The American Board of Health Physics (ABHP) does deny certification to some candidates following examination or may reject the certification renewal application of a certified health physicist. Health physicists who have been denied certification or certification renewal may appeal the ABHP’s decision. The American Academy of Health Physics (AAHP) has procedures in place for handling such appeals.

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

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

The CESB’s General Guidelines, applicable to all programs, prescribe responsibilities to applicants. The CESB requires that “the Certifying Body shall prescribe, maintain, and publish procedures that certification candidates can use to appeal actions and decisions of the Certifying Body pertaining to the candidate’s application and certification.” The ABHP meets this requirement as described in the Bylaws of the American Academy of Health Physics (January 2006). The ABHP Prospectus, available on the ABHP Web site (www.aahp-abhp.org), states, “Any applicant denied certification may appeal the action of the Board by contacting the Executive Secretary within six months of notification of results.”

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

Section 7.1.6 of the Bylaws establishes the Appeals Committee as a standing AAHP committee. Section 7.10 states, “The Appeals Committee consists of three Plenary Members of the Academy excluding current members of the ABHP or its Examination Panels.” Appeals Committee members for 2009 include Gregory Hall, Nicholas Panzarino, and Penny Shamblin.

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

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

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

Although the Appeals Committee plays an important role in maintaining the integrity of the certification process, it does not make the decision about the appeal. That is the duty and responsibility of the ABHP chair. The committee studies the appeal as the appellant presents it and provides the written results of its review and recommendation to the AAHP president, who may add his or her own comments and recommendation before forwarding the package to the ABHP chair for final disposition.

The Appeals Committee does on occasion receive additional collateral assignments from the AAHP president.

Nominating Committee
Kathryn H. Pryor, CHP, Chair

The Nominating Committee is composed of nine plenary members of the Academy whose job it is to put together a slate of candidates for open positions on the Academy Executive Committee, the American Board of Health Physics (ABHP), and the Academy representation on the American Board of Medical Physics.

Nominating Committee members represent a wide variety of geographical areas and disciplines of health physics. It is this diversity on the Committee that helps in identifying a larger and more diverse pool of candidates for elective office.

Members who are continuing terms on the Nominating Committee are Keith Anderson, John Hageman, Steven King, Kyle Kleinhaus, and Glenn Sturchio. New members are Morgan Cox, Earl Fordham, and Trish Milligan (2009 ABHP vice chair and ex officio member). Kathy Pryor continues her term as chair.

The Nominating Committee would like to thank those members who concluded their term this past year for their service: outgoing members Daniel Burnfield, Max Scott, and ex officio member Kent Lambert (2008 ABHP vice chair).

Professional Standards and Ethics Committee
Paul S. Rohwer, CHP, Chair

It is the purpose of the Professional Standards and Ethics Committee to define the Standards of Professional Responsibility for certified health physicists and to review all complaints about unethical practice referred to the committee by the Executive Committee. The Standards of Professional Responsibility are in place and they have been reviewed. It appears that all CHPs have been conducting themselves in a professional and ethical manner as no complaints have been referred to the committee. In spite of the lack of formal complaints, the committee has continued to explore the following question from the Executive Committee: What actions, if any, should the academy take when a CHP is convicted of a felony?

Another responsibility of the Professional Standards and Ethics Committee is the establishment of procedures for selecting, awarding, and announcing the Joyce P. Davis Award winners. Those procedures are in place. They have been reviewed and a call has been issued for nominations for the 2009 Joyce P. Davis Memorial Award.

The Professional Standards and Ethics Committee is a standing committee of the AAHP composed of five members of the Academy. Serving on the committee in 2008 in addition to the chair were Karen Barcal, Regis Greenwood, Ruth McBurney, and Cheryl Olson. In 2009 Regis Greenwood will complete his term on the committee and Jack Fix will join the committee.