

CEU Revision Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: March 7, 2017

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Ken Todd, Committee Chair, opened the meeting by discussing the agenda for the day.

Rebecca Sammons conducted a roll call. Those committee members in attendance were:

Ken Todd, FBPE

Bill Bracken, FBPE

Babu Varghese, FBPE

Public advisors in attendance were:

Bill Dunn, Suncam

Gerry Ward, Licensed Engineer

Rick Barber, Licensed Engineer

Brett Cunningham, Licensed Engineer

Jaime Gold, Licensed Engineer

Dr. Fred Bloestcher, FAU

Patrick Ferland, FES

Staff in attendance:

Larry Harris, FBPE Counsel

Rebecca Sammons, FBPE Assist. Exec. Director

Zana Raybon, FBPE Exec. Director

Attendees continued the discussion of specific concerns with the current rule. The following list are those concerns that have been raised to date. The group discussed whether or not each item was worthy of discussing in greater detail to try and develop language that would resolve the issue. Any new concerns should be sent to Rebecca Sammons, as the Committee Point Person, to be sent to all the participants.

1. What types of "Board" participation can an engineer expect to be given CEU credit? As an example, various technical Civic Boards.
2. What type of educational courses can be given CEU credit? i.e., engineering business courses
3. Should a live course require an exam or at least some written response by each participant describing the key issues taught in the course to obtain CEU credit?
4. Long term certification of providers (3-5 years) has been a problem for FES.
5. Should the course be required to designate whether it is an advanced course or basic material? Apparently, too many courses are not teaching to the expectation of attendees.
6. Courses offered should be less broad in coverage and cover fewer subjects in more detail.
7. Courses offered should be more instructive and less self-study and not done in a group discussion manner.
8. Should we develop a methodology for checking compliance of the rule by providers?
9. Does a teacher of Ethics or laws and rules, who is a P.E., get credit for the laws and rules/ethics requirement for teaching such a class?

10. What will be the penalty for not obtaining the required CEUs or claiming to have taken the courses when, in fact, they had not?
 11. What can be done for a P.E. who practices in an exempt engineering field that designs mechanical processes or power generation equipment that vaguely touches upon building codes? CEU courses aren't offered in that particular field and taking course in mechanical processes are usually basic in nature and not very valuable.
 12. Have the laws & rules/ethics courses approved by the FBPE resulted in improved course quality? Is this process effective?
 13. Should feedback be obtained from students to ascertain quality of courses? If the courses receive a consistently poor review, then should FBPE not renew the approval of the provider?
 14. Should live courses be anonymously audited?
 15. Should the current list of unacceptable topics for coursework be expanded?
 16. How can we make the exam more meaningful in deciphering what was actually learned by the student?
 17. Can we allow out of state providers other than a Florida provider be acceptable for providing course work that Fla. P.E. get credit for?
 18. Should we use an ANSI standard for evaluating the credentials of providers?
 19. How is the area of practice requirement going to be administered, specifically for engineers who don't have a specific area of practice?
 20. How can we make sure the course offered truly utilizes 50 minutes of instruction?
 21. What has the Board done in auditing providers or courses? Has there been communication with a provider concerning concerns about what the provider is offering?
 22. How do we hold providers accountable for meeting the requirements of courses offered?
 23. Is a roughly 19% rate of P.E.s audited that did not have proper documentation of having met the CEU requirements acceptable. What can be done to improve that?
- Note: Rebecca Sammons reported that FBPE audited about 1000 P.E.s (3% of all currently licensed P.E.s) during the last renewal period and of those audited 188 could not produce documentation of having met the CEU requirements.

The group started with item no.1 and finished with item no. 10. The following item numbers were dropped off the list as not needing to be addressed as part of the rule change: items 3,4,7,9, and 10. The group will continue discussion of the items at the next conference call starting with item no. 11. Should any of the group have any new concerns they should be sent to Rebecca Sammons, as the Committee Point Person, to be sent to all the participants.

The group agreed to hold the next conference call on Tuesday, March 21, 2017 at 10:00 a.m. The conference call was adjourned at approximately 11:30 a.m.