to inquire about a course. Dan Harper and Alice Anderson re-joined the meeting. Morrone requested that one of them explain to the Council where Environmental Economics is covered in the Undergraduate curriculum, as it is not currently explained in Table 2. Sprau answered that it is included in the Undergraduate Course 4200, Environmental Health Management, a required course. Anderson indicated that it included the Ten Essential Services, general organization and legal topics, case studies, many of which deal with environmental economics, rule making, cost benefit analysis cost methodology, programs operation. Students are also required to keep a journal with news articles about current environmental health and environmental economics topics. The Council returned to closed session.

The Undergraduate Program at East Carolina University received full accreditation for six years The Graduate Program at East Carolina University received conditional accreditation, and upon meeting those conditions, full accreditation for the remaining 6 years. The conditions include providing documentation that all graduate students meet the guidelines criteria.

12.0 Recess for the Day

The meeting was recessed for the day. The Council will reconvene tomorrow morning, Friday June 23, 2006 at 8:30 a.m.

2006 Annual Meeting of the Council

Date:	Friday, June 23, 2006	Time:	8:30 a.m. – 5:30 p.m.
Purpose:	Annual business meeting of the Environmental Health Council to conduct the routine business of the Council, determine policies, and consider the accreditation status of academic Environmental Health programs.		
Members Present:	Randy Bentley, Pat Bohan, Eli Bermudez, Tania Busch, Jim Dingman, Dan Harper, Carolyn Harvey, Tom Hatfield, Phil Kneller, Keith Krinn, Sharron LaFollette, Barbara McCarthy, Michele Morrone, Vince Radke, Fan Robinson, Rick Rowe, Gary Silverman, Dale Stephenson, Don Williams.		
Guests Present:	David Gilkey, Alejandra Tres, Alison McIntosh, Judith Mazique, Ingrid Ritchie (via phone), Rob Blake, Allen Burton, Alice Anderson, Tim Kelley, Tim Ryan, Diana Rawlings.		

13.0 Re-Convene

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m.

14.0 Committee Reports

Undergraduate Committee Reports. Bermudez and Stephenson presented the Undergraduate Committee report. They indicated that there are seven undergraduate programs either seeking initial or re-accreditation this year. Next year, the tentative count is also for seven programs seeking initial or re-accreditation. In addition to these programs, two years ago saw two undergraduate programs receive conditional accreditation, and the next meeting will be the deadline for those programs to have met the conditions.

The first program was University of Wisconsin Eau Claire (UWEC). UWEC has already satisfied the conditions for its undergraduate programs. Spelman College is another program, and Bermudez has requested that the entire Council discuss this program. It is a subjective decision, and one that should likely be made as an entire Council. LaFollette described the process for removing the conditional accreditation. In cases where the condition was providing additional information or method of accounting, that decision can be sent to the Undergraduate or Graduate chairs, who review the initial decision, the letter, and the reply by the University. They then present the decision to the Chair. Should no issues arise, the decision is final and presented to the Board. However, in more complicated cases or in cases where there is disagreement on the Board, the decision will come to the Council.

LaFollette then returned to the matter of the University of Wisconsin Eau Claire. As indicated on their Annual Update report, one faculty member is leaving and this leaves them short of the FTE requirement. Hatfield made a motion to give UWEC one year to present a report to the Council which addresses their progress towards finding a faculty member. It was seconded by Robinson.

McCarthy inquired where such a letter requesting the report might be sent, and it was answered that it would go to the signatories on the self-studies. Morrone was concerned about giving the program one year to find a faculty member. It is a difficult task, and they must have addressed this thus far – otherwise classes would be cancelled. Stephenson indicated that nothing has yet been communicated with UWEC, this is solely based on their Annual Update report. LaFollette also responded that the motion is for information and accountability, and Silverman added that the motion is supportive of the program. LaFollette called for the vote. The vote was 16 in favor, none opposed, and one abstention. The motion passes. Bermudez will write a letter to UWEC.

The next item was the Graduate Committee Report. Harvey informed the Council that UWEC also has a conditional accreditation for its graduate program, which has not yet been met. She will be contacting the program to let them know they need to provide information to the Council. The University of Findlay also

received conditional accreditation last year, and will require the Council to receive an update and revisit the issue at the 2007 meeting. Harvey will also send a letter of reminder to Findlay. Next year, California State University at Northridge's graduate program will be up for re-accreditation. Old Dominion University may also seek initial accreditation for its graduate program.

Self-Study, Primary Reviewer Assignments. LaFollette indicated that all Council Members are expected to read all self-studies. However, they are assigned to read one – to – two self-studies in depth, and provide comments to the site team no later than February 1. She then asked for volunteers. The tentative list of primary reviewers is:

Program	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2
Bowling Green State University	Patrick Bohan	Rick Rowe
California State University at Northridge (Undergraduate)	Tim Ryan	Randy Bentley
California State University at Northridge (Graduate)	Keith Krinn	Jim Dingman
California State University at San Bernardino	Tania Busch	Eliezer Bermudez
East Central University	Carolyn Harvey	Phillip Kneller
Illinois State University	Vince Radke	Tom Hatfield
Indiana State University	Fan Robinson	Diana Rawlings
Richard Stockton College	Gary Silverman	Dale Stephenson
North Carolina Central University (Potential New Program)	Alice Anderson	Don Williams
Old Dominion University Graduate Program (Potential)	Alice Anderson	Tom Hatfield

LaFollette then inquired about Council Members or Volunteers who have yet to participate in a site visit. They include: Tim Ryan, Tania Busch, Alice Anderson and David Gilkey. LaFollette then asked for former Council Members who might be willing to volunteer for site visits. She (LaFollette) volunteered as well as Morrone.

15.0 EHAC Recognition

Stephenson presented the Council with information on possible recognition for EHAC. First, he asked Silverman to present some history on the subject. Silverman responded that in the early 1990's, there was a plethora of certifications that schools could receive, and as a way to separate EHAC from the many other types of certification; they applied for certification by the United States Department of Education (USDE). It was a very expensive process, and assisted with EHAC's development of its own internal structure. However, after going through this process, the USDE changed its requirement, and as a result EHAC withdrew its request to be recognized by USDE.

Stephenson went back to the matter at hand. He believes that EHAC would receive a value from being recognized by CHEA, the Council on Higher Education Accreditation, which would be the best fit for EHAC at this point. An external body would review policies and structure, and provide feedback. However, CHEA Recognition is fairly expensive – at least \$10,000 per year. Stephenson also reminded the Council that for environmental health programs, there is another option – ABET is now accrediting such programs, although no program has yet to apply.

LaFollette reminded the Council of yesterday's budget discussion, and she requested that the Board and Treasurer examine what ways this would impact the yearly budget. Tres indicated that during her time at

EHAC, the recognition issue has been one that has been examined annually by the Council, and generally thought not to be worthwhile. She has, as part of her work with EHAC, continued to maintain both an interest in recognition and whether or not people that work with EHAC are interested in our recognition. In recent years, and in particular, this year, interest in recognition has increased significantly, from the Centers for Disease Control and the United States Public Health Service. Radke questioned how much time such an endeavor would require, and Silverman responded that it took a tremendous amount of time. LaFollette requested that the Board for next year review and examine this issue in more depth.

16.0 Linkages with AEHAP

AEHAP President Patrick Bohan provided the Council with a brief update on the Association of Environmental Health Academic Programs (AEHAP). He thanked the staff for their work, and noted that he was completing his term as President of the organization. Recent accomplishments by AEHAP include the recent signing of a three-year cooperative agreement with the CDC, of which AEHAP just received notice of its second year funding. Other projects include assessing faculty experience, working to include the Ten Essential Services and PACE-EH into the curriculum at accredited programs, and researching best practices in recruitment and retention. AEHAP also selected its second NSF Scholar, in partnership with NSF International. AEHAP has also increased its efforts to work towards better environmental health policy. Pat provided the Council with a flyer with regards to potential budget cuts that asks folks to call their Senators and oppose these cuts.

Krinn inquired about PACE-EH, and whether that was still a useful tool. Radke and Bohan both replied, yes, it was very useful, and being used and evaluated in several places. Robinson noted that Indian Health Service uses it with Tribes as well.

Silverman then referenced discussions earlier in the meeting, and stated he was interested in the relationship between AEHAP and EHAC. He noted that a grant needed to be written to fund the Undergraduate Guidelines Conference, and that in years past, he would have thought that this would be something AEHAP would undertake. LaFollette indicated that the Office, as EHAC, did write the grant for the Guidelines Conference, and that as EHAC continues to increase its infrastructure, EHAC continues to use more time to carry out its function. LaFollette also noted that AEHAP is constrained by its major source of funding – the Cooperative Agreement with the Centers for Disease Control. Silverman noted that he felt this was a major shift in the relationships, and Bohan suggested that representatives from both Boards of Directors discuss the matter. Radke also noted that, from his perspective as an employee of the CDC, the monitoring and reporting of Cooperative Agreements has changed significantly. In years previously, organizations often had a Project Officer who understood the organization's role and mission, and the complexities, whereas now, flexibility has decreased and oversight has increased – and not just for AEHAP, but everything within CDC. Bohan seconded this thought, and noted that AEHAP responds to a request for proposals from the CDC.

17.0 Report on the Conference for New Schools and Programs, AEHAP

Bohan presented a report to the Council on a recent Conference held by AEHAP. In 2005, AEHAP received funding from the CDC, EPA, and NSF International to bring together programs, specifically Minority Serving Institutions, to learn about environmental health programs and accreditation, and provide feedback about the accreditation process and barriers faced by these institutions.

Bentley, who attended the Conference, also noted that participants were particularly interested in job opportunities for their students. He noted that as a practitioner in the private sector, he is faced with having to hire a significant amount of employees in the coming years. Particularly being in the Pacific Northwest, recruiting and retaining diverse employees is difficult.

Tres informed the Council more about the Conference. It was a great opportunity to explain both EHAC and accreditation, and the conference not only included Minority Serving Institutions, but also schools in geographically underserved areas. Since the conference, 8 of 19 have been matched with mentors, and four have joined AEHAP, and one was elected to the Council. Tres then presented a powerpoint

presentation which described the conference. The powerpoint also explained the last session of the conference, which involved the participants providing feedback – on information they were interested in obtaining, resources they thought they would need, etc. Staff had worked with the participants, and they had divided the list into categories – i.e., items AEHAP could provide, items that AEHAP could advocate for, and items that EHAC would be best suited to provide.

The list of items that EHAC would be best suited to provide included:

- Goals and Objectives for required courses.
- Clarify roles of professionals with two- and four-year degrees.
- Specific course content and syllabi.
- Sample Self-Study.
- List of Core competencies.
- Information on program data.
- Address course requirements, e.g. organic chemistry.
- Background and credentials of faculty.

Krinn inquired about schools in Arizona, and Tres responded that Arizona had severe budget cuts to its higher education programs, and had therefore decided against creating new programs. Tres then indicated that the most important aspect of assisting new programs as they work towards accreditation is mentorship, and she asked for volunteers to assist in the mentor process. Silverman, Harper, Harvey, Bohan, Robinson, and Krinn volunteered. Silverman, however, noted that mentorship is a two way street, and programs must also return communication.

18.0 Texas Southern University

Professor Judith Mazique entered the meeting. Texas Southern University is seeking initial accreditation. Its site team included Bohan, Robinson and Bentley.

Bohan provided the Site Team Report. He noted that Texas Southern University is a Historically Black College in Houston, Texas. It has had an environmental health program for thirty years, within the Health Sciences Department. Dr. Jones directs the program, which began as an Environmental Engineering Department. The Dean is very supportive of the Program and its Professors. When Mazique initially began to work towards accreditation, the Dean provided \$100,000 toward funding for equipment and other needs. The program currently has three full time faculty, with a fourth position open. There are 33 students, with all of whom the site team met. The students are all energetic, supportive and interested in the accreditation process. The site team also met with 8 – 9 alumni, several of whom drove multiple hours from around the Houston area to meet with the site team.

The program has excellent opportunities and resources, including computers. They developed an Advisory Committee in 2005, which includes a member of the Commission on Environmental Quality, an Occupational Health Researcher from the University of Texas, an Environmental Policy specialist, and a cancer researcher. Currently, the Health Sciences Department is planning to split from the College of Pharmacy, and it is hoped that this will result in increased lab space for the Environmental Health Program.

Currently, the courses Epidemiology and Bio-Statistics are combined into one course. However, the course meets three times a week, for two hours. It is only four credits, although it could be as much as six. It is not an easy course, and the classroom time is equivalent to two courses. The program does not require microbiology, but it does require environmental microbiology. The site team recommended that the faculty increase the number and documentation of student progress reviews, and formalize the advisory committee, as well as implement a marketing plan to increase recruitment of students.

Bentley then provided his comments. He noted that the program is very structured, and includes a timeline for course completion. There are no electives, but the program is very successful and has a high rate of retention. The program requires 146 hours for graduation. Students were very appreciative of the structure, and alumni also felt the same way.

Robinson also provided comments. It was her first site visit, and she was very impressed. She noted that the program had access to two additional area universities for research, and she was impressed both with the course load, but also the science requirements and basis for the program. Bentley also noted that they could identify their own program budget, which was important and would ensure future planning for the program.

Mazique then responded. She provided the Council with a hard copy report to the Site Team. First, she thanked the site team for their visit – it was two long days filled with a very packed schedule, and she thanked them for their hard work.

Mazique noted that Texas Southern University (TSU) is a very diverse school, in the heart of Houston. Since the time of the site visit, the Provost that the site team met has become the President of the University. Mazique also noted she brought four students with her to NEHA this year. Since the visitors made recommendations about upgrading lab space, Mazique and the program have implemented this. They are in the process of taking over a floor in their building, and expanding their lab space.

With the recommendation regarding the Epidemiology and Bio Statistics, she noted the program has internally worked very hard to improve this course and ensure students get all the knowledge they need, and the program believes students learn more and do better with the combined course. After they take the combined course, which is the course hour equivalent to two courses, they take a Research Methods course.

With the recommendation on Microbiology versus Environmental Microbiology, the Department made the decision to possibly eliminate the Environmental Microbiology course, and then require students to take the general Microbiology, and add an environmental health component to the class. Regarding the recommendation for student records, she noted that advisors haven't been in the habit of setting official meeting times with students and recording their conversations. This has been changed, and students will now be asked to meet with their advisors two times per semester, or three times in the semester in which they graduate. She has created a form for the advising.

Regarding the recommendation or query about equipment, Mazique provided a list of equipment found in the lab. Regarding the advisory committee recommendation, she has formalized the structure, added an alumni practitioner, and the committee is scheduled to meet on July 2nd. With respect to the recommendation about a student recruitment plan, she noted that TSU had received a grant from AEHAP to assist with recruitment, and they have been increasing their efforts. The department also contacted a recruiter on campus.

The floor was opened to questions. McCarthy inquired about the Epidemiology Biostatistics course. She wanted to know about the Health Research course, and whether this was a two course sequence. Mazique answered that students did first take the Epidemiology/Biostatistics course, and then took the Health Research course, although due to scheduling, they might not necessarily take them in concurrent terms. Mazique noted they are required to take the Epidemiology/Biostatistics course prior to the Health Research course.

Krinn inquired about the background of the faculty and whether any had practitioner backgrounds. Mazique answered yes, their new faculty member worked for several years as a practitioner at Dow Chemical. She also noted they have several alumni guest lecturers, who work in various capacities at state agencies. Mazique said that she was not allowed to hire them as adjuncts due to state requirements. Krinn then inquired about the relationship with the Texas Environmental Health Association. Mazique answered that students have attended, but not yet presented. They do participate also in NEHA, the student club at TEHA, and there is a student environmental health club on campus. Krinn also inquired about the internship records. Mazique responded that students are required to submit a log or journal, as well as a final report. Supervisors are also contacted monthly for updates about student progress.

Morrone inquired about the advisors for students. Mazique answered that she has been the advisor for all students, but they are currently working to divide the workload. Morrone then asked about Organic

Chemistry 1 & 2. Mazique answered that they are both pre-requisites for the program, although she doesn't believe they were included on the Table. Bermudez noted that it was included in the site visit report.

LaFollette inquired about the average time students take to graduate, and whether the number of credit hours was large for the University. Mazique answered that most finish in four years, and most take the internship, of which most are paid, during the summer. She noted that the program exceeds the norm for course hours, and have considered combining several classes, such as Water Quality and Wastewater, and Solid Waste and Hazardous Waste. However, the department wants to ensure that students are well prepared, particularly with the variety of environmental health issues in Texas.

Dingman asked about the policy highlighted in the site visitor report that students must receive a C or above, or they are required to take the class again. Mazique indicated that was university policy, and students did not like it, but it helped them once they graduated. 80% are employed within 3 – 6 months. Harvey made suggestions for cutting some of the curriculum, such as one of the organic chemistry classes, and possibly combining some of the topics courses. Mazique indicated that this is an internal discussion at the Department, and the professor that has been in the department the longest feels very strongly about maintaining the current class structure. Harper asked about the relationships with local community colleges, and Mazique answered that the Houston Community College had developed a program and relationship with TSU, and that was assisting in recruitment.

There were no remaining questions. Robinson indicated, as a final site visitor comment, that after meeting her students and alumni, she would gladly hire them. LaFollette thanked the site visitors, Bohan, Bentley and Robinson for their efforts. The meeting was then closed to visitors and members with potential conflicts of interest.

Texas Southern University received full accreditation for six years.

19.0 Indiana University – Purdue University at Indianapolis

Professor Ingrid Ritchie joined the meeting via teleconference. Stephenson took over as Chair of the meeting, as LaFollette is a site visitor for Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI)

IUPUI is seeking initial, first time accreditation for their undergraduate program. The site visitors for IUPUI were LaFollette, Rawlings and Williams.

LaFollette gave the site visitor report. IUPUI is an umbrella university – the State University system combined two existing universities in Indianapolis. The environmental health program is within the School of Public and Environmental Affairs. While the administration is rather nebulous, the school functions well. Dr. Ritchie is the director of the program. LaFollette explained that the program meets the requirements for the Biological Sciences. She also explained that the department requires a different Organic Chemistry than is required of science majors. The program also requires Epidemiology, Toxicology, and is very heavy on the statistics requirements. Students also take two courses of environmental economics, and the remainder of the topic areas are infused through the curriculum. Students receive in-depth coverage of five topic areas. Students also take two lab Data Analysis courses, and they are required to complete an internship as well. The program has a 3.25 FTE to meet the curriculum.

Williams took over to describe the students. Williams mentioned that students recognized the need for increasing the amount of chemistry labs, which mirrored the alumni comments as well. He also noted that students complete the program in a cohort system, which fosters togetherness among the students. He also noted the faculty was exceptional. Rawlings was also very impressed with their Certification programs.

LaFollette then completed the site visitor report. One item of note was that three of the students in the program had received honors as being in the top 100 students academically within the University. Williams seconded this thought and informed the Council that the student body is 29,000. LaFollette also

noted that the Associate Faculty have backgrounds as practitioners. She also noted the program offers its students certifications in Food Safety and Sanitation.

The site team recommended that the program increase the number of labs, the program needs to ensure that students receive the one and a half years of basic sciences, the 101/110 Chemistry sequence needs to be improved. The site team also recommended: (1) advising sheets to assist in guiding students, (2) the formation of an advisory committee, and (3) an encouragement to increase enrollment.

Ritchie was given the floor for her response. First, Ritchie thanked the Council for accommodating her need to appear via teleconference. She also thanked LaFollette, Williams and Rawlings for an excellent and very collegial site visit. Ritchie noted that progress has been made as per the recommendations of the site team.

With respect to the biology, the curriculum now includes a Human Biology with lab class as a supplement to the Microbiology requirement. This is also part of the SPEA efforts to increase the distinction between the environmental health department and other, environmental studies related curriculum.

With respect to Chemistry 105/106, Ritchie has been working to devise a solution. In part, the department is concerned about losing majors to the other environmental studies related departments. As such, Ritchie is proposing to create Tracks, which will separate and differentiate those that take the more difficult chemistry classes with the Organic Chemistry class as having graduated from the accredited degree program.

Ritchie also identified a list of courses that would be suggested to meet the one and a half years basic sciences requirements, and informed the Council that students would be directed to these courses through advising. Ritchie also explained that the lab work and hands-on experiences would increase and intensify across the curriculum, although the department is concerned about diluting the existing lab classes.

As for the remaining recommendations, Ritchie replied that the Department would absolutely implement advising sheets. That will be completed once the curriculum changes are in effect. The Advisory Council has stayed in touch informally, and there are plans to formalize the Council with 4 – 6 members. Invites will be going out in the fall. The funding for lab equipment, while important, is hard to guarantee. They have seen modest increases since the site visit, and the department is working to forge a relationship with state and local health departments to increase opportunities for students.

The Program is under pressure to increase enrollment, and they are facing competition from the Environmental Studies department. They are seeking ideas, and are interested in moving forward.

The floor was opened to questions.

Krinn asked about graduates – and what their degree states. Ritchie replied that students from their program graduate from Indiana University at Indianapolis. Krinn asked about the population on campus. Ritchie replied that in the last ten years, the percentage of students who are more traditional students – i.e., directly from high school full time has significantly increased, although the University is still considered a commuter campus. Krinn asked about a student Environmental Health clubs, and whether the program had a relationship to the Indiana Environmental Health Association. Ritchie answered that yes, there was a student club, and she, as the Advisor, is currently working to build the club. As of yet, they do not have a relationship with the Indiana Environmental Health Association, but interest from students is growing.

Krinn then asked about the internship program. Ritchie replied that the Institution places limits on internship requirements. Students that have less than a 2.5 GPA are not allowed to do internships. For those who do not, they take a field requirement course, but this has no substantive differences from the internship experiences. Ritchie also explained that the faculty sponsor sets the specific requirements of the internship. Most require a weekly log, a paper, a student evaluation and an employer evaluation. A sampling of these records was made available to the site visit team.

Morrone inquired about the tracks, and whether these were approved. Ritchie replied that the tracks had been approved by the Administration. The requirements for what would be the non-accredited track are not substantially weaker but there are differences. Ritchie is unsure – if all the necessary courses are required – what will happen. At the moment, she feels at a disadvantage for recruitment, and wants to see how the process will go. Hatfield inquired as to whether she would recruit students into the accredited track, and Ritchie stated yes, the benefits of the accredited track would be marketed to students, both on campus, in community colleges and high schools. Anderson asked if the track would be phased out, and Ritchie replied yes, they would work to phase out the track within three years.

There were no remaining questions. Stephenson recognized the site visitors, Sharron LaFollette, Don Williams and Diana Rawlings. He thanked them, and the meeting was then closed to visitors and those with a potential conflict of interest.

Indiana University – Purdue University at Indianapolis received conditional accreditation, and upon meeting those conditions, full six-year accreditation. The conditions are as follows: first, the program must add a requirement for a biology class, second, the program should add a chemistry track that increased the required level of chemistry classes and third, the program creates a mechanism to require and document the one and a half years basic sciences.

20.0 President of the National Environmental Health Association

Rob Blake, incoming 1st Vice President for NEHA joined the meeting. He apologized first on behalf of Rick Collins, the Incoming President, who was held up in Atlanta. Blake indicated that both he, personally, and NEHA have been concerned about the recent program closures, particularly Ferris State University last year. At the same time, they have been most excited by new programs and universities that are receiving accreditation. Blake also let the Council know that Central Michigan University was possibly working towards a program, and that was very exciting. Blake is interested in encouraging students to increase their involvement, and he is interested in hearing from the Council on ways to increase and improve the relationship between the organizations for the betterment of the field.

Krinn began by requesting that NEHA consider allowing EHAC an ex-officio seat on the NEHA Board. Blake responded that he would write down suggestions and questions, and present them to the NEHA Board.

Robinson then took the floor, explained that she was a civilian employee for Indian Health Service, and that currently, she is working to change the requirements for these positions to require a college degree, and is interested in gathering letters of support, including from NEHA.

LaFollette then applauded NEHA for their proactive efforts to increase student involvement. She let Blake know that as a Professor, she has joined NEHA solely for the sake of her students. She feels there is much NEHA could do to increase benefits to its students, including assisting them in attending the conference. Harvey indicated that her University brought 7 students, and will continue to bring students, despite obstacles and hurdles. Stephenson also seconded this, asking NEHA to reach out more to students.

Harper indicated that diversity in environmental health is increasing, particularly among students, and it is great to see the increased diversity within NEHA leadership, however, it is important to continue to increase efforts to increase the number of qualified graduates. He suggested that NEHA consider approaching Congress, and requesting funding for students.

LaFollette inquired about more marketing of the field, and Blake responded he knew that Tom Dickey, at NEHA, had started a workforce development consortium, which he and EHAC's Executive Director, Alejandra Tres, were both part of. The consortium has been working on increasing visibility for the field, as well as increasing initiatives to get and retain qualified employees. He also noted that Nelson Fabian, NEHA's Executive Director, appeared on Dateline.

Tres inquired about two items. First, she asked Blake what percentage of the field NEHA represents, and with the policy presence, what have the outcomes been? Blake and Dingman answered that there are no hard numbers, but it is a fairly small portion due to the large amount of subspecialties. Dingman also indicated that studies show that younger professionals aren't joining NEHA or other professional organizations. Krinn pointed out that if you were to add in Affiliate memberships, the number would be larger. Dingman also answered the policy question, informing the Council that NEHA had recently hired a part-time employee in Washington, D.C. So far, results have been good and he has been invited to many federal level meetings, although NEHA has no plans to lobby.

Krinn asked that Blake bring EHAC up to speed on technology related efforts at NEHA. Blake answered that Fabian is pushing to go more and more online, particularly with the REHS study class. The NEHA website has also been improved. Bohan then inquired about the strategy to revitalize environmental health services that was published by CDC a few years passed, and indicated that this is a very important report that should not be shelved – he inquired if NEHA had a plan to ensure this remained a priority. Blake answered that he would look into it.

Blake was thanked for his presence, and the Council moved on to the next agenda item, the outcome assessment discussion and presentation.

21.0 Undergraduate Outcome Assessment Update

Silverman began with a presentation of the results of the last set of outcome assessment surveys. He indicated that four programs – those seeking re-accreditation this year – had submitted surveys. The major areas of deficiency, from 1997-2003 have been soils, and environmental law and policy. The major areas of deficiency in 2005-2006 were environmental economics, risk communication and hydrogeology. Areas of over preparation for 2005-2006 were noise, food and vectors. The response rates were: East Carolina University, 12%; East Tennessee State University, 8%; Salisbury University, 15%; and Wright State University, 22%.

LaFollette was interested in seeing a summary of the outcome assessment data from 2005-2006 on the web. Silverman indicated that this would require posting a copy of the survey questions as well – so that the raw data and reported data would make sense within the context of the report. Bentley felt it was acceptable to post the survey to the web. Silverman indicated that in the past, several schools have been interested in administering the survey electronically every year, and allowing them access to the survey would allow them to do this. Bermudez pointed out that they likely had a copy of the survey instrument as it hasn't changed in recent years. LaFollette indicated that the web committee should examine the issue of placing both the data and the survey instrument online, and report to the Board.

Silverman then moved to the discussion regarding the web-based outcome assessment survey. In the past, EHAC has moved to develop a web-based outcome assessment tool. Graduates and supervisors are sent a link, directly to the survey. Currently, the survey is being taken through the EHAC website. After it is taken, the survey results are downloaded to a .CSV file, which can then be uploaded into Excel, or another spreadsheet program. However, there are several problems. First, surveys are submitted individually, so staff must take the survey, and cut and paste into an excel file with the other surveys. Second, not all the fields code in the same way every time, depending on what is entered by survey respondents, so Silverman is required to do a significant amount of work on the back end of the survey, to prepare the data for analysis.

As a result, the Board has recently been examining potential survey options, including two, web-based survey tools, Web Surveyor and Survey Monkey. Staff prepared a comparison chart that lists the two companies, and explains the issue. There were questions about the number of surveys that could be ongoing with both companies. Staff explained that for the price listed, on Survey Monkey, we could develop unlimited surveys with unlimited responses. However, with Web Surveyor, for the price listed, we would only be able to develop one survey. To test the survey, the office used the survey's conditional skip logic available, to separate the graduate from the supervisor, but keep both the questions within one survey.

LaFollette inquired if this would decrease the workload. Silverman answered that yes, once the surveys were set up, the workload would be done except for data analysis. Ryan inquired about the timeline for this survey, and the office answered that it could be up and running within a month or two. Bermudez inquired if programs would still have the option to use paper surveys, and LaFollette answered that yes, it must always be an option. Busch pointed out that it did not make sense to invest money and staff time into an online option if no one is responding to the survey. She feels that it is important to address the response rate issue first, then worry about whether or not to increase the capabilities of the online survey. Tres responded that yes, the Council still needed to think about getting people to increase their response rate, but the movement of the Council has increasingly been towards electronic.

Bentley indicated that this was something that was a fairly low expenditure, and something that would need to be tried eventually. McCarthy made a motion that we purchase the year account with Survey Monkey on a trial basis. It was seconded by Kneller, and all were in favor. Silverman inquired about the response rate, and it was noted that the committee should consider this topic. Bermudez also noted that the letters to the programs go out August 15th, so the survey needed to be functional by that point. It was so noted.

22.0 Graduate Outcome Assessment Update

LaFollette presented information on a possible graduate program-specific outcome assessment survey. Currently, graduate programs use the same survey tool as undergraduate programs. However, Harvey noted that with the revised graduate guidelines and the corresponding new programs, the current survey does not allow for a good assessment of the new programs. Harvey noted that she and LaFollette were asking the new Chair and the Council to set up a committee to review and revise the tool based on the new guidelines. Silverman noted that the majority of the survey includes big picture type questions and skills, and should fit with these programs. LaFollette indicated that we have approximately five years before these programs come up for re-accreditation, and we need to be prepared. Rowe, Silverman and Harvey volunteered to serve on the committee, with Harvey serving as Chair.

23.0 Web Committee Update

Busch provided the Council with an update on the web committee. For the past three years, the Council has been using a system with the majority of the documents for the Annual Meeting and the business of the Council have been online. This system has been operational and successful, and will continue to work.

Last year, the Council redesigned its logo, and there has been an effort to redevelop its website as well. Our web-designer has made a mock-up of the new site, which everyone liked. Silverman inquired about how long putting up the new page would take, and Busch replied that we would simply be changing the background with a few minor changes to the structure. As a result, it would take very little time.

Return to Agenda Item 9.3. 2007 Budget

The Council returned to the Budget, which had been tabled on Day One. The budget was amended to include the Survey Monkey item, at \$200. Dingman made a motion that we approve the budget as amended. Robinson seconded the motion, and all were in favor.

Return to Agenda Item 22. Outcome Assessment

The next discussion was regarding increasing the response rate from surveys. There were discussions about following up with graduates and supervisors who had not yet returned the survey, but it was answered that due to restrictions by the Internal Review Board (IRB) that the survey respondents had to remain anonymous, thereby preventing any follow up. Busch offered, as a member of the web committee, to review the current response rate, talk to program directors about their choosing the web-based survey over paper, and work from there. There was a call for volunteers to assist with the web committee, and Robinson and Anderson agreed to participate.

24.0 Wright State University

Professor Allen Burton of Wright State University joined the meeting. The site visitors for Wright State University were Vince Radke and Chuck Treser. Allen Burton began by indicating this is his fourth re-accreditation – he has been at Wright State for twenty-one years.

Radke gave the site visit report. He noted that his fellow Site Visitor, Chuck Treser was at the World Congress on Environmental Health in Dublin. He thanked Dr. Burton and their staff – for being very gracious hosts and making the site visit easy. He also thanked Bentley, who provided primary reviewer comments.

Radke indicated that Wright State University recently developed a doctoral program, and is in the process of developing a Masters of Public Health (MPH) program, and Dr. Burton has been instrumental in developing the proposal. He has tried to ensure that the undergraduate program will benefit from the increased resources, and that students will also be able to enroll in that program directly from the undergraduate program.

At the time of the site visit, the program required 199 credit hours. They have since revised their curriculum, and are now at 191 hours. The core courses exceed the basic requirements of EHAC. They also have an internship program, which is 9 credit hours, and is 400 hours in the field. However, Radke noted that most students choose to do more. Students submit a weekly activity report as well. The University has access to the Ohio Link, which is an invaluable library resource.

In recent years, enrollment and graduation rates have been a concern, as enrollment has decreased. The program has introduced a new general education course, and has begun working with high schools to let them know early about environmental health.

The program has five adjunct faculty, as well as two full time professors. They have an advisory committee, and while the committee doesn't meet regularly, they are fully up to date on the program, and impressed with the work of Dr. Burton. The program also receives good support from the Administration. The concerns of the site team were the enrollment, the need to bring lab equipment up to date, and the heavy reliance on Dr. Brown and Dr. Burton.

Dr. Burton then took over his response. He thanked both Treser and Radke, for being an excellent site team. Over the years, the curriculum has changed to some extent, but the basics have remained the same. The program has always had excessive basic science requirements, but it helps students, particularly those that apply to graduate school. The program has always received positive feedback from students and employers.

The program has several adjuncts who teach and very much enjoy teaching. The same adjuncts have remained for many years, and have a wealth of capabilities. The program has a new doctoral program, and 51 students have been enrolled into the MPH Program. The MPH degree program was started because a local health department director approached the university, and communicated the need for such a program. It has been a positive improvement for the undergraduate program – and they have hired new faculty with expertise in epidemiology and environmental health, who will begin teaching classes soon.

Wright State has also undergone a renovation, and this will increase the space for the program, as well as research space. A new development since the site visit has been that the Institute for Environmental Quality – where the program has been housed – has merged with the Earth and Environmental Studies Department, and Dr. Burton will be the new Chair. This is an exciting opportunity, and makes the program more secure.

Challenges to the program have included low enrollment, which they are trying to correct with many different strategies, including updating their website, and visiting high schools each fall. The curriculum is inflexible with little room for electives, and they are trying to do more refinements to improve it. They are

also working to improve their alumni database, and spending both time and money to reach alumni, and gather better contact information.

The floor was then opened to questions. McCarthy asked if the program, with 191 credit hours was on the quarter system. Burton answered that yes, it was. Stephenson asked if Burton would remain the head of the program, as well as Department Chair. Burton answered no, Dr. Hunt Brown would begin as Director of the Environmental Health Program.

LaFollette inquired about the comprehensive exam, and what was done with the data. Burton answered that each key course instructor submitted questions to the exam. The questions remain the same, as Burton would like to maintain consistent baseline data. He believes students are well prepared, and employers believe they are well prepared as well. Rowe asked where the graduates went. Burton responded that it seemed to be a cycle of approximately two-three years. Graduates have entered all sectors – government, private industry, public health departments, and at the moment, the majority seem to be entering consulting firms. Radke indicated that the alumni they spoke with felt their training allowed them to go anywhere. Burton also answered that most graduates stay in the area, but because of the large metropolitan area, there are a lot of opportunities. Anderson asked about the Ph.D. program, and the number of graduates. Burton responded that there were currently 26 Ph.D. students, but it has only been in existence for four years. They hope to have their first graduate next year.

There were no remaining questions. LaFollette recognized the site visitors, Chuck Treser and Vince Radke, and the meeting was closed to visitors and members with a potential conflict of interest.

Wright State University received full accreditation for six years.

25.0 Recess for the Day

The meeting was recessed for the day.

AGENDA

Annual Meeting of the Council – Day 3

Date:	Saturday, June 24, 2006	Time:	8:30 a.m. – 5:30 p.m.
Purpose:	Annual business meeting of the Environmental Health Council to conduct the routine business of the Council, determine policies, and consider the accreditation status of academic Environmental Health programs.		
Members Present:	Randy Bentley, Pat Bohan, Eli Bermudez, Tania Busch, Dan Harper, Carolyn Harvey, Tom Hatfield, Phil Kneller, Keith Krinn, Sharron LaFollette, Barbara McCarthy, Michele Morrone, Vince Radke, Fan Robinson, Rick Rowe, Gary Silverman, Dale Stephenson, Don Williams.		
Guests Present:	David Gilkey, Alejandra Tres, Alison McIntosh, Doug Weirick, Alice Anderson, Tim Kelley, Tim Ryan, Diana Rawlings, Elichia Venso, Lynn Burgess, Jack Hatlen, Steve Arnold, Bill Lindeman,		

26.0 Reconvene

The meeting was reconvened on June 24, 2006 at 8:30 a.m.

27.0 Salisbury University

The meeting began with the re-accreditation review of Salisbury University's Undergraduate Program. The site visitors are Phillip Kneller and Captain Mike Herring. Kneller thanked the primary reviewers who provided comments, as well as Salisbury for a wonderful site visit. He noted they met with the Vice-Provost, the Dean and both faculty in the program. They also met with employers, alumni and students. There were initial concerns regarding enrollment, with seven freshmen/sophomores in the program and 11 juniors/seniors.

The program easily meets the FTE requirement. The program is currently within the Department of Biology. The program meets the guidelines for the environmental health programmatic areas. Students complete internships, which are tied to the Administration Course – and they are given the opportunity to present information about their internships. The program meets the basic sciences requirement. While there was initial concern about the program meeting the computer requirement, upon visiting, the site team found that the program was more than sufficient in that area.

Enrollment has decreased over the last five years. The program is currently attempting to recruit 3-7 students each year. The team met with several alumni, which was a very positive experience. The site team made several recommendations – including formalizing the advisory committee, increasing the visibility of the environmental health program within the University, and increase innovative recruitment strategies.

The site team found that the administration is very supportive, students are very energetic, and enjoy their courses and faculty. The program has several adjunct faculty. The program also has connections with FEMA and the USDA, whose offices are located close to campus. The students spend one week in a FEMA training program. Students also have a high success rate of passing the RS exam – which they can take within one year as they graduate from the accredited program. All but one student from Salisbury passed on the first try (and that student passed on the 2nd try), while the statewide passing rate is only 42%. People sitting for the exam who are not from an accredited program must wait three years.

Herring provided his comments. He appreciated the opportunity to be involved in a site visit. The students were very impressive at Salisbury University. He also noted that the affiliation with the biology department is a double-edged sword – while it shields the program from visibility on campus, it also

protects it from being singled out for enrollment concerns. He noted that he was impressed by the level of support by the Dean.

Professor Elichia Venso took over her comments for the program. Venso noted that the process has been great, and the site visitors were very good and very supportive. She has nothing but praise for what the program received from the process. She noted that the program is making plans to increase the marketing and visibility of the program. She also noted that the campus has three environment-based programs, which include environmental health sciences, environmental studies and environmental marine sciences. The three programs are working together to increase their visibility and attract students on campus.

In efforts to increase enrollment, the program has gone to feeder institutions, and have enhanced their relationship with the admissions department. Dr. Wagoner spends time mentoring students and teaching, while Venso, in addition to teaching, spends time on research. She recently returned from a trip to France with students, where they presented research. She noted that the next challenge for the program is the upcoming retirements. She believes the program is stable for a minimum of three to five years, but that recruiting someone to take over the program will be a significant challenge. The administration is very supportive of this challenge. She thanked the site visit team, and the Council for their support.

The floor was then opened to questions. Radke inquired about the feeder institutions that had been approached by the program. Venso answered that high schools, as well as community colleges in Maryland, New Jersey and Pennsylvania had been approached. Radke also asked about whether the program would attempt to recruit biology majors. Venso answered that all biology students take a course that contains principles of environmental health. She also noted that the school has information regarding undecided students, and they will concentrate there. The enrollment must come up again – it has been as high as 60.

Morrone inquired about the budget for the University. Venso noted that the past three – four years have been difficult, budget-wise, and that has resulted in lower salaries. She noted that she has sent the Dean announcements for similar faculty positions to indicate a salary range, and while the program will not be able to offer higher salaries, they will hire someone.

McCarthy asked about the transition, and whether those conversations had started within the college. Venso answered that yes, the conversations have started. LaFollette inquired about the requirement for one and a half years additional basic sciences. Venso answered that students are required to take 6-8 credit hours from a list of required courses that completes those hours.

LaFollette then thanked and recognized site visitors Phillip Kneller and Mike Herring. The meeting was then closed to visitors and Council Members with a potential conflict of interest.

Salisbury University received full accreditation for six years.

28.0 Update by East Central University

East Central University then presented information on potential changes to their curriculum. The program is in the process of revising its curriculum, and is interested in receiving feedback from the Council regarding this change.

The program removed the course, CHEM 3114, Organic Chemistry. In its place, the program then required both General Chemistry I and II, as well as requiring a class previously titled Environmental Chemistry, which has since been renamed Environmental and Organic Chemistry. This new course title more accurately reflects the course content. Organic Chemistry is also included in six other courses taught as part of the Environmental Health curriculum.

This change has increased the required course hours within the Department, although there was a corresponding decrease in the number of related course work hours. Weirick provided the Council with a presentation, which showed the change in the College Catalog.

Weirick indicated he believed this change would strengthen the program, and more adequately provide students trained for the particular workforce they are entering. He also noted that this change received administrative support from the Chemistry Department, the Dean and the Provost. LaFollette inquired how the background areas were the same as those offered to basic science majors. Weirick replied that the year of General Chemistry plus Lab was the same as that offered to basic science majors. This did not include enough Organic Chemistry. Bentley inquired about the basics of organic chemistry, and whether the students were receiving that knowledge and how students were meeting the competency in toxicology required by the guidelines. Weirick answered that organic chemistry is infused through the curriculum, is taught within the new course – Environmental Organic Chemistry, and is also included in the epidemiology/toxicology courses. Stephenson and Morrone both thanked Weirick for presenting this change to the Council prior to seeking re-accreditation.

Harvey asked if the students were happier with the current course changes, and Weirick answered that yes, the majority had switched to this set of requirements. McCarthy asked if science majors could take Environmental Organic Chemistry. Weirick answered yes, although it would not be a substitute for organic chemistry one. Silverman asked if non-science majors could take the course. Weirick replied they had been able to in the past, but they had suffered. As a result, they are not taking the course any longer. LaFollette encouraged Weirick to look at the Guidelines, and their description of the background areas, and address this requirement in their self-study.

New Agenda Item – Hiring Standards for Civilians within the Indian Health Service

LaFollette then indicated she would like to take a few minutes to revisit and discuss some pending matters. The first one was by Robinson, who mentioned earlier in the meeting, her desire to work with EHAC to write a letter of support for changing the hiring requirements for Civilian employees of the Public Health Service to require a college degree. Bentley indicated due to the potentially political nature of the request, he would prefer it go to AEHAP rather than EHAC. Bohan requested that Robinson draft the letter and send it to the Office and AEHAP Board for review.

New Agenda Item – EHAC Committees, and Requests for Volunteers

The next item is the Committees. There have been several committees created, and tasked with a variety of projects. LaFollette would like to examine the current committees, and add members to assist with the workload.

- Undergraduate Guidelines Committee. It is currently made up of Stephenson, Bermudez and Stephenson. Robinson and Williams also volunteered for the committee.
- Nominations Committee. Williams is the current Chair of the committee, and Bohan and Silverman also volunteered.
- Budget Review Committee. As the newly elected treasurer, Silverman will Chair the committee. Rowe and Burgess volunteered to assist.
- Committee to address concerns from the Minority Serving Institutions Conference. Anderson, Burgess, Robinson, Aguirre, Harper and Harvey volunteered.
- Web Committee. Busch is the current Chair. Robinson, Anderson and Ryan volunteered.
- Mentor Committee. The Chair is an AEHAP lead – Judi Mazique. There were volunteers who agreed to be mentors, including Busch, Stephenson, Harper, Rowe, LaFollette, Morrone, Anderson and Robinson.
- Recognition Committee. Stephenson is the Chair of this committee. Stephen Arnold, Krinn and Dingman volunteered to assist.

29.0 New Mexico State University

The next review is the initial accreditation review for New Mexico State University. The site visitors for the program were Stephenson, Busch and Aguirre. Stephenson thanked the program – he was very appreciative and noted they had been very gracious hosts. The program the Council is reviewing is an Environmental Health Option, which was first offered in the Fall of 2005. It is collaboration between two

colleges – the College of Health Sciences and the College of Agriculture and Home Economics. The College of Agriculture has for many years housed a Bachelors of Science in Environmental Science, under Professor Bill Lindeman. The College of Health Science has had an Environmental Health program under Professor Stephen Arnold for several years.

The program has two main faculty, and Arnold is the Coordinator for the Environmental Health Option. The other faculty, including Dr. Lindeman, play a major role in the program, and teach, conduct research and advise. The program meets the 2.0 FTE requirement, with one FTE dedicated to the program. The curriculum has no deficiencies. It meets the scientific rigor required under the guidelines, it meets the requirements in basic sciences, and it exceeds the guidelines in math. The facilities at the college are tremendous – both on campus, and in the area. Locally, there is the Los Alamos National Laboratories and the White Sands Missile Range. These two facilities provide a practitioner base, course instruction for students and opportunities.

The major concern of the site visitors was that the newly revised curriculum did not meet the guidelines in that as the Environmental Health Option under review had not yet graduated any students, nor did it have any students who were close to completing the program. There are currently two students enrolled in the program. The school, however, underwent a mentoring process in which they had been encouraged to seek accreditation. The program, however, meets the spirit of the guidelines.

The site visitors recommended an advisory committee, and the program was very receptive to this idea. The program is also interested in phasing out the environmental health degree option under the College of Health Sciences. The site visitors also encouraged increasing the coverage of the REHS exam and options in the curriculum.

Arnold took over his response, and provided the Council with an addendum to the Site Visit Report. First, he provided a brief history of the program. He joined NMSU eight years prior, after teaching at an accredited program for several years. He was interested in developing the program and seeking accreditation, as it would be the first accredited program in a three state region. Upon joining NMSU, he also found an existing Environmental Science Department. At this point, he asked Dr. Lindeman to say a few words about the Environmental Science degree program.

Lindeman provided a brief history. In the early 1990's, the program evolved from a soils-based program to an Environmental Science program. It is a multi-disciplinary program, which is spread throughout the colleges, and departments. Upon joining the University, Lindeman indicated that Arnold convinced the Dean to start an environmental health program – which was amazing. The two were combined last year to create a better program. However, the components, classes and much of the structure have been in existence for years.

Arnold then continued the history of the program. Upon his arrival, he discovered much about University politics. He was told that – upon requesting to create a program that would be able to receive accreditation – that if the students arrived, the faculty resources would as well. Unfortunately, that had not been the case. After much work trying to improve the existing environmental health program, Arnold convinced the Dean to allow the program to become a collaboration between two colleges, and merge the courses and faculty with the Environmental Sciences Department. Students who graduate from this program will receive a degree in Environmental Sciences, from the College of Agriculture. Arnold believes everyone will benefit from this program.

Arnold also indicated that he has created an articulation agreement with Dine College, a Tribal College in Shiprock, NM. This will allow students to spend two years at Dine College, fulfilling basic science requirements, then transfer, and finish at NMSU in two years. He also indicated that the support for the program is very high – particularly from Indian Health Service, Local Health Departments and other agencies in the area.

Arnold then moved on to the Addendum to the Site Visit Report. He thanked the site visitors for their visit and hard work. He noted that the department has a structure that all students within the Environmental Studies Department can choose one of eight options, the newest of which is the Environmental Health

Option. Arnold then indicated that the Addendum also included a detailed recruitment plan, an updated and detailed faculty list. He also noted that effective August 15th, he is stepping down from his position as Chair, and returning to be the one full time dedicated to the Environmental Health Option, with the full support of his Dean. Other faculty teaching in the program include two full time practitioners who teach as an Adjuncts.

There are currently two students within the Environmental Health Option, as it newly exists. The first student will graduate within two – three years. There is tremendous interest in the degree program, and accreditation will help significantly.

With respect to the programmatic coverage, the program was good prior to the changes, and the outlined changes will only improve the program. The program is planning to require a foods course, and include an additional field experience course and options for professional certifications.

Lindeman then offered a few final comments. He noted that Arnold will be in charge of the Environmental Health option students, and will be teaching full time again. He has been very impressed by Arnold's dedication to secure an accredited program at NMSU. The Environmental Science Department faculty are very dedicated and supportive of the new option.

The floor was then opened to questions. Hatfield inquired about the listing on the degree, and whether students would have their chosen option on their diploma. Lindeman answered yes. Silverman inquired about the curriculum changes, and how many courses were added to create the Option. Arnold indicated that no new courses were created. Fifteen credit hours were added to create the option. Bohan inquired about whether the original Environmental & Occupational Health program under the Department of Health Sciences would have been accredited. Arnold answered no – they would not have been able to do it without the partnership. The program lacked faculty and some technical areas. LaFollette followed up with this question by asking about the program under the Department of Health Sciences. She asked if it met the requirements for basic sciences, overview of environmental health issues, the three core courses – epidemiology, biostatistics and toxicology and how many of the program areas it met. Arnold answered that yes, it met the requirements for basic sciences, the overview of EH areas, the three core courses, and it covered 5 or 6 programmatic areas. The biggest problem with the existing program was the FTE resources.

LaFollette asked that Arnold detail the courses or coverage he was lacking under his old program. Arnold replied they would miss some coverage in environmental economics, environmental health management, law and policy, and risk assessment. He indicated that he tried to cover these topic areas, but in the old Health Sciences department, he was the only one teaching the courses. In the new program, the Environmental Health Option will have six faculty.

Radke asked about the internship program. Lindeman indicated that the internship is not a requirement for the Environmental Science Department, but it will be for the environmental health option, and Arnold will run the program. Radke also asked about an Environmental Student organization. Lindeman responded that they had a very active club, mostly run by students within the program. Radke asked if the site team had seen the student requirements and records, and Stephenson indicated yes, and there were no problems.

Morrone asked about the internship. It will be three credit hours, and 320 clock hours. Students will be placed – and have been placed in Arnold's time at NMSU – at local health departments, CDC, Los Alamos National Laboratories, Environmental Consulting Firms, and the White Sands Missile Range.

Harper asked about links to NEHA, and the New Mexico Environmental Health Association. Lindeman indicated that those were in the process of being established. McCarthy asked about the Table 2 that NMSU sent with their application for accreditation. Specifically, she was interested in courses listed under the prefix HLS. Arnold replied that those courses were ones listed under the old College, in the Department of Health Sciences, but they were long-standing courses. Harvey asked why this move was controversial, and Arnold replied that the boundaries of departments were such that departments and colleges were trying to keep students, FTE's, budgets, etc. wherever they could, plus there is stiff

competition for students. Harvey asked about the FTE's of the program directors. Lindeman answered that courses taught by him within the program would stay within his college, while courses taught by Arnold would go to the College of Health Sciences.

LaFollette recognized the site visitors, Stephenson, Busch and Aguirre. The meeting was then closed to visitors and members with potential conflicts of interest.

New Mexico State University received conditional accreditation, reverting to full accreditation for four years upon meeting the conditions. The conditions set forth require the program to provide annual updates at the ends of years one and two, to be reviewed by the Board. The reports are to include a comprehensive report on students in the program, including recruitment strategy, the number of students enrolled, their class status and progress towards graduation. The reports shall also include information on student internships, including progress, locations and clock hours.

30.0 Election of Officers

Williams reported that all ballots had been returned. The Board for the coming year is as follows:

Chair: Randy Bentley

Secretary: Jim Dingman

Treasurer: Gary Silverman

Undergraduate Chairs: Dale Stephenson and Eliezer Bermudez

Graduate Chair: Carolyn Harvey

31.0 Announcements & Citations

This agenda item was moved to the end of the agenda. The meeting recessed for lunch

32.0 U.S. Public Health Service Presentation

The meeting was reconvened at 1:15 p.m. United States Public Health Officers Alan Parham and Craig Shepherd joined the meeting. Shepherd is the Chief Environmental Health Officer, stationed at CDC. Parham is in attendance to present regarding the COSTEP Training Program.

Parham thanked the Council for their partnership, and for allowing them to present. He also noted that the EHOPAC Meeting is on Wednesday, June 28, 2006.

The COSTEP Program is the Commissioned Officer Student Training and Externship Program. Students enrolled in academic programs typically seek out the Jr. COSTEP Program, as an internship opportunity. The students serve for a summer as a Commissioned Officer, receive \$2500 a month in pay, and are assigned a preceptor. This program is used as a recruitment tool for the Public Health Service – it allows the PHS to check out potential candidates and for students to check out the PHS.

In 2005, there were 40 – 45 applicants from 18 Universities. 23 COSTEPs were selected. Of those twenty-three students, 19 went to the Indian Health Service, 2 to the Coast Guard, 1 to CDC and 1 to the National Park Service.

Parham then discussed the application process, which he described as an involved process. The deadline is December 31 of each year. Because there are limited staff to process the applications though, the notification of acceptance comes late, and the PHS understands this creates issues and problems for students. Parham has several tips for students interested in applying:

- Submit your application early;
- Initiate the application online;
- Follow up; and
- Use Agency Contacts.

He noted that the selection process is competitive. Agencies themselves make the selections, and often interview candidates over the phone. He asked Professors to inform their students that if they receive a call from the PHS, it is likely an interview-situation.

Reasons for acceptance include: Direct recruitment, good references, good grades, and a good fit with the PHS – i.e., career potential, students that are willing to accept any assignment and demonstrated leadership skills. Parham also outlined reasons that students are commonly not accepted. They included a lack of available positions, weak references or a GPA less than 2.5, few environmental health courses completed, students that are selective about assignments, no car, and a DUI or failed medical clearance on their record.

Parham then distributed a survey for people to complete – the survey will help him work to improve the process. The floor was then opened to questions.

Radke inquired to Captain Shepherd about whether the retirement rates from PHS are increasing, or affecting staffing levels. Shepherd noted that there are currently 268 Commissioned Officers in the Environmental Health section. The most recent high point was 280. He also noted that retirements are increasing, and that the Corps is trying to increase the number of officers within EPA, USDA and other federal agencies.

Krinn inquired about the Jr. program – and whether there was a senior COSTEP Program. Parham answered that yes, there is a Senior program. A student is hired, more typically within the medical fields rather than in Environmental Health, and the student works during the school year and makes a commitment to PHS. This is less typical because the agency must have an FTE for that COSTEP.

Tres inquired about graduate programs, and Parham answered that the USPHS would like to see more graduate applicants. Stephenson inquired about other accredited programs, and whether occupational health students would be able to apply. Parham answered that yes, ABET accreditation is also a standard for students interested in Occupational Health internships. Parham also noted that the appointment standards are a hotly debated topic, and some within the USPHS feel the standard is too restrictive. However, most believe in the standards and want to keep them. Shepherd noted that 1999 was the year that the appointment standards were linked to ABET or EHAC Accreditation.

LaFollette thanked both Parham and Shepherd for the presentation and participation.

33.0 University of Illinois Springfield

The University of Illinois Graduate Program is up for initial accreditation. Harvey took over as Chair. Tom Hatfield and Rick Rowe were the site visitors for the program.

Hatfield began by explaining the structure of the University. He noted that the Environmental Studies Department has six concentrations within the Department, and two are up for accreditation today. The two concentrations up for accreditation are: a Masters of Science in Environmental Studies with an option in Risk Sciences (Risk Sciences Option) and a Master of Arts in Environmental Studies with a Concentration in Environmental Policy, Planning and Administration (EPPA Concentration). The missions of the programs are both consistent with EHAC Accreditation.

Hatfield noted that the curriculum of both programs is highly applied, and the students are also very qualified. While the program is not 100% online, the University has dedicated a significant amount of resources to online education.

The faculty at UIS is very dedicated. The program has an exceptional advocate in LaFollette, and she has been very effective. The program and University recognizes the importance of accreditation, and this is part of the strategic plan of the institution. The budget for the Department has increased this year, and three new faculty have been hired. The program has also received external foundation support. The University is part of the University of Illinois system, and therefore has access to those resources. The student and faculty resources are excellent, and the employers value the program's graduates.

Hatfield then outlined the concerns and recommendations of the site team. He noted that the Department is still establishing a formal advisory committee, and the site visitors recommend the formation, although

they note that the connections are a good substitute. Another recommendation is with regards to the program growth, and the need to be aware of evolving space needs. The site team also recommended that the transcripts, which currently do not identify the concentration within the major, be changed to make this identification. The administration has assured the program that this will take place. With regards to the EPPA Concentration, the site team requested that LaFollette provide documentation regarding the concentrations of epidemiology, toxicology and risk assessment.

Rowe noted that he was very impressed by the level of administrative support, and he understood their commitment to the program. He also noted that the practitioner experience among the faculty is very impressive. With that, the floor was turned over to LaFollette for her response.

LaFollette thanked the site team for their visit. She noted that it was a very difficult decision to pursue accreditation at this time. She began her response by providing the Council with a brief history of the University of Illinois at Springfield.

UIS used to be known as Sangamon State University. It was created in 1970, and it is a Public Affairs University. The programs must be Policy or Public Affairs oriented programs, and they must be interdisciplinary. When LaFollette arrived at UIS, the founding faculty within the Environmental Science department were still within the Department. LaFollette was hired, in part, to move the program towards accreditation.

With the Risk Sciences Option, there were no changes to the curriculum as a result of the site visit – however, LaFollette did work to change the degree to a Masters of Science in Environmental Sciences, rather than a Master of Arts. The program has a general Environmental Science concentration, and is science based. Initially, the program did not have grades, it had a flexible curriculum and self-evaluations. LaFollette noted the struggle for Professors to create learning objectives for their courses.

Since the site team's visit, LaFollette also has several updates. First, there have been three new faculty hired, who are: Dr. Zhang, who has a background in GIS, linkages with Environmental Health, and Environmental Sciences; Dr. Doughman, whose expertise is in Policy; and Dr. Keele, whose focus is Natural Resources with an Environmental Health background. LaFollette also noted that the transcript issue has been resourced, and the transcript will note concentrations and tacks, and graduation from an accredited degree program. LaFollette also noted that enrollment requirements have changed, and students must now have an advisor to enroll, as well as approval from the advisor.

The program has new Certificates programs as well – in both Risk Assessment and Emergency Planning & Homeland Security. The GIS Center was recently updated as a classroom and now has laptops for student use. Space is still a problem, but the Department will continue to work to address this.

LaFollette also reported that the website has been redeveloped. Thanks to the site visit, the website was completed, and LaFollette showed the Council a picture of the new site. LaFollette then went over the ENS 501 Class. This class is being improved, and will fit the risk assessment requirements, as well as include components on epidemiology, toxicology and risk communication. LaFollette also explained the changes to ENS 521. This course will increase its learning objectives, and cover a variety of environmental health topics. The syllabus will also include the assessment of students. The floor was then opened to questions.

Silverman asked about the ENS 501 course that LaFollette just described, and whether all the requirements for epidemiology, toxicology and risk assessment/communication were being contained in this single course. LaFollette answered that no, these topics were covered in a variety of ways throughout the curriculum. Each course is based in environmental health. This course, however, was expanded to further meet the requirements. She also noted that the intent of this track is to assist students in becoming administrators.

Silverman also asked about the natural sciences background for the EPPA Concentration program– and where in the curriculum that students obtain these competencies. LaFollette answered that all students take a core course, which includes ecology, as well as a background in natural sciences. Silverman

indicated he was troubled that they only received this information in one course, and LaFollette answered that other topics were infused throughout the curriculum.

Krinn inquired as to why EHAC was being asked to accredit the EPPA Concentration when that is a Master of Arts degree. LaFollette answered it was classified as an MA because students weren't required to have a science background, but that students who graduate from the program enter environmental health fields, and upon graduation, students meet the spirit of the guidelines. The Administration feels accreditation is important, which is why LaFollette has prepared these programs for accreditation. Radke then inquired about the epidemiology competencies, and where they were addressed. LaFollette answered that she was proposing to add a course to the core concentration of the EPPA Concentration, and create an Environmental & Occupational Health Course as a requirement for this program. She believes that the program has strong advising ability, and can direct students towards a curriculum. However, to switch the program to a Risk Sciences Option program as well, LaFollette indicated it would take at least two and a half years to make this transition.

Anderson inquired as to whether the department or college had an undergraduate program. LaFollette answered no – although it is in the development stages. In the past, the University has not admitted undergraduate students. However, if the College develops a program for undergraduates, it will be Environmental Sciences, and it will not seek accreditation due to Illinois State University. The University of Illinois Board of Regents does not allow similar degree programs within the University system. Anderson then asked about where students in her program came from. LaFollette answered that many came from local health departments. Their average age is 33. She noted that because of the wide availability of well-paid internships for students, approximately half leave their jobs and accept an internship while in school.

Robinson asked about the students' educational background. LaFollette answered that many were from Illinois State University's environmental health program, some had Masters of Public Health, some studied soils or hydrogeology, and some were engineering majors.

Silverman inquired about the Risk Sciences Option, and where students received Administrative skills within this program. LaFollette answered that within the Risk Curriculum, there is a required course in Project Management. Students enroll in a practicum, where they take a situation from problem to solution. Silverman then asked about the sequence of courses. LaFollette answered that students begin with Environmental Risk Assessment, then Air, Land, Water, then the Practicum, and then Economics. They also take their science background pre-requisites first, and sometimes students take toxicology and risk concurrently.

Bohan inquired about the Advisory Committee. LaFollette answered that yes, there is an advisory committee, with ten members – two per concentration. Bohan then asked about student knowledge in epidemiology and toxicology. LaFollette answered that for those in the Risk Science Option, they take toxicology, and epidemiology one is suggested. However, they receive exposure to epidemiology throughout the course.

Kneller inquired as to why the Masters of Arts in Environmental Sciences was seeking accreditation at this time. LaFollette answered that the professionals in the field are asking for accredited program degrees, specifically when hiring program graduates. There were no more questions on the floor. Harvey recognized the site visitors, Hatfield and Rowe. The meeting was then closed to visitors and members with a potential conflict of interest.

The Masters of Science program with a concentration in Risk Sciences at the University of Illinois Springfield received full accreditation for six years. The concentration in Environmental Policy, Planning and Administration did not receive accreditation at this time.

34.0 Announcements & Citations

The agenda item, Announcement & Citations was moved to this time slot. LaFollette first acknowledged the departing Council Members, Dan Harper, Michele Morrone, and Chuck Treser.

LaFollette acknowledged the hard work of the Board over the past year, including applying for 501(c)3 status, the writing of the Policy Manual, and increasing the transparency and infrastructure of the organization. She thanked Stephenson, Treser, Bentley, Harvey, Bermudez and staff, Tres and McIntosh. Harvey then thanked LaFollette for her service as Chair for the past two years, as well as recognizing and thanking LaFollette for her serving on the Council for the previous six years. LaFollette is also a departing Council Member.

35.0 Eastern Kentucky University National Council on Diversity in Environmental Health

Priscilla Oliver joined the meeting, and presented on the National Council on Diversity in Environmental Health. She unveiled the recent work of the organization, as well as the new logo, poster and brochure. She noted that she was welcoming all the members of EHAC to the organization, and hoped they would join the organization. LaFollette thanked Oliver for joining the meeting.

East Central University – Discussion regarding Council Response.

There were several items remaining to be discussed. LaFollette called for new business. Silverman noted that East Central University had requested feedback from the Council, and he made a motion that the Council return to closed session to give formal feedback to East Central University. Bentley seconded the motion, and thirteen were in favor, with two abstentions. The Council returned to closed session.

The meeting was re-opened. Prior to adjourning, Morrone asked to recognize the work of the Executive Director, Tres. She noted that she would like to commend Tres for her hard work over the years, and her incredible work recruiting new programs to seek accreditation, building the organization and its infrastructure. The Council thanked Tres.

36.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m..