EHAC Board Meeting Minutes – November 19, 2020 – 12:30pm Pac. Time

Board Members Present: Jason Finley, Dave Gilkey, Tania Busch Isaksen, Laura Suppes (had to leave early, which left Board without a quorum at 1:14pm PST)

Board Members Absent: Don Williams, Tim Murphy

EHAC Staff: Leslie Mitchell

1.0 Meeting Called to order at: 12:33pm PST by Chair Finley

2.0 Standing Items

2.1 Approval of Agenda: Gilkey moved to approve the November 19, 2020 agenda with a second from Busch Isaksen, followed by unanimous approval.

2.2 Approval of November October 20, 2020 Meeting Minutes: Gilkey moved to approve the October 20, 2020 minutes. There was a second from Suppes and the, minutes were approved unanimously.

3.0 Reports

3.1 Treasurer’s Report: Murphy/Mitchell

- Current Balance Sheet - no questions
- Current Income and Expense – no questions
- Treasurer Position – discussion of Board recommendation to Council to extend to 2 year term. This topic was tabled until the next meeting when, hopefully, all Board members will be present to discuss.
- Bank Account related motions - these items were tabled until the next meeting when, hopefully, all Board members will be present to discuss.
  - ACTION: Mitchell will rewrite the motions briefly discussed to provide great clarity for the Board. These motions will include the following:
    - Motion to make Executive Director Position the primary signer on EHAC bank accounts
    - Motion to make the EHAC Treasurer a signer on EHAC bank accounts
    - Motion to make EHAC bookkeeper a signer on EHAC bank accounts
    - Motion to designate Executive Director position “Assistant Secretary” in order to allow ED to address banking issues under the supervision of the EHAC Secretary and Treasurer.
  - ACTION: Mitchell will ask Dave Dyjack who serves as the signatories on NEHA bank accounts?
3.2 Chairperson’s Report: Finley

- 2021 EHAC Dues Increase Letter – final draft
  - Distribution date - January 8
  - Discussion of current letter:
    - Busch Isaksen emphasized that the letter is long and asked if some of the data was going to be put in an appendix. Finley explained that the data is important for PDs to see, which is why the Board discussed leaving it in the letter at the October Board meeting. Gilkey felt like it was a good letter and that the data is necessary for comparison sake and should stay in the letter. Suppes added that she agreed with both Busch Isaksen and Gilkey – the letter is long but valuable - and expressed the importance of the data comparison. Suppes wondered if anything could be cut and Finley explained that cutting parts of the letter, the comprehensive nature of letter would be lost.
    - Busch Isaksen commented that she thought the comparison of EHAC costs with CEPH and ABET might backfire but Gilkey doesn’t think so. Busch Isaksen also feels the data comparison is not reflective of the true costs of the accreditation process (especially the CEPH process which took UW a full time position and well over one hundred thousand dollars to navigate).
    - Bush Isaksen and Suppes submitted that the letter also conveys a defensive and “weak” tone. Busch Isaksen also wondered why we are trying to communicate so hard to say we are different from ABET and CEPH. Finley – PDs may feel like there is more value in EHAC so if there is a decision to be made among accreditors – they may choose EHAC because of value. Busch Isaksen said that is not a decision made at the PD level. Busch Isaksen would put the data comparison in an appendix. Suppes commented that the strength of the letter is the value explanation of EHAC. Busch Isaksen agreed that it sounds defensive in providing so much information and that tone may trigger unnecessary investigation. Gilkey likes the document as is. Gilkey agreed that there is a tone of defensiveness but thinks it is necessary because of the increase notification. Gilkey commented that the necessity of small increases in the past could be explained and defended to administrations in the past and that this letter is helpful in providing further defense.
    - Regarding the “true cost” of accreditation, Gilkey suggested changing the table one title to “Maintenance Dues and Fees”. Gilkey stated that he has been amazed at CEPH’s increased number of accreditations, as he finds the EHAC criteria much more effective for producing students prepared to enter the EH field.
    - Finley submitted that he likes things to be one page - to be concise and consistent. One page is suitable in most cases but feels this letter needs to be comprehensive. Finley likes the document but wants the Board to be comfortable with the document. Finley also submitted that he would be more comfortable with full Board consideration – which is lacking right now due to Murphy’s and Williams’ absences.

  - ACTION: Suppes will edit the letter for clarity and strength and provide comments to Mitchell for December Board meeting approval.
• CIEH - report on meeting. Finley reported reaching out to CIEH in October in order to expand and broaden EHAC’s awareness and opportunities.

**ACTION:** Mitchell will send out CIEH accreditation criteria to Board.

• ABIH partnership opportunity – Finley explained that he and Mitchell met with ABIH earlier this month. They are interested in forming a partnership with EHAC in which EHAC graduates would be awarded a graduate ABIH credential that would allow them access to entry level ABIH EH exams.
  o Finley submitted that from an academic perspective he not sure of the value of a potential credential with ABIH and he would like the academics on the EHAC Board to take a look at ABIH’s proposal. Gilkey spoke of “credential creep” and offered that credentials give customer assurance of minimum competency and we want to give students any opportunities to be more competitive, but submitted that credentialing is expensive to achieve and then to maintain. Finley submitted for background that he had spoken with Dave Dyjack about his desire to broaden awareness of EHAC and that we would be talking with ABIH about potential partnership.
  o Busch Isaksen feels we should defend “our turf”. Finley commented that this is not something we have to do right now, but he just wanted to give the Board an update.
  o Gilkey suggested that a question about the value of credentials to EHAC graduates be added to the Annual Update Survey.
  o **ACTION:** Academic member(s) of the EHAC Board will review the ABIH proposal and make a recommendation on whether to pursue a partnership.

3.3 Undergraduate Program Report (Gilkey)

• Self-study Review/Site Visitors for 2020-21 – SUNY ESF (UG), FVSU (Grad.) – update
• BYU initial accred. update. Gilkey will be working as designated mentor for BYU – they are working through the process and hope to apply for accreditation in Fall 2021.
• Finley asked about ETSU. Gilkey reported that Li’s last correspondence said they were in the process of moving forward and would supply evidence as soon as it is available.

3.4 Graduate Program Report – Vice Chair Busch Isaksen – no report

3.5 Committee Reports – all topics tabled to December meeting and quorum is present

• Annual Update Revision Committee – Gilkey
  o Submissions for Review
  o **Racial questions**
  o **Gender questions**
• Nominations Committee:
  o Policy wording update - re: special elections (Williams)
  o Dr. Harvey’s Council position – Finley recommended leaving Dr. Harvey’s seat open until 2021 elections. Finley asked for opinions.
    ▪ Busch Isaksen submitted that the position should be filled and that there is precedent for doing so – either by special election or by returning to the next in line of nominees who lost in the 2020 Council election. Finley is of the position to respect the individual that passed by not filling their position until the end of
their term – in this case with the 2021 elections. However, Finley understands the reasoning behind going ahead and filling the position. Busch Isaksen appreciated Finley’s position and suggested there are definitely ways to honor and remember Dr. Harvey’s legacy, but there is precedence for filling the seat from the past.

3.6 Office Report:
  - Mitchell highlighted some trends from the presentation, including CEPH’s emphasis on the net gain in accreditation of EH degrees.
  - Busch Isaksen explained that in the past they were really only concerned with MPH degrees. But now if you are seeking a school wide accreditation with CEPH – all degrees within the school have to be reviewed and meet CEPH criteria.

4.0 Old Business:

5.0 New Business:
- Technical Responsibility for Virtual Site Visits – program or EHAC/Lead Site Visitor? Gilkey – preference is always to go for a visit but is on board with reaccrediting degree programs providing technical support for virtual visits.
- NEHA - enhance relationship with NEHA and if so desired, what would be ways to do that? Finley asked the present Board members what they thought of potentially bringing Dave into the fold as Council or some such thing. Finley explained that he is a site visitor for CEPH and Finley wants to have a closer relationship to enhance EHAC’s visibility. Gilkey cited that historically there was effort to create and maintain some separation between NEHA and EHAC. AEHAP served as the go between. Gilkey suggested keeping some distance is a good idea. Busch Isaksen agreed with getting him more involved, though, and suggested inviting him on a site visit when COVID is over and we return to onsite activities. Busch Isaksen likes the distance established right now and pointed out that Dyjack’s commitment to CEPH was something developed before his commitment to NEHA. Finley feels the relationship between NEHA and EHAC has been strengthened and wants to maintain that. Busch Isaksen congratulated Finley on his efforts in that area.

6.0 Schedule December 2020 Board Mtg. – December 10, 2020 at 1pm

7.0 Adjournment Mtg. adjourned at 1:33pm Pacific