

the population due to radiation from cosmic sources, radionuclides in the earth, internally deposited radionuclides, inhaled radioactivity, and fallout from nuclear weapons tests.

The primary usefulness of this report is seen to be in the areas of applied health physics and environmental

health, most probably dealing with situations involving contamination from reactor releases.

LANCE ROSE
Presbyterian-University Hospital
Pittsburgh, PA

NMT AV Reviews

CUT THE QUABS and QUALITY ASSURANCE IN NUCLEAR MEDICINE

L. David Wells and Buck A. Rhodes, Educational Resource Center, Kansas City, Kansas University Medical Center, 1976, \$60.00 (color video tape)

This package is a two-part program on common sources of errors in nuclear medicine procedures.

Part I is a brief overview of errors that usually result in a waste of time and money for the patient, hospital staff, and nuclear medicine technologist. Examples given are incompletely filled out requisitions, scheduling conflicts, and repeating nuclear medicine studies because of interference from previous diagnostic or therapeutic procedures.

Part II gives examples of quality-assurance measurements which can be conducted on in vivo and in vitro studies. There is a good description of the principles of internal and external controls for in vitro laboratory procedures. Reference is made to the programs available through the College of American Pathologists and the Center for Disease Control. The in vivo studies can be

evaluated by controlling the quantity and quality of radiopharmaceutical, and the performance of the instrumentation and the physician. The quality of patient positioning or machine operation by the technologist is not mentioned.

The quality of production of the video tape is very good relative to color and sound. Some of the narration, especially the interview in Part I, is obviously being read, but it is well articulated and not distracting. Video tape is an excellent medium for portraying dynamic situations. Except for the interview in Part I, the entire program consists of still pictures. As such, this program could also be made available in a slide/tape format.

In summary, this video-tape program is recommended as an introduction to the topic of quality assurance, and would serve well as an introduction to the subject to students.

LOUIS M. IZZO
University of Vermont
Burlington, VT

Letter to the Editor

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A SINGLE NATIONAL EXAMINATION BOARD IN NUCLEAR MEDICINE TECHNOLOGY

During the past two years announcements or reviews of essentials in nuclear medicine technology have appeared with increasing frequency in the various newsletters or chapter journals. Their purpose: to update technologists and students in current theory and practice of their profession, and to guide them in the preparation for a certifying examination.

Most of such reviews end with a mock examination intended to evaluate the effectiveness of the program.

The simplicity of modern computerized data analysis applied to these mock examinations, their reasonable cost, and the rapid distribution of the results to the participants make them a very desirable *annual* continuing education activity for the various areas in which they are

offered. They also lend themselves to be offered on a national scale or, when adequately modified by experts in the fields of nuclear medicine and nuclear medicine technology, can be upgraded to the level of current registry examinations.

For the prestige of hosting similar nationwide examinations some University Computer Centers are willing to offer their facilities and expertise to analyze and score such tests at a minimal cost.

On the subject of nationwide examinations in nuclear medicine technology, two come immediately to mind: the ARRT and the ASCP "registries" which are offered twice yearly by those organizations. It should surprise no one if the legitimate question is asked why the Technologist Section of the Society of Nuclear Medicine is not yet entrusted with the credentialing of its own members.

Certainly the reputation and long experience of the

ARRT and ASCP cannot be questioned; what is puzzling, however, is their negative attitude toward the development of a single national conjoint examination board in nuclear medicine technology structured along the general lines of the American Board of Nuclear Medicine (ABNM). The ABNM, formally incorporated on July 28, 1971, is a conjoint board of the American Board of Internal Medicine, the American Board of Pathology, the American Board of Radiology and it is also sponsored by the Society of Nuclear Medicine. The credentialing of nuclear medicine technologists through a similar board was the clear mandate of the Section's National Council to the appointed committee in June 1975 and constituted the main goal of Glenn Isserstedt, Leo Lopez, and Judy Glos when they met the ARRT and ASCP representatives in a day-long session in Atlanta in August 1975.

Unfortunately the attempt was reported as unfruitful. The ARRT and ASCP simply stated that they "could not abandon their registry efforts in favor of a single conjoint registry examination."

What the Technologist Section sought was the advice, encouragement, and assistance it needed from two "sister organizations" to fly on its own wings. It did not expect to be grounded. It hoped to obtain, eventually, full recognition as a certifying body of its own members, by the Society of Radiological Technology, and the Society of Medical Technology, two older, different, and distinct paramedical professions.

Has not the Technologist Section demonstrated itself to be a responsible entity capable of accepting and providing the required obligations for nuclear medicine technology? Has it not demonstrated dynamic and organizational abilities through the outstanding teaching sessions at the various local, state, and national meetings, and its contribution to the existing accrediting and credentialing activities? Why has the legitimate desire of members of the largest professional organization representing all nuclear medicine technologists been termed unduly "Big Idea of Another Registry"?

Nuclear Medicine Technologists seek not a "third, independent" registry, but a single consolidated examination board for all individuals practicing Nuclear Medicine Technology.

Again, at the 23rd Annual Meeting of the Society of Nuclear Medicine, the mandate of the Technologist Section National Council rang clearly from the Dallas Convention Center with two unmistakable resolves:

1. Agreed with the concept of a distinct national examination board in nuclear medicine technology.
2. Agreed to establish a committee to study the feasibility of the creation of such a certifying board.

The committee will report the result of the study at the National Council Winter meeting in January 1977 in Las Vegas.

Both resolutions were supported and sponsored by the Society of Nuclear Medicine. It is hoped that before January 1977, both the ARRT and ASCP may be willing to modify their present position and generously decide to lend a helping hand to the Nuclear Medicine Technologists in their effort to realize what must be recognized as a legitimate aspiration: THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A SINGLE NATIONAL EXAMINATION BOARD IN NUCLEAR MEDICINE TECHNOLOGY.

These are the feelings expressed by the overwhelming majority of the members of the Southeastern Chapter, Technologist Section of the Society of Nuclear Medicine, after the appearance of the articles "What's the Big Idea of Another Registry" and "Where Do We Stand with Nuclear Medicine Technology Registry" in the June 1976 issue of *JNMT*.

Individual members and representatives of other chapters, SNM, Technologist Section, are invited to voice openly their opinion on this important issue.

RICHARD J. BESCHI and
FRANCES KONTZEN
Veterans Administration Hospital
Birmingham, AL