

**EHOC Conference Call  
Wednesday, March 4, 2009  
Minutes**

Present: May Dobal, Alvaro Garza, Kathye Gorosh, Anita Hawkins, Robert Hood, Jean Swinney, Scott Weber, Ann Umemoto

Absent: Barbara Baylor

**I. Call to Order**

**II. Minutes**

- a. Revised minutes from the business meeting at the Annual Meeting: Approved.
- b. Minutes from February 4 conference call: Approved.

**III. Possible Project Assignment from APHA Executive Board through member Linda Landesman**

- a. Scott gave background on the project as discussed during a conversation with Linda and Tia:
  - i. EHOC was charged with monitoring and evaluating implications of switching from a slot to slate system for EB elected positions.
  - ii. The original charge to EHOC appears to have been issued around 2001.
  - iii. Members of APHA governance recall an interim report from EHOC, but there is no record of it (or a final report).
  - iv. EB would like EHOC to review data from 1995-2008 on EB elected members and provide recommendations on whether the slate system results in a more equitable EB.
  - v. Linda would like the findings to be presented at May or November Executive Board meetings.
  - vi. Scott mentioned potential for including data on membership and component (Sections, SPIGs, etc.) leadership in the analyses.
- b. Kathye reviewed the slot vs. slate system:
  - i. Slot. In the slot system, the Nominating Committee would pair 2 candidates (based on demographics and needs of the EB) on the ballot and the Governing Council voted for one of that pair.
  - ii. Slate. The GC felt that too often the best candidates were paired against each other and voted to move to the slate approach, in which a slate of six candidates is proposed and the top three vote getters win.

c. Concerns & questions from committee:

i. Logistics

1. Anita questioned the logistics of completing the analysis. How will tasks be delegated? Who will do what?
2. Scott suggested that the whole committee would be responsible for reviewing the data and conducting the analysis.
3. Jean expressed concern that the project would be time consuming for the committee; General consensus that the project seemed lengthy.
4. Tia reminded committee that the charge as described by Linda seemed simple and straightforward. More in-depth analyses were considered by Scott, and up to the committee's discretion.

ii. Charge from EB

1. Alvaro and Jean requested to see the original charge to EHOC or a new charge in writing from the EB.
2. Committee agreed that they need clarity on what exactly is being asked.

iii. APHA Staff Support

1. Jean asked what support will be provided by APHA staff; and reiterated her point that APHA staff should conduct the data analysis and EHOC interpret the results; Alvaro agreed.
2. Tia was uncertain that staff would have the capacity to conduct the analysis.

iv. Concurrent project

1. Jean stated that it wouldn't be realistic to do another project. Alvaro agreed noting that the committee should not over extend itself.
2. May questioned whether the project is where EHOC should spend its energy? What is the value of the project in light of other tasks EHOC is considering?
3. Robert and Anita agreed that the project is relevant to the charge of EHOC.

4. Ann suggested that the committee should decide what it wants to do for the year.

d. Overall:

- i. EB should provide the charge to the committee in writing-Tia or Scott will request.
- ii. Committee will review the data before making a decision on whether to accept the project; and if a concurrent project is possible- Tia will send excel spreadsheet.
- iii. Committee will continue to explore other project options for 2009.
  1. Topics for policy paper or manuscript
  2. Method of dissemination for EHOC project (raised by Anita)

**IV. Other Business**

- a. Committee should review Alvaro's notes on the scientific session and caucus lunch from the Annual Meeting
- b. Next call scheduled for Wednesday, April 1, 12:30-1:30 EDT.

**V. Adjournment**