Summary of Accreditation Body
Expert Committee Meeting
January 15, 2008
Newport Beach, CA

1. Roll call.

Jeff Flowers, Chair, Accreditation Body Committee (ABC), called the meeting to order at 1:30 PM PST in Newport Beach, CA. Members present included: Dan Dickinson, Linda Geddes, Lynn Bradley, and Sharon Mertens. The chair announced that a quorum was present.

2. New committee member.

Jeff Flowers stated that the committee needed a new member representing the accreditation body sector. He indicated that he had received indication that Joe Aiello from the New Jersey DEP was interested. After the committee discussed the appropriate mechanism for receiving and acting on applications for committee membership, Lynn Bradley moved to invite Joe Aiello to join the committee. Sharon Mertens seconded the motion. Voting was done by secret ballot. All present voted in favor.

3. Overview of Mission and Accomplishments

Jeff presented an overview of the Mission and Accomplishments of the Accreditation Body Expert Committee.

4. Dispute Resolution SOP

Jeff reviewed the dispute resolution SOP that the committee had drafted. The draft SOP was sent to LASC for comment. There has been some concern expressed about the difference between an appeal and a dispute. Jeff clarified that the first step was an appeal to the decision making body. When an appeal does not resolve the matter to the grievant’s satisfaction, then the matter becomes a dispute. He also pointed out that the draft SOP requires the appeals panel to be appointed by the Nominating Committee. Jeff opened the floor for comments and received the following:

- A process for –the NELAP Board do discuss matters related to the evaluation team’s recommendation, when the Board is considering issuing a decision different than the evaluation team recommendation, needs to be a part of the evaluation SOP. Kevin Kubik will draft language and submit it to the NELAP Board for action.
- There needs to be a process for appealing a NELAP Board decision.
- This process looks like mediation. We should take it out of the judicial model and use more neutral terms.
• The LASC has requested that language be added to this SOP stating that this SOP applies to disputes that still exist after a matter has gone through an appeal.

Jeff indicated that the committee can draft an appeals process for NELAP Board decisions to be included in this SOP. He will title it “request for reconsideration” or something similar.

5. Review/Revise Committee Charter

Jeff indicated that since the committee’s primary work had been completed when the new accreditation body standard became final, the committee needed to review and revise its charter in light of new work assisting with implementation SOPs. Revising the committee charter will be a future project for the committee.

6. Affiliate/associate recognition categories

The Affiliate/Associate Accreditation Body (AAAB) Forum is seeking ways to recognize accreditation bodies that are not NELAP ABs, but that participate in TNI and incorporate some of the NELAC standards into their programs. Jeff indicated that the ABC would be working with LASC on developing this policy in the coming months.

7. Open discussion

Comments received included:
• What happens to Chapter 6 of the NELAC standards?
• Current renewals of ABs are being done by 2003 Chapter 6. The new standard may be in place by the next round of renewals. There will need to be policies and SOPS in order to implement.
• The ABC identified 17 elements in the 2003 Chapter 6 that are not in the new TNI standard. The ABC would like to assist LASC and the NELAP Board in writing these SOPs.

8. The committee then adjourned into work session to draft an appeals process as discussed earlier in the meeting.