The 1995 Winter meeting of the AAHP was held in Charleston, South Carolina on January 30 and 31, 1995. After the 1994 officers and Committee Chairs gave their reports, the 1995 officers were installed and off we went... planning the new year's activities. When the dust settled, we had an aggressive and exciting plan in our hands. Many of the items are well on their way towards completion. Others will require your input before we can proceed further. I would like to take this opportunity in the CHP News to give you some information about just a few of the AAHP's pending initiatives.

What are we up to?

One of the most important items on the 1995 agenda pertains to the newly-defined relationship between the AAHP and the American Board of Health Physics (ABHP). Shortly, the ABHP will cease to exist as an independent corporation. Therefore, the bylaws of the AAHP may be modified to reflect the new relationship and how we intend to “do business.” Ron Katherin and his team of experts have revised the bylaws, a draft of which is currently being reviewed by the Executive Committee and the AAHP’s new legal counsel. The final version will be approved by the Executive Committee in July, and will be presented to you for voting in August.

A significant change in the bylaws is a new Code of Ethics. John Kelly and the Professional Standards and Ethics Committee have been working hard to prepare a draft in time for the July meeting. They are also working simultaneously, to modify the Committee’s procedures for responding to ethics complaints.

You may have noticed that the AAHP booth in the exhibits area at the last Annual Meeting of the HPS was a bit “sorry looking.” Howard Dickson, Jerry Thomas and Tom Buhl are in the process of giving the booth a new look. Look for the ’95 model at the Summer Meeting in Boston.

Along the same lines, several of the committees are preparing fact sheets and other material to be inserted in folders for distribution to ABHP Exam applicants, the press, students, or other interested parties. The folders will be prepared with the CHP logo tastefully printed on the front and will contain fact sheets about the ABHP certification process, the recertification process, the continuing education program, and other items about health physics and ABHP Certification.
Other items that you might like to see in the folders are Position Statements generated by the AAHP. However, the Executive Committee needs your input and guidance before we initiate this venture. (1) Should the AAHP prepare Position Statements? (2) Should the Position Statements be approved by the membership prior to publication? (3) Who should pull together the first draft? (4) What topics should be addressed by the AAHP? (5) Should the AAHP comment on proposed rules issued by Federal, State or Local agencies if there is a technical issue pertaining to radiation protection that demands a sound and technically-based response?

Elsewhere in this CHP News you will be reminded about the AAHP’s special session scheduled for Wednesday, July 26, 1995. Don’t miss this one! Bob Casey couldn’t have picked a more timely or a more interesting topic. (I will leave it to him to tell you what it’s about.) However, designing, arranging and coordinating these sessions is quite a bit of work ... just ask the Program Committee of the HPS. Why doesn’t the AAHP have a Program Committee? Good question. Hopefully we will have an answer for you by the Summer Meeting of the Executive Committee.

Currently, the Academy has a listing of all of the CHPs who have indicated their interest in being included on a list of CHPs who do consulting. This list also provides the CHP’s two specialty areas as designated on their maintenance fee envelope. The Executive Committee is presently discussing the desirability of also preparing an AAHP Handbook that would contain the name, address, technical specialties, and a brief resume for every CHP. It could also include a listing of names sorted by state or technical expertise. Should the AAHP produce such a handbook? Do you have any thoughts on what it should contain, how it should be formatted or how it should be distributed?

Joe Ring and the Professional Development Committee have made overtures to the National Organization for Competency Assurance (NOCA) about AAHP membership. Through NOCA, the AAHP could work toward accreditation by the National Commission for Certifying Agencies (NCCA). NCCA accreditation would, among other things, provide recognition that the AAHP has met the highest national voluntary standards for private certification, and enhance the reputation of CHPs. The Executive Committee is reviewing information about NOCA, and will be discussing it further in July.

Joe Ring and his Committee are also debating the possibility and mechanisms of producing AAHP Standards of Practice for health physics. Standards on a variety of topics have been produced by other organizations (e.g., the Commission on Physics and Radiation Protection of the American College of Radiology, the American Association of Physicists in Medicine, the American College of Medical Physics, and others), and the Executive Committee was under the opinion that the body of Certified Health Physicists might benefit from standards produced by the AAHP.

That’s enough for now. (Believe It or not, there’s more! Keep your eye on the next “CHP Corner” in the July issue of the HPS Newsletter.)

How can AAHP members keep up on all of this?

In this edition of the CHP News, there is a list of the AAHP officers and Committee Chairs. Each one of them would be more than pleased to exchange information when you call.

The Executive Committee also intends to maximize the use of the “CHP Corner” in our efforts to keep you up to date on where we stand on the 1995 initiatives. (The AAHP is indebted to Genevieve Roessler for permitting us to distribute our publication as part of the HPS Newsletter.) Nancy Daugherty, the editor of the CHP News and the “CHP Corner” tells me that from the first of each month until the 15th, she does nothing but wait for articles and submissions to come rolling in on the E-mail system. Please don’t disappoint her. (It goes without saying that Nancy has our deepest gratitude for all of her hard work and her talent at turning the AAHP’s publications into useful vehicles of communication.)

Two of our best information resources are the AAHP’s program director, Nancy Johnson, and the Executive Secretary, Dick Burk. Nancy and Dick do the real work of running the AAHP. They also provide the continuity that we need as Executive Committee members come and go. Nancy truly is the “pulse” of the AAHP since she is copied on all communications, and she maintains all of the AAHP’s records. There is no better place to inquire about the AAHP, its activities, its financial and corporate status, or even about the skeletons in its closet. (Makes you want to give her a call, doesn’t it?)
How can AAHP members benefit from the 1995 initiatives?

First, you must stay informed. Second, provide some feedback to the members of the Executive Committee so that they will know how to represent your interests. (To that end, we have enclosed a survey form to make it a bit easier for you to make yourself heard.) Third, check the "yes" box on the annual maintenance fee envelope that asks whether you want to join a committee. Committee appointments are selected by the President-Elect from the list of CHPs who checked a box. There is no better way to guide the direction of the AAHP than to join a Committee.

I am honored and proud to represent the AAHP as its President for 1995. It will be difficult to fill the shoes of my predecessors, who served with distinction and advanced the profession of health physics through their tireless efforts. I hope to hear from you about your concerns, desires, opinions or suggestions regarding the AAHP and its endeavors. Maybe then I can also represent you as you deserve to be represented.

The addition of the new question will result in the candidate's having increased flexibility in the selection of questions to answer—a pool of 8 questions rather than the current 7.

Part II of the Examination currently consists of 6 core questions which must be answered and 7 specialty questions, from which the candidate may select 4 to answer. The specialty areas include Accelerators, Environmental, Fuel Cycle, Medical, Power Reactor, University, and General. The "General" category consists of subjects such as non-ionizing radiation, emergency planning, materials transportation, etc. The Board attempts to place a question from each of these specialty areas on each Part II Exam.

In recent years, as a recognition of the importance of non-ionizing radiation as an area of HP specialization, the Board has attempted to include a non-ionizing question on each Part II Exam. Since non-ionizing radiation is considered to be in the "general" category, other general questions, such as emergency planning and transportation, have not been recently available to the candidate. To alleviate this situation, the Board has decided to add an additional question to the Part II Exam.

The additional question will usually be from the "general" category. With the addition of this question, we will be able to ask two questions from "general" category topics, thereby providing better coverage. The net effect will, I believe, be a benefit to the candidate.

This change will be effective with the 1995 exam.

NCRP COLLABORATION

At the February 1994 meeting, the AAHP Executive Committee voted to become a collaborating organization of the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP). At its January 1995 meeting, the Committee authorized the AAHP President to forward NCRP draft documents to appropriate members of the Academy for review and comment and to coordinate the submission of comments to the NCRP.

If you are interested in being considered as an AAHP/NCRP collaborator, please contact Carol Serger, AAHP President.

KUDOS!

Appointment of Carl J. Paperiello
Deputy Director, NMSS, NRC

Carl J. Paperiello, CHP, has been selected to succeed Guy Arlotta (retiring) as Deputy Director of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards (NMSS). Carl previously had been the Director of the Division of Industrial and Medical Safety, NMSS.

A native of Philadelphia, Carl earned a bachelor's degree in physics from LaSalle College and a doctorate in nuclear physics from the University of Notre Dame. He was Certified by the ABHP in 1975 and that same year joined the NRC Region I as an inspector in the reactor health physics area. Since that time Carl has served in a variety of responsible positions with the NRC.

FROM THE CHAIR
JUNE 1995

E. Scott Medling, CHP Chair, ABHP, 1995

Another Question for Part II
At its last meeting, the American Board of Health Physics voted to increase the number of specialty questions on Part II of the ABHP Certification Examination.
LETTERS:

**Pro:**
Thomas E. Goff, CHP
Carlsbad, NM
January 30, 1995

I would like to voice my support for the Board requiring a degree for certification. I feel the focus on the exam as the only requirement for certification is wrong. The exam represents only the technical portion of the CHP award. In order to act as a true professional, other areas of the applicant's background and education come into play. The bachelor's degree empowers the individual with a broader base, which will be required in the interactions between CHPs and other professionals.

To be taken seriously by government, the media and other professionals, the CHP must have significant academic requirements, not just the ability to take a strenuous exam. The Board needs to enforce high academic standards to maintain the respect associated with CHP.

Individuals can now get appropriate degrees from several accredited colleges that offer off-campus programs, and most nuclear plants have the Nuclear Science Degree program. Anyone who truly desires ABHP Certification can obtain the required degree over a period of time.

I would also support my original misunderstanding of the pre-1997 requirements: "A non-science bachelor's degree plus 60 credits in physics..." This would maintain the degree requirement, but allow candidates to obtain the science requirements at the more generally available junior colleges.

I thank the ABHP/AAHP for its stand on the degree requirements.

**Con:**
Dawn J. Skinner, CHP
Pasadena, CA
March 1, 1995

I read with great dismay the newly approved qualifications requirements for the CHP exam as discussed in the February "CHP Corner." I am a CHP and proud of it; however, I do not believe in "closing the door" after me. If someone wants to take the exam, without a degree - even if their chances of failing are higher than a degree candidate - who are we to say no?

Concerning the amount of time required to grade, check and proctor exams, let's not forget that this is a VOLUNTARY activity, undertaken by CHPs who want to foster or mentor upcoming future CHPs. If it's too much work, I'd say don't volunteer.

The additional point advocating that the profession is becoming increasingly complex may be true; however, the complexity is not due to the physics or technical applications. It is mainly due to legal requirements. Following the logic of the ABHP we should all have law degrees, not bachelors in an appropriate subject. Is math an appropriate subject? I can envision a great mathematician being able to pass the exam, who may or may not know about the profession's goals and philosophy.

I believe all HPs need to remember the primary reason for the profession is "protection of man and his environment" from the harmful effects of radiation, while promoting the safe use of it. This, by our own definition, is OPERATIONAL applications. The guidelines developed appear to be self-serving and mystifying of our function, instead of actually promoting safe operations. It probably would make sense if the HP profession only supported or primarily supported research institutions and applications. The elitist impression that because someone has a degree they are automatically more likely to pass an exam - or worse, they are more likely to be a "better" safety professional - is distressing. I know many PhDs who have multiple degrees, but to whom I'd not trust my safety. Many are quite out of touch with reality and practicality.

How did the Board members justify the fact that many people could not afford to get multiple degrees when they were starting out and have achieved reasonable proficiency and are well-respected in the community - despite their lack of papers - later in their careers?

Let us remember that Einstein failed in school - as did many other geniuses in our society - but went on to make profound contributions anyway. Granted, Einstein went on to finish school later, but his theory of relativity had its foundation in an essay he wrote when he was 16, after failing school and prior to obtaining a degree.
Although the goal of the changes is advocated as altruistic, it comes off with a “haves and have-nots” divisive flavor, which is not enhancing professionalism by any stretch of the imagination. The elitism demonstrated by the proposed changes frightens me. I wonder: if the Board had put it to a vote of CHPs, would their decision have been supported by the masses?

I sincerely hope that the Board will reconsider implementing these qualification requirements in the future. If not, I believe the AAHP membership should be polled to confirm the Board’s decision. Perhaps a questionnaire could be published in the CHP News. I will volunteer to tally the results.

Thank you for equal time on this issue.

FROM THE EDITOR:

Nancy M. Daugherty, CHP

Why Certification?

When Gary Lautenschlager was developing his CHP Salary Survey he asked me for suggestions as to information that might be requested in the survey. I asked him to include the question “Why did you choose to pursue Certification?” The narrative answers are not easily tabulated, but I believe they are important in establishing and prioritizing the activities of the AAHP. As a non-voting member of the AAHP Executive Committee, I have witnessed many discussions concerning possible projects that could be pursued by the AAHP, and I can testify to the sincerity of Committee members in wanting to best serve the Academy’s interests. In order for the Committee members to do that, they must know what the concerns and priorities of the diplomas are. I expect some of those concerns and priorities have changed over the years.

I expect, for example, that there was a greater emphasis in the early years of Certification on using the Certification process to advance the science of radiation protection among the health physics community. The ABHP Certification Exam serves to encourage a comprehensive understanding of the fundamental concepts of radiation protection, as well as the utilization of these concepts in solving complex problems of specialty areas. Recertification requirements encourage CHPs to remain current in the profession. I expect that many of the early candidates took the Exam because it was there, used the discipline and challenge that it offered as a means of furthering the dissemination of health physics knowledge, and delighted in increasing the number of health physicists who shared in that knowledge base.

I also expect that, as the job market tightens and credentials become increasingly important in employment, it is more often the advancement of individual careers, rather than the advancement of the profession, that serves as the major motivation to pursue Certification. As an idealist, I am saddened by this. I enjoy health physics tremendously and get a kick out of talking about it with other HPs who enjoy it too. I don’t get much kick out of talking about the job market. However, I also enjoy eating regularly and having a roof over my head, so I can’t condemn the pragmatic perspective. I know that Certification has enhanced my own career opportunities.

I believe the AAHP/ABHP’s decisions to strengthen the academic degree requirements for Certification candidates reflect a recognition of the importance to many CHPs of protecting Certification as a professional credential. The provision for legal counsel for the AAHP and possible membership in NOCA are other activities that further this goal.

I hope, however, that Bob Casey’s AAHP Special Session on “Professional Practice of Health Physics” at the Boston meeting will be well attended by health physicists committed to the advancement of radiation protection, and that any Position Statements issued by the Executive Committee also are in this spirit. The responses to Gary’s survey indicate that a good balance is needed between the professional advancement of the individual CHP and the furtherance of the profession of health physics.

AAHP Special Session
Boston, Massachusetts - Professional Practice of Health Physics
Wednesday, July 26, 1995
8:30 - 11:30 am

The purpose of this session is to promote a greater understanding of the standards for professional practice within the United States and the role of professional societies in upholding these standards. In particular, the standards, procedures, and current practices of the AAHP will be discussed. The session will include a question and comment period from the audience.
# AAHP MEMBERSHIP SURVEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Your Comments, Suggestions or Other Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The AAHP should comment on Federal, State or Local rule-making that pertain to radiation protection issues and prepare position statements on topical issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Indicate concurrence with recently established requirements or suggest alternatives, if desired.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The AAHP/ABHP should have minimum academic degree requirements for Certification Exam candidates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The AAHP should prepare and distribute Standards of Practice for Health Physics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(List those that would be most useful to you.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The AAHP should pursue legal protection of the term &quot;Certified Health Physicist.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The AAHP should produce a Handbook of Certified Health Physicists that includes technical specialties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(List those things that you think should be contained in a Handbook.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The AAHP should appoint a Program Committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Suggest topics that should be considered for future Special Sessions.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I have some suggestions that will improve communications among AAHP members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(List your suggestions.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I have some suggestions that will improve the &quot;CHP Corner&quot; and the CHP News.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(List your suggestions.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I have some specific suggestions or some input for a Committee Chair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(List your suggestions.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I have some time to work on a specific Committee project this year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(List the Committee and/or Project of interest)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your Name (Optional):

Your Telephone Number (Optional):

Mail or FAX to: Nancy Johnson, Program Director, American Academy of Health Physics, 1313 Dolley Madison Boulevard, Suite 402, McLean, Virginia 22101, FAX - (703) 790-2672. Attach additional pages, if desired.
CERTIFIED HEALTH PHYSICIST
SALARY SURVEY
JUNE, 1995

Gary L. Lautenschlager, CHP
Elizabeth A. Thompson, CHP

INTRODUCTION
This report presents the results of the CHP salary survey conducted by Gary Lautenschlager, CHP, of the Midwest Chapter of the Health Physics Society, in association with the American Academy of Health Physics. Elizabeth Thompson, CHP, also of the Midwest Chapter provided invaluable peer review of the survey results and co-authored this paper. Nancy Daugherty, CHP, provided many ideas for this survey. And not least, credit is due to Nancy Johnson, Program Director, AAHP Secretariat, for her assistance in collecting the survey responses during a busy time for the ABHP exams. CHPs were asked to respond to this salary survey in the December, 1994 CHP News that was co-distributed with Volume XXII, Number 12 of The Health Physics Society's Newsletter. A total of 188 responses were received by the March 31, 1995 deadline. Responses were also received from some non-certified health physicists. While these were not solicited, they are discussed later in this report.

DISCUSSION
Respondents were asked to provide information in many categories, including years of experience and geographic location to name just two. The many categories were intended to help generate generic CHP profiles. For example, one profile could have been CHPs with a Ph.D. in Health Physics who were employed at universities, had 10 - 15 years experience, and worked in the northeastern region of the country. However, given the number of responses received it was not possible to obtain more detailed profiles than are presented in this report. As the profiles became more specific, there were fewer responses that fit the categories. In general for this report, profiles do not appear where there were fewer than ten responses that fit a particular profile. A few exceptions are presented in the report.

The CHP profiles in this report were generated based on the perceived interest to a large number of readers. There are certainly other profiles that could have been created, but were not because there were not enough responses that fit the profile. For instance, the profiles of CHPs with American Board of Radiology or American Board of Nuclear Medicine certification do not appear because no responses were received with the ABNM category checked, and only four responses were received with the ABR category checked. A few respondents thought a category for American Board of Medical Physics certification should have been included in the survey, to which the authors concur. The next CHP salary survey should include this category.

THE "WITH BENEFITS" QUESTION
Regrettably, there was much confusion over the question of whether the respondent's salary was "with benefits." If a respondent's salary was "with benefits," it was intended to indicate that the salary so checked was a base salary with the employer providing a benefits package in addition to the salary, not to indicate that the salary was total compensation that included the cost of those benefits. For instance, government employees probably receive health, retirement, and other benefits in addition to their base salary and should have checked "yes," whereas a private consultant probably does not and should have checked "no." Only 94 out of the total 188 CHP respondents checked "yes" for the "with benefits" question, 39 out of 188 checked "no," and 55 did not indicate either. A few respondents who had checked "yes" included handwritten notes indicating that the salary checked was (in the authors' interpretation) actually a total compensation figure. Because the data for this question is highly suspect, none of the CHP profiles generated include this category.

RESULTS
For each CHP profile, the average salary, median salary, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum salaries are reported. The number of responses that fit the category and were used in the calculations is indicated by N. Salaries indicated as greater than $110,000 were not included in the data for determining the average, median, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum. The number of respondents earning more than $110,000 per year in each category is indicated by M. The salary ranges from the survey were reduced to the midpoints of the ranges for analyzing the data. For example, the salary range $50,000 to $54,999 was assigned a value of $52,500. Calculated values for the average and standard deviation were rounded to the nearest $500.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Education</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Other Field</td>
<td>$71,000</td>
<td>$67,500</td>
<td>$15,500</td>
<td>$47,500</td>
<td>$102,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Health Physics</td>
<td>$61,000</td>
<td>$57,500</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>$77,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Health Physics</td>
<td>$76,000</td>
<td>$71,500</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$47,500</td>
<td>$102,000</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Other Field</td>
<td>$71,500</td>
<td>$72,500</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$47,500</td>
<td>$97,500</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. Health Physics</td>
<td>$79,500</td>
<td>$72,500</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
<td>$107,500</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. Other Field</td>
<td>$76,500</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$14,500</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>$102,500</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In some cases respondents indicated more than one degree. If a respondent indicated more than one degree, the highest level of education was used for data analysis. If a respondent indicated a degree in health physics and another degree at the same level of education, the data were counted only in the health physics degree category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By ABHP Certification</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>$74,000</td>
<td>$72,500</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$47,500</td>
<td>$107,500</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Reactor</td>
<td>$71,000</td>
<td>$72,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>$97,500</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial</td>
<td>$79,000</td>
<td>$77,500</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$62,500</td>
<td>$107,500</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TOP TEN REASONS TO SEEK CERTIFICATION**

There were many reasons given for pursuing certification. An abbreviated list of those is presented here.

1. "Free training and study time during work offered by employer."
2. "Personal goal representing professional achievement."
3. "It was a challenge and represented a level of proficiency in my field. At the time, income and employment were a secondary consideration."
4. "Professional advancement."
5. "To increase my luck. Luck is when opportunity meets preparation."
6. "To prove that I was a Health Physicist and not just a computer nerd."
7. "Because it was there and highly respected by the HP professionals I work with."
8. "Professional recognition."
9. "To increase knowledge, i.e., CHP is a goal that requires effort to achieve (and maintain)."
10. "To establish credentials."

**RESPONSES FROM HEALTH PHYSICISTS NOT ABHP CERTIFIED**

A number of responses were received from health physicists who apparently are not ABHP certified. Although these were not solicited, and the number was limited, a summary of the data is presented here. A good source of salary data for health physicists is provided by the Oak Ridge Institute for Science Education. The contact for this information is Duveen Shirley who can be reached at (615) 576-3409. This information is also available via e-mail at: shirleyd@orau.gov

**SUMMARY**

The authors thank all those who took the time to complete and send in this survey. Although there were not enough responses to provide more detailed profiles, we hope that what is provided here is useful to many. Future surveys will be improved to remove some of the ambiguities inherent in these results.

---

### By Employer Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer Type</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>Median Salary</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>$87,000</td>
<td>$82,500</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$63,500</td>
<td>$93,500</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Firm</td>
<td>$83,000</td>
<td>$87,500</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$97,500</td>
<td>$107,500</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Contractor</td>
<td>$70,500</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>$61,500</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$89,000</td>
<td>$82,500</td>
<td>$14,500</td>
<td>$57,500</td>
<td>$107,500</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Facility</td>
<td>$74,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$57,500</td>
<td>$107,500</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>$66,500</td>
<td>$72,500</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
<td>$47,500</td>
<td>$102,500</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Laboratory</td>
<td>$71,500</td>
<td>$72,500</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$47,500</td>
<td>$107,500</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Power Utility</td>
<td>$60,500</td>
<td>$67,500</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$57,500</td>
<td>$107,500</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### By Master’s in Health Physics and Years Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Experience</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>Median Salary</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 - 15 Years</td>
<td>$59,500</td>
<td>$72,500</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
<td>$47,500</td>
<td>$102,500</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 25 Years</td>
<td>$79,500</td>
<td>$72,500</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$57,500</td>
<td>$107,500</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;25 Years</td>
<td>$87,500</td>
<td>$77,500</td>
<td>$15,500</td>
<td>$47,500</td>
<td>$107,500</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### By Master’s Other Field and Years Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Experience</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>Median Salary</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 - 15 Years</td>
<td>$59,500</td>
<td>$97,500</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$47,500</td>
<td>$102,500</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 25 Years</td>
<td>$79,500</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$57,500</td>
<td>$107,500</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;25 Years</td>
<td>$74,500</td>
<td>$72,500</td>
<td>$15,500</td>
<td>$51,500</td>
<td>$102,500</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### By Bachelor’s Other Field and Years Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Experience</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>Median Salary</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;25 Years</td>
<td>$78,000</td>
<td>$73,500</td>
<td>$15,500</td>
<td>$62,500</td>
<td>$100,500</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### All CHPs By Region of Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region of Country</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>Median Salary</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>$78,500</td>
<td>$77,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$47,500</td>
<td>$107,500</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SouthEast</td>
<td>$67,500</td>
<td>$67,500</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
<td>$97,500</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SouthWest</td>
<td>$78,500</td>
<td>$72,500</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
<td>$102,500</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>$73,500</td>
<td>$77,500</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$52,500</td>
<td>$102,500</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### All CHPs by Primary Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Job Category</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>Median Salary</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$78,500</td>
<td>$77,500</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$47,500</td>
<td>$100,500</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Many respondents checked multiple boxes in this area. The only credible category for which there was a significant number of respondents checking a single box was administration. That is why it is the only profile provided here.

### All CHPs by Metropolitan Employment Area Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>Median Salary</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;250,000</td>
<td>$73,500</td>
<td>$77,500</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>$67,500</td>
<td>$107,500</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000 - 499,999</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$72,500</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
<td>$92,500</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 - 299,999</td>
<td>$71,500</td>
<td>$67,500</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$47,500</td>
<td>$102,500</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 - 99,999</td>
<td>$80,500</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$67,500</td>
<td>$102,500</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 - 49,999</td>
<td>$62,500</td>
<td>$67,500</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$47,500</td>
<td>$77,500</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### All CHPs With Other Certifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Certification</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>Median Salary</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$78,500</td>
<td>$82,500</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$47,500</td>
<td>$100,500</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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THE REST OF THE STORY . . .

In the April edition of the "CHP Corner," you were informed that an individual attempted to "re-activate" his Certification status without providing documentation to show that he was ever Certified by the American Board of Health Physics (ABHP). He was also issued a new plaque and Certificate before the discrepancy was discovered. The President of the AAHP sent the individual a letter demanding proof that he was indeed Certified or return of the Certificate. This individual wisely elected to comply, and the Certificate was returned.

Documentation of this incident is a permanent part of the AAHP's records, and any individual who calls to confirm the Certification status of this individual will be given a detailed account of what has transpired. Furthermore, if this individual should ever submit an application to take the Certification exam, these circumstances will be provided to the ABHP for their use in evaluating his eligibility.

The AAHP has been taking and continues to take this issue seriously. One cannot and should not become a CHP without the appropriate combination of education and experience, and the highest standards of professional ethics and integrity. Attempts to "short-cut" the process or to misrepresent one's Certification status are foolish and will not be ignored.

LEGAL COUNSEL FOR THE AAHP

The AAHP has entered into a contract arrangement with J. Thomas Esslinger, Esq., for performance of legal services on an "as needed" basis. Mr. Esslinger is the Managing Director of Schmeitzer, Aptaker & Shepard, P.C., a Member of the District of Columbia Bar, and is admitted to practice before the United States Supreme Court and the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. He has provided counsel to businesses and non-profit corporations, serves as the ethics advisor to other lawyers in his firm, is actively involved in radiation-related issues, and knows a number of AAHP members on a first-name basis. He has a J.D. degree from Georgetown University Law Center and a B.A. from Yale University.

The AAHP has matured to the point that legal review of our actions and activities is no longer a luxury. We are looking forward to the services and assistance of Mr. Esslinger as short- and long-term initiatives are implemented.
THE CERTIFICATION YEAR AT A GLANCE

Nancy Johnson, Program Director, AAHP Secretariat

January 15
- Postmark deadline for ABHP Certification Exam application

Late January
- Plaques and pins mailed to new CHPs

January/February
- AAHP Executive Committee meets at the HPS Midyear Meeting
- Part II Panel of Examiners meets at the HPS Midyear Meeting

March 1
- Nominations due for William B. McAdams Outstanding Service Award; mail to Vice Chair, ABHP

Late March/
Early April
- Acceptance letters mailed to ABHP Exam candidates
- AAHP election ballots mailed

Late April
- Recertification packages mailed to all CHPs who must recertify that year

Late May/
Early June
- Entrance slips and final information mailed to ABHP Exam candidates

June
- Certification maintenance fee envelopes mailed

June/July
- ABHP Certification Exam given on the Monday of the HPS Annual Meeting
- ABHP Board of Directors meets at the HPS Annual Meeting
- AAHP Executive Committee meets at the HPS Annual Meeting
- AAHP Open Meeting held at the HPS Annual Meeting*
- AAHP William B. McAdams Outstanding Service Award presented at the AAHP Open Meeting*

Late October/
Early November
- ABHP Board of Directors meets
- Part I Panel of Examiners meets

Late November
- ABHP Certification Exam results mailed

*The 1995 AAHP Open Meeting will be held Wednesday, July 26, in Boston, immediately following the AAHP Special Session on Professional Practice of Health Physics, from 8:30 - 11:30.

THE AAHP CONTINUING EDUCATION COMMITTEE DOES IT AGAIN!

ANNUAL MEETING
AAHP 8-HR CONTINUING EDUCATION COURSES
Saturday, July 22, 1995, 8:00 am - 5:00 pm, Sheraton Boston Hotel and Towers

AAHP Course 1 - Radiation Physics at Accelerators, J. Donald Cossairt, Instructor

AAHP Course 2 - Calibration of Survey Instruments, George E. Chabot, Instructor

AAHP Course 3 - Health Physics Aspects of Environmental NORM, John R. Frazier and Howard M. Prichard, instructors

AND...DON'T FORGET: The AAHP Special Session -

Professional Practice of Health Physics
Wednesday, July 26, 1995, 8:30 - 11:30 am
Applications for the 1996 ABHP Certification Exam must be postmarked no later than January 15, 1996